Comments and Responses to Comments Received on the Public Draft EIR (October 10, 2000)
This section of the Final EIR (FEIR) presents the responses to public comments made on the Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft EIR (DEIR). Each letter commenting on the Plan and DEIR has been assigned a number, from 1 to 59. Within each letter, comments have been numbered in ascending order. A unique number that consists of the number assigned to the comment letter, followed by the comment number, identifies comments and responses. For example, the comment and responses identified as 1-1 represents the first comment in the first letter. Subsequent comment from that letter would be identified as 1-2, 1-3, etc. The second comment letter would commence with 2-1, 2-2, etc. The person making the comment is the “commenter,” and is identified before the response. Some comments do not pertain to physical environmental issues, but responses are included to provide additional information for use by decision-makers. Many of the comments spoke directly to issues with the Master Plan. Responses to these are included here. Also included in the FEIR are staff-initiated text changes and errata.

List of Persons Commenting on the Cal Poly Master Plan and DEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terry Roberts</td>
<td>State Clearing House</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allen Settle</td>
<td>SLO City Mayor</td>
<td>13-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Mandeville/Arnold Jonas</td>
<td>SLO City Council</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Moss</td>
<td>Utilities Director</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Michael McCluskey</td>
<td>SLO City-Director of Public Works</td>
<td>12-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barry Lajoie</td>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roger W. Briggs</td>
<td>CA Reg. Water Quality Cont. Bd.</td>
<td>16-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Larry Newland</td>
<td>CA Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ron DeCarli</td>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harvey Greenwald</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>29-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jasmine Watts</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ali Schlageter</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Andre von Muhlen</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bob Ladd</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brianna Holan</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brooke Saavedra</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chad Gifford</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chad Gifford</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dale Sutliff</td>
<td>LAC/College of Architecture</td>
<td>18-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Doug Piirto</td>
<td>Professor-NRM (CAGRLUC)</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Kranzdorf</td>
<td>Professor-Pol Sci. Dept.</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eugene Jud</td>
<td>Professor- CE</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glen Lawson</td>
<td>Student (Senior Project)</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>James Vilkitis</td>
<td>Professor-NRM</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jenny Wong</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ken Scotto</td>
<td>CAGR Land Use Committee</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ken Solomon</td>
<td>Bio-Resource/Ag. Engineering</td>
<td>15-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mark Shelton</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>26-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Norm Pillsbury</td>
<td>NRM Dept. Head</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Obadiah Bartholomy</td>
<td>Student - ME (via Paul Zingg)</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Phil Ashley</td>
<td>Bio. Science Dept.</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rick Johnson</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rob Rutherford</td>
<td>Animal Sciences</td>
<td>29-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Roger Gambs</td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>20-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sarah Brown</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Scott Cooke</td>
<td>Resident (&amp; Staff at Cal Poly)</td>
<td>30-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Scott Steinmaus</td>
<td>Crop Sciences</td>
<td>21-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Simon Robertshaw</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>22-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Stephen Kaminaka</td>
<td>Professor-Bio Res/Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Steven Marx</td>
<td>English Dept., Resident</td>
<td>26-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Tyson Carroll</td>
<td>Student (Landscape Arch.)</td>
<td>5-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>V.L. Holland</td>
<td>Chair-Biological Sciences</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yasman Okano</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Carlyn Christianson</td>
<td>Action for Healthy Communities</td>
<td>16-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Donna Duerk</td>
<td>Foundation Board Member</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Frank Mumford</td>
<td>Foundation Director</td>
<td>14-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>John Beccia</td>
<td>Life on Planet Earth</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Bishops Peak Neighbor Assoc.</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pamela M. Heatherington</td>
<td>ECOSLO</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Patricia Wilmore</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Terry Elfrink</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ben Fine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>New Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Margot MacDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Paul Zingg, Chair</td>
<td>University Planning And Budget Advisory Committee</td>
<td>25-Oct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 1, 2000

Robert Kitamura
California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo
C/o Facilities Planning
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Subject: Cal Poly Master Plan
SCH#: 20003101072

Dear Robert Kitamura:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on November 30, 2000, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse
Letter 1
Mr. Terry Roberts  
State Clearinghouse  
December 5, 2000

1-1 No comments were received from the agencies receiving the EIR via the State Clearinghouse.

Response Other, local agencies have responded to the EIR and their comments follow. No response required
December 13, 2000

Warren Baker, President
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Dr. Baker:

The City of San Luis Obispo greatly appreciates the opportunity to again review the evolving Cal Poly Master Plan, now including the Draft Environmental Impact report. The extensive and inclusive process of community involvement during preparation and refinement of the plan is evident, and we have been most impressed with your use of public meetings, the Internet and even CD's.

As you recall, the City provided comments on the earlier draft of the plan, and we are gratified to see that, with few exceptions, those comments have been incorporated into the current Master Plan draft through changes to the plan itself, analysis in the Draft EIR, or by designation for analysis as part of future implementation studies. Our comments on the current draft are included as an attachment to this letter.

While the University is cognizant of the concerns of its neighbors, and is actively pursuing solutions to the issues presented, the comments provided by one of our citizen groups, the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods (RQN), were not incorporated to the same extent as those of the City. It is important to understand that members of RQN are residents of the City of San Luis Obispo, and that the City Council must represent their concerns to the best of its ability. While the University may be unable to guarantee the desired outcomes, we must insist that the plan and the EIR deal with the issues raised by RQN, and believe that inclusion of the requested language (or a reasonable modification) are worthy of additional consideration. In some cases we even offer specific recommendations.

It should also be noted that RQN and the Bishop Peak area residents have also provided responses to the current draft of the plan. In accordance with the City Council's direction, those comments have been incorporated into the City's response to the plan.

Notwithstanding the extensive analysis given to housing, traffic and parking, environmental protection, and other significant issues, our strongest recommendation continues to be for realistic and sincere implementation, once the plan is adopted. The closing section of the plan, Communication and Consultation, holds great promise that a dynamic partnership of the University, the City, and its residents will continue unabated
toward that end. A showing of good faith in this area would be Cal Poly's commitment to “fix” the problem with the current Sports Complex lighting, especially the unintended, tremendous light and light trespass from the four lower multi-use fields.

We look forward to working with you to the conclusion of the planning process, and the ultimate realization of its goals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Allen K. Settle
Mayor

Attachments:

City comments on Master Plan draft and EIR
Memo from Richard Kranzdorf
Statement and letter from Naomi Wright

c: Residents for Quality Neighborhoods
   Bishop Peak neighborhood residents
Letter 2  
Mayor Allen Settle  
City of San Luis Obispo  
December 6, 2000

- The Mayor suggests that while most of the City’s comments from the last draft were incorporated, a few remain. Further, many comments from RQN were not addressed in the draft.

Response See responses to letter number 58, Residents for Quality Neighborhoods. The remaining City responses are set forth in responses to letter number 3, below.

2-2 The mayor recommends that realistic and sincere implementation of the plan is important.

Response The comment is noted. Please refer to the revised text in Chapter 7 on implementation of the Master Plan. Following adoption of the Master Plan, Cal Poly will engage in a series of implementation studies (specified in Chapter 7). As projects are planned and built, they will be reviewed and monitored for compliance with the environmental analysis as well as with meeting plan expectations to reinforce the academic quality of the University. The Campus Planning Committee will review the Master Plan annually so as to determine whether conditions have changed sufficiently to warrant a major update.

One of the responsibilities of the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) is to monitor the implementation of the Master Plan. The CPC sees project proposals as part of the five-year capital improvement program, submitted annually to the California State University (CSU). When a specific building or landscape project is being designed, the CPC assesses its consistency with the Master Plan and sees the environmental assessment. If the proposal differs from the Master Plan, the campus, with CPC approval, may forward a request for amendment to the CSU Board of Trustees. As the CSU is most concerned with enrollment capacity and physical construction, the system requires campus review of enrollment levels and facilities annually.

The Campus Planning Committee will add responsibility for an annual review of the assumptions underlying the master plan and its policies, so as to identify when a major update may be required. This annual review will include an update on compliance with the Master Plan mitigation monitoring program. The Academic Senate has urged that the University assess the impacts of enrollment growth on academic quality for each phase of Master Plan implementation. This analysis should occur as part of Cal Poly’s assessment and accountability efforts, including academic program review.
City of San Luis Obispo
Recommendations For Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report
December 5, 2000

After reviewing the October 10, 2000, version of the Master Plan and draft EIR, the City of San Luis Obispo would like to provide the following input. We start with a list of general concepts and follow with specific references to the document itself.

**Concepts Strongly Encouraged**

1. Commitment to neighborhood preservation through redesignation of the remaining "ancillary activities" area at the Grand Avenue / Slack Street intersection to "natural environment", and addition of another double-ended arrow indicating potential neighborhood conflicts.

2. Designate the hill area above the dorms to "natural environment".

3. Incorporate provisions for retaining in open, undeveloped uses, the lands shown as "outdoor teaching and learning".

4. Elevate Stenner Creek to the same level of environmental protection and enhancement as Brizzolara Creek.

5. Insure that retail and other support activities do not conflict with, or establish inequitable advantage over, similar facilities and services in the off-campus community.

6. Reinforce the recognition that housing impacts are the major community concern for additional University growth, and make every effort to provide on-campus housing for the greatest possible number of students, including fraternities and sororities. Housing should be provided prior to increases in enrollment.

7. Based on testimony of several speakers at the City Council meeting expressing concern over the specific siting of on-campus student housing, the City respectfully requests that the University reevaluate the siting of those proposed units, but without reducing the level of housing proposed. Efforts should be taken to minimize impact to the campus's natural environment and particularly on important foraging habitat adjacent to Poly Canyon, Brizzolara Creek, and the hills adjacent thereto.

8. Cite the Jones and Stokes Sound Study and its recommended mitigations and show their use in the evaluation and design of a new Mustang Stadium.

9. Cite the Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan in the references.

10. Include documentation on the generation of the 2,000 space parking reduction.
11. Clarify the purpose and potential future uses of the Goldtree site, and assure that any development there will not conflict with, or inequitably compete with, off-campus community resources.

12. Include a definitive process for Plan development and Plan amendment, which assures early community notification, involvement and consultation.

In addition, the City requests further effort be made to accommodate the suggestions provided via the Mayor's June, 2000, letter that are not reflected in the October 10 draft Master Plan, in particular those submitted by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods (RQN).

Key Previous Comments Not Previously Addressed

1. Additional consideration should be given to making a bolder, action based, statement promoting alternative transportation.

2. Additional policy language should be added to the Master Plan text to insure that City design policies and standards are followed to the greatest extent possible for all off-campus housing developments.

3. Cal Poly should make every effort to amend, or adapt, University System policy so that fraternal housing can be located on campus, as occurs at other state-funded universities.

4. The Jones and Stokes noise study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex should be referenced in the Master Plan, and its use in the preparation of the Plan verified.

5. The Plan should include a strong commitment to unified analysis and planning techniques with the City to facilitate a higher level of awareness and accuracy in both jurisdictions.

6. The proposed Parking Management focused study, included as an implementation effort, should be given high priority considering the importance of parking impacts, and the need for strong commitment to effective mitigation measures.

7. Inclusion of the suggested language by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods relating to light and glare is appropriate considering the EIR evaluation, an interest in reducing the need to refer to the EIR as well as the Plan, and for clarity in the Plan text.

8. The Constraints Summary Map should be amended to include designation of the Goldtree site, and a double-ended arrow should be added at the southeast corner of the Slack Street/Grand Avenue intersection to indicate potential neighborhood conflicts in that quadrant of the intersection.

9. The language proposed by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods relating to environmental consequences of planned residential uses near existing neighborhoods, and Highway 1, should be included in the Plan text to insure compatible development in those areas.
Previous RQN comments included a number of specific text proposals, which for the most part have not been incorporated into the current document. Cal Poly staff states that the proposed text was not incorporated because the total elimination of impacts on established residential neighborhoods, a basic precept of the RQN comments, is not technically possible. As a consequence, the University cannot promise to entirely eliminate impacts. They do note that the current version of the plan, and the DEIR, contain various sections that address the underlying issues raised by the RQN, and mitigate related impacts to the greatest extent possible. University officials also commit to working closely with neighborhoods as actual projects are developed, as the City has urged, and as further discussed later in this report relative to Chapter 7 of the Plan.

RQN now proposes that the words “avoid” or “minimize to all extent feasible” be used in place of the word “eliminate” in their earlier comments, to facilitate the consideration of the underlying concepts. With such change, the suggestions need not be considered as absolutes, and the City urges their continued consideration and incorporation.

10. The Plan text should be amended to clarify what constitutes a “commercial component”, as well as the nature of anticipated uses in the instructional core and the Goldtree site to insure avoidance of impacts on residential neighborhoods, and potential competition with community business interests.

11. Additional environmental review for future projects, as appropriate and necessary, should be confirmed by additional plan text.

Specific Comments on the October 10, 2000, Master Plan and Draft EIR

Analysis of the current draft has generated the following comments in addition to those of the earlier review.

Ch.4, Existing Conditions

Page 58, Constraints Summary Map

The Constraints Summary Map includes several double-ended arrows showing general areas of potential neighborhood conflicts. An additional arrow should be added to the east side of Grand Avenue, south of Slack Street, to indicate that conflict potential will continue to exist in that area as well.

Ch. 5, Physical Plan Elements

Page 70, Land Use Map, San Luis Creek Watershed

This map includes several land use designations in the “outdoor teaching and learning” category, which covers the bulk of the campus property, encompassing all of the agricultural use and natural habitat areas. The steep hillside area to the east, or rear, of the residential dorm area is shown in the general outdoor classification, although it is otherwise surrounded by the “natural environment” category. Given the topography of
this area, which does not appear suitable for agricultural use, and its relation to the campus core, this area should also be shown as “natural environment”.

Page 71, Campus Development Map (re: Grand/Slack Neighborhood Interface)

The Campus Development Map has been modified from earlier versions so that it provides a diagrammatic indication of the ancillary facilities (additional residential dorms, and a visitors center, described at pages 194-195) now anticipated for the Grand Avenue/Slack Street site. The impression now created is that the remainder of the site, which is at the campus/community interface, will be left in a natural state. Given the sensitive nature of this location to the nearby residential neighborhood the area should, therefore, be shown as permanently in open space. This can be done by removing the pink shading indicating the possibility of future development from this map, and all other maps on which it may appear throughout the Master Plan, and replacing it with the Natural Environment land use category.

Page 78, Stewardship (re: Open Space Protection)

The Plan text discusses the concept of “outdoor teaching and learning” and “environmentally sensitive areas” (first paragraph, Plan Components – Land Use Designations, page 67) as designations for the natural and undeveloped open areas of the campus, setting them apart from the more typical “open space” designation found in most land use plans. The implication is that the campus lands are potentially more heavily used, at least in part, than their non-university, “open space” brethren. Regardless of these distinctions, the Plan should incorporate a commitment to retaining these lands in open, undeveloped uses in a fashion similar to that of the City of San Luis Obispo open space lands. The section at page 78, Natural Environment, Stewardship, would be a logical location for such a commitment.

Page 98, Other Creek Enhancement Activities (re: Protection/Restoration of Stenner Creek also)

This short paragraph deals with Stenner Creek, which flows in large part through lands used mainly for agricultural related uses. The text promotes activities to ensure no further degradation of the creek area. This is in contrast to the preceding discussion of Brizzolara Creek, its relationship to the campus core, and restorative and/or enhancement activities proposed for that waterway. The two streams comprise the major waterways on the heavily used part of the campus, and are shown in the same land use designation on page 70. Given that, they should be recognized as equivalent resources and be provided equivalent levels of protection and restoration. This would require a commitment to activities beyond arresting degradation on Stenner Creek, by extending and reinforcing the language on page 98 to activity levels afforded Brizzolara Creek.

Page 106, Uses (re: Provision of commercial activities on-campus)

The Plan anticipates provision of a variety of services and activities on-campus of a non-instructional character in support of the primary educational effort. General retail, franchised food outlets, personal services, rental of automobiles and recreation
equipment, and entertainment facilities such as movie theaters, are examples listed. Cal Poly staff has stated that the recent University Union Master Plan was a major resource for defining the type and extent of the supporting uses, and will be attached to the Master Plan as an appendix. It would be helpful if the document were more readily available for community review prior to Plan adoption. The concept of providing such facilities and services, thus substantially reducing the need for off-campus trips by faculty and students, is sound. However, it needs to be balanced with community concern regarding duplication of services already provided off-campus, to assure that an atmosphere of unfair competition is not created, and that such uses do not draw from the larger community thus increasing impacts on adjoining residential areas. The provision of these facilities and services should be sufficiently explored prior to implementation to minimize community impact. If they are to be provided, utmost effort should be made for provision of the desired goods and services through contract, or other arrangements, with community sources. The potential of these services drawing non-students to the campus and further impacting the nearby neighborhoods should also be considered.

Page 128, Residential Communities, Feasibility

The Plan incorporates the admirable goal of providing new housing to accommodate any increase in the student population during the life of the plan. In this respect Plan policies conform to City General Plan policies (Land Use Element Section 1.4, and Housing Element Section 10.2.4) requiring mitigation of any additional impacts resulting from growth. New residential construction now underway (800 student beds) will be available early in the plan period, and development of the Request for Proposals for the next phases of student housing (approximately 1300 beds on two sites), as well as faculty and staff accommodations, is already underway. Given the incremental nature of housing production, during the early life of the plan this activity could actually result in an increase in housing supply that will exceed the growth in student population. The requirement that student housing be self-supporting, however, gives rise to community concerns that providing additional housing to accommodate all new students might not be realized under some circumstances. This section should more clearly elaborate on the source of housing development funds, the nature and operation of “partnerships”, the likelihood of funds being available when needed, and the potential for the California State University System imposing their preferred 33% student growth rate on Cal Poly, rather than the locally proposed 17% increase that would be accommodated by planned new housing.

Page 137, Introduction (re: Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan citation)

Reference is made in the second sentence to the Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan, but a citation to this document does not appear elsewhere in the campus plan document, or the Draft EIR. Given the importance of the Heery Plan as a basis for the amount, location and development of sports facilities on campus, and the sensitivity of the adjoining community to potential impacts from the operation of the facilities, the availability of this document for reference should be made clear. If Cal Poly should build a new football stadium, it is the expectation of the City Council that it be designed with the full participation of the surrounding community. The Heery Plan should not be the sole or key basis for the design, size, or location of a new stadium. A new stadium design should
avoid noise and light impacts on established neighborhoods and the City's open space areas to the greatest extent possible.

Page 138, third paragraph, last sentence (re: Mustang Stadium location clarification)

The Plan states: “The football program, however, will remain at its present location at Mustang Stadium during the initial phases of the Master Plan”, and the Recreation/Sports Facilities Map on page 141 shows the stadium at its present location. However, succeeding discussion of the athletic field house, page 142, Mustang Stadium, page 143, and Mustang Stadium impacts in the Draft EIR at page 290, result in a concern among community residents that the “initial phases” of the plan (at least relative to the stadium location) may not be long-lived. These various sections, and perhaps others pertinent to this topic, should be better integrated and coordinated so that the adjoining residential community has a clear understanding of the actual potential for change of the stadium location. Any relocation of the stadium will likely be strongly opposed. As an alternative to moving the stadium, remodeling the present facility should be discussed in the Master Plan and EIR.

Page 164, Pedestrian Circulation Map

The designation: “Controls to Inhibit At-Grade Pedestrian Crossing” should also be shown along the railroad right-of-way bounding the west side of the instructional core.

Page 165, second bullet

The citation should be “Americans With Disabilities Act”.

Page 165, third bullet (re: creek side trail)

The pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek should be located outside the creek itself, or the adjacent riparian vegetation. The creek side trail should be shown to make use of the same creek crossing as the pedestrian path from the H-1, 2, and 3 residential areas to the campus instructional core to minimize the number of creek crossings.

Page 168, Campus Shuttle

An enhanced University leadership image, and additional air quality benefits, would result from employing electric or similar low-emissions vehicles for this service.

Page 170, second paragraph, last sentence

The referenced roadway section does not include an indication of pedestrian crossings.

Page 185, Parking Demand

The Plan proposes a reduction of 2,000 parking spaces at build-out as compared to the number required if present parking ratios were to continue. There appears to be no documentation in the Plan, or the Draft EIR, verifying the feasibility of this reduced
number of parking spaces, or the basis of its generation. Inadvertent omission of an appendix to the traffic study included in the EIR may be the cause. Thus, the reader cannot confirm the viability of this desirable goal. Additional text clarifying this situation is very important, as campus generated parking demand is of critical concern to adjoining residential neighborhoods, and overall community impact.

Page 194, Issues (re: Goldtree Site concerns)

The issues included in this section, Ancillary Activities and Facilities, appear to be only introspective to the campus environment. However, given the non-specific character of examples of potential uses for the Goldtree site, there is the unknown potential for significant community conflicts as well. Competition with community businesses, sprawl of urban uses into planned rural areas, and generation of urban impacts such as aesthetics, traffic, noise, and light and glare, as well as impacts to wildlife corridors and habitat, should be more thoroughly evaluated before committing to this land use on even a conceptual basis. As with the comments concerning retail and other non-instructional uses above (Page 106, Uses), there is substantial community concern for establishment by the University of subsidized competition with off-campus locations and providers of identical (or at least similar) services and facilities. The Plan should be made explicit regarding the nature of the proposed development, and that it will be non-competitive with off-campus community resources.

Page 210, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Noise, Mitigation

The EIR should include the recommended mitigations from the 1997 Jones and Stokes Sound Study as feasible mitigations. Additional mitigation measures should be added as follows:

“Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts.”

“Other feasible mitigations that have been used for other stadiums such as berms, acoustical barriers, enclosing or partially enclosing the stadium, and sinking the stadium significantly below ground level, should be considered.”

Page 211, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Residual Impact

The proposed Master Plan lighting mitigations are not adequate. The third box down in this column shows that Class II impacts would remain after mitigation of lighting and glare resulting from implementation of the Master Plan. The City Council finds that residual impacts of this magnitude, which affect off-campus neighborhoods, are unacceptable, and all such impacts should be mitigated to a Class III level. Cal Poly should consider a broader range of more effective lighting mitigations for the proposed football stadium, basketball stadium and large park area proposed for the sportsfield complex area in the Master Plan.
Page 211, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Mitigation

The following statement should be added to the third box down to emphasize Cal Poly’s commitment to community involvement: “Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts”.

Page 211, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Mitigation

The fourth box deals with lighting from parking structures. Fully shielded lights, or lights with internal and external louvers, avoid impacts on established neighborhoods and the City’s open space to a greater extent than “hooded lights”. City open space and some neighborhoods are not adjacent to Cal Poly. The following language should be added to this box: “All light fixtures must be fully shielded, or have internal and external louvers (whichever is most effective) to avoid glare and light spillover onto adjacent, and non-adjacent areas and onto public rights-of-way. Light trespass shall be avoided to all extent feasible”.

Page 212, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Mitigation

In the second box down, and consistent with the immediately preceding recommendation, change the first sentence to read: “If this project were to occur, final design shall include all feasible mitigation measures possible to avoid light trespass, and light and glare visible to area residents”.

Add the following statement: “All light fixtures must have internal and external louvers or be fully shielded (whichever is most effective) to avoid glare and light spillover onto adjacent, and non-adjacent areas and onto public rights-of-way. Light trespass shall be avoided to all extent feasible.”

Add the following statement: “For new parking structures, new Mustang Stadium, the Slack and Grand area and the Goldtree area, add other feasible lighting mitigations such as: fully shielded lighting, internal and external louvered lighting, landscaping, enclosing or partially enclosing structures, lighting fixtures of non-reflective materials and horizontal lighting arms which are aimed in a downward direction”.

Page 212, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Noise and Aesthetics

The City Council requests that mitigation measures of all types, and particularly those dealing with noise, and light and glare impacts, be tied to standards of performance and enforceability. Mitigation monitoring plans should be created and implemented.

Page 213, Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Public Services, Mitigation

The third box down, first bullet, is a mitigation relating to water consumption on campus. The University should consider a policy statement in the Master Plan that the University will develop and implement a water demand management program which, at a minimum,
will retrofit the existing campus with water-saving fixtures and ensure that all new
development includes the installation of water-saving fixtures only.

The second bullet in this box deals with a drought contingency plan. The University
should be aware that water shortage contingency planning is one of the required best
management practices (BMP’s) for all signatories to the California Urban Water
Conservation Council’s (CUWCC) MOA, and while the University may not be a member
of the CUWCC, the City appreciates the University’s consideration of adopting a drought
contingency plan and recommends that the University consider adoption of all BMP’s
identified by the CUWCC. The City is signatory to the CUWCC MOA and does comply
with the BMP’s. The City would appreciate the University’s consideration of adoption of
the BMP’s in the Master Plan, regardless of required mitigation.

Chapter 7, Implementation

Page 302, Table 6.23

It does appear that at least some information is lacking from Table 6.23 on page 302 of
the DEIR and should be addressed in the FEIR. In the discussion of the Physical Plan
Elements on pages 147 and 148 of the Master Plan, the discussion of the available water
resources for the University includes two deep-water agricultural wells north of
Brizzolara Creek that supply 450 acre feet of water per year for agricultural irrigation.
The supply of water available from these two wells, and any corresponding demand they
satisfy, should be included in Table 6.23 for clarity. Once properly included, there may or
may not be the identified deficit in available yield.

Page 333, Communication and Consultation (re: Community and Neighborhoods)

This four-page section is one of the most important to the long run success of the Plan,
relative to the surrounding community. It documents a process of on-going
communication and consultation that is intended to verify University concerns for its
neighbors, and facilitate continuation of the interactive relationship established during
plan preparation. It can be made even stronger through inclusion of a definitive
description of the process that will be followed for Plan amendment, including early
community notification, involvement and consultation.

Page 337, Studies, Standards and Guidelines

This section includes a number of proposals for Design Guidelines and Facility
Standards, Focused Studies, and Area Studies that are intended to facilitate
implementation of the adopted Master Plan. Some are already available, or in production.
The list includes a significant number of items, but may not be comprehensive of all of
the suggestions contained within the body of the plan text. The authors should assure that
the list is comprehensive upon plan adoption.
From: Richard Kranzdorf <kranzdor@calpoly.edu>
To: <sstandah@stlocity.org>, Kranzdorf Richard <kranzdor@calpoly.edu>
Date: 12/5/00 12:26PM
Subject: Cal Poly Master Plan

Sherry,

Thanks for making copies for the City Council members and others who may be interested.

Richard Kranzdorf

*160 Graves*
> San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
> December 4, 2000
> California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
> c/o Crawford Mutter Clark and Mohr
> 841 Higuera Street, Suite 302
> San Luis Obispo, CA 93402
> Attention: Nicole Phillips
> Re: Cal Poly State University
> Dear Ms. Phillips:
> I am hereby submitting my comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft Environmental Impact Report. The comments are in four parts. Part I are general in nature. Part II concentrate on one particular aspect of the Plan, the proposal for a Visitors' Center and other ancillary projects on the west side of Grand Avenue between a line of trees and Slack Street. The third part are comments on other aspects of the Plan. Finally, there is a brief concluding statement.
> General Comments
> As a long-time faculty member at Cal Poly who is interested in the environmental dimension of projects involving the University, I am pleased to note that far more attention has been paid to environmental issues in the Master Plan than in other recent efforts including the Cal Poly Sports Complex. I applaud those responsible for the shift in emphasis. For instance, efforts to make the campus less auto-centric is to be commended and, to some extent, so are the constraints on additional parking spaces commensurate with planned new student housing.
> I am distressed, however, at the time-line for review of the Draft EIR. I understand the desire by this campus to move with all due speed so that the Final EIR can be sent to the Chancellor's office early in 2001. One of the pleasures in serving on the Land Use Task Force in the spring of 1999 was having the time to think about and then discuss proposals regarding land use matters on the campus. At the present critical stage of the process, however, those who are interested in our campus and community do not have the same opportunity. This is a major shortcoming.
Comments on the Proposed Ancillary Activities and Facilities Abutting Slack Street East of Grand Avenue

In the interest of openness, I want to first be clear that my house at 160 Graves is only a stone’s throw from where the proposed Visitors’ Center and possibly other structures would be located according to the Master Plan. As one who may retire from full-time teaching in a year or two and possibly move, my comments are directed towards the future of the neighborhood where I have lived since 1983 rather than simply catering to my own wants.

The neighborhood is amazingly quiet given its proximity to the University and the fact that 50 percent or more of the houses are student rentals. One of the reasons for this happy state of affairs, I submit, is the buffer between the neighborhood and campus residence halls in particular and University structures in general. A second reason, already mentioned, is the mix of occupants in the immediate area.

I wish I had been on campus last spring when, according to the DEIR, the proposal was first made to house a Visitors’ Center adjacent to this quiet, residential neighborhood. Alas, I was teaching overseas and was thus not "in the loop" during the formative stages of the proposal. I realize I am submitting my comments at the 11th hour but that is, by itself, insufficient reason to have the proposal go forward if there are serious problems as I believe there are.

When one talks about environmental considerations, you must be concerned both with natural habitat and human habitat. The maps and text of the DEIR designates the area in question as "Suitable for Facilities Expansion." In other words, it is not just a proposed Visitors’ Center that is at issue but basically the reconstitution of the entire area. For instance, on page 196 one reads that the relatively small area may also be suitable for "additional conference facilities."

What is particular disappointing is that those who put the DEIR together, I am told, refused to designate the ancillary structures as even leading to the possibility of "Potential Neighborhood Conflicts" (see map on page 58). Given that the map on page 61, for instance, shows the entire area in question as "Suitable for Facilities Expansion," it is hard to know how such a designation could escape being listed as one of Potential Neighborhood Conflict.

In page xi of the Executive Summary it is stated that "the team [working on the DEIR], in most instances, chose the environmentally superior approach." I can only conclude that the word "most" was used because this case (and perhaps others) could not be classified as "environmentally superior." The Land Use Task Force, on which, as previously stated, I was a member, had a list of guiding principles. I'll quote six:

1. Strive for compact development of buildings and sites. New development should be concentrated in the campus core (There may be a difference in classification but I certainly question the proposal under discussion as being within the campus core.);

2. Campus land uses should be located so that adjacent uses are compatible with respect to their activities and environmental impacts;

3. Campus facilities, land use patterns, support facilities, signage, etc. should be compatible with their surroundings;

4. The concerns of neighbors regarding traffic, noise, lighting, viewsheds, etc. need to be considered in conjunction with educational and facility needs of the campus;

5. Effective buffers should be established and maintained between campus lands and activities and natural or built environments of both campus & surrounding community;

6. Buffers should be provided to offer protection from dust, pesticide drift, odors, noise, visual, traffic and
public safety.

> The proposed ancillary projects will surely result in the destruction of a buffer between the campus and the adjacent community. The cumulative impacts including noise, lighting, traffic, aesthetics, and ambiance will change this neighborhood forever. We often hear the phrase “urban sprawl.” The proposed activities represent “campus sprawl.”

> You will note that I have not uttered a single word about new housing south of Yosemite Hall. Development between Yosemite and the last line of trees before Slack Street is appropriate and still leaves the campus-neighborhood buffer. Perhaps the Visitors’ Center or some other ancillary structure could be placed in that same general location. In other words, I understand the need for such a structure or even ancillary structures. The question is location, location, location. The DEIR location and the designation adjacent to Grand Avenue and Slack Street is simply wrong, wrong, wrong.

> Other Aspects of the Plan

> Others are commenting on the future student housing plans (designated as H-2 and H-3 on DEIR maps) near the north bank of Brizzolara Creek and the mouth of Poly Canyon. Again, as with Slack Street, there is the lack of adequate buffers. Similarly, the quarry south of Poly Canyon Road is an eyesore and an embarrassment. I shudder to think what close monitoring might discover.

> In order to lessen the “footprint” for future student housing, the planned parking component should be reconsidered. By building multilevel parking structures (either below- or above-surface), the land necessary for such structures can be reduced. In short, additional consideration should be given to building up or down, not out, when necessary.

> I am also unaware that provisions have been considered as to how students in the planned Brizzolara housing area will be fed. It’s true that the new housing structures will consist of apartments with kitchens but I’m dubious how often they will be used. The last thing this campus needs are students driving off-campus for their meals or even driving to on-campus locations. This is an issue that needs to be confronted now, not later.

Concluding Statement

> As mentioned at the outset, those steering the three-year Master Plan process are to be commended. Compared to other projects instituted during my almost three decades at Cal Poly, the Master Plan is a giant leap forward.

> But as the Plan enters the crucial endgame, much remains to be done. Again, getting the job done quickly should not be the major goal; getting it done right is far more important. I know others have spent many hours in studying the Master Plan DEIR. So have I. We are talking about the next 20 years at least. Important matters have yet to be fully thought out. Having come this far we all need to make the extra effort to intelligently and with environmental-sensitivity deal with the remaining issues. As I wrote earlier, the remaining issues include both natural and human habitat.

> Sincerely,

> Dr. Richard Kranzendorf

> cc: San Luis Obispo Mayor Allen Settle
    Councilmember John Ewan
    Councilmember Jan Marx
Councilmember Christine Mulholland
Councilmember Ken Schwartz
Sydney Holcomb, Chairperson, Residents for Quality Neighborhoods
I believe that the future of the City of San Luis Obispo could hinge on the Cal Poly Master Plan.

If our City wants to attract clean industry such as the Computer industry, it is obvious that we must have housing for the young families who will be employed in these industries.

If Cal Poly and Cuesta College will house the majority of their students on their own large campuses as soon as possible, this would free our own San Luis Obispo housing stock for young families and maybe, just maybe, the "California Housing Crunch" which will become more severe as time goes on, will be a little less severe in San Luis Obispo City. Otherwise, I believe that the future of S.L.O. and its work force could stagnate with the conditions that exist today.

We desperately need Cal Poly and Cuesta Colleges cooperation in this matter for the good of the University's fine graduates whom we wish to attract stay here and work here and live here, for the good of our industry, present and future, for the good of and the revitalization of our neighborhoods and for the good of young families who wish to live here for whatever reasons.

Working with Cal Poly and Cuesta College, we could become a model for the State of California by partially solving the housing crunch in our own area.

I am pleased and delighted that Chancellor Reed and President Baker and Cuesta College President Marie Rosenwasser will be working together to achieve a solution to the student housing problem.

I wish to suggest here tonight that the City of San Luis Obispo make it a top priority to encourage these leaders to promote as much housing on the campuses as possible. I would also like to suggest that you appoint a Council member and or a committee from the City to work with them as well.

Thank you for listening.
Dan Walters

On Sacramento

Housing crunch now top issue

Did you hear about the young couple who sold their tract house for a million and a half bucks, bought a virtual mansion in Sacramento for a half-million and are living high on the leftovers? Did you hear about the mayor who resigned and moved to the suburban so that his family could afford a new home?

Did you hear the one about the Silicon Valley techies who have formed a colony in low-cost Las Vegas and commute to San Jose by airliner?

These stories, all true, and dozens like them are fodder for this year's holiday gatherings in the San Francisco Bay Area, where the high and the still-soaring cost of buying or even renting homes has surpassed every traffic as the local preoccupation.

California's population is growing by 550,000-600,000 people a year, which would translate into a need for something like 203,000 new housing units a year, based on traditional measures. But some economists believe that societal changes, such as the delay of marriage and the presence of millions of low-income immigrant workers, have slowed the formation of new households. Thus the true gross demand for housing in California is more like 150,000 units a year, just about what the housing industry is producing.

That academic debate aside, there's no doubt that the geographic and economic imbalance exists, one that has raised local housing costs to stratospheric levels and is driving Bay Area workers to seek housing in more affordable areas, especially those in the Central Valley, and put up with daunting commutes. What's not so clear is what, if anything, political decision makers will do about it.

There are, in essence, three approaches to California's housing crunch. One is to build more, and probably much denser, housing near the burgeoning job centers; a second is to push job creation into areas with abundant housing, such as the Central Valley; and the third is to ease commuting through expansion of highways and mass transit.

While all three have their advocates, and are being pursued to one degree or another, there's nothing even approaching a statewide or even regional policy on correcting the housing-job imbalance because politicians are reluctant, for a variety of reasons, to confront the trade-offs the fashioning of such policy would require. Local officials are unwilling to relinquish their authority over land use, which tends to favor revenue-producing commercial or industrial projects over housing, state politicians are reluctant to intrude on land use because it would involve facing the equally touchy subject of local government financing, environmentalists more or less oppose any development anywhere, and business has shunned its implicit responsibility to balance jobs and housing.

Gov. Gray Davis and the Legislature have flung a little money at housing — just enough to say that they've done something — but have bailed at more direct involvement, such as assuming some land use authority or changing laws that discourage high-density condominium construction by making them attractive class-action lawsuit targets. And as long as that dereliction continues, and the economy remains strong, the housing crunch will become even more severe.
Cal Poly, Cuesta discuss project

COMMUNITY COLLEGE MULLS ON-CAMPUS DORM
SALOON OASIS

By Matt Lazier
The Tribune

Cal Poly and Cuesta College officials have begun meeting to discuss the possibility of joint student housing efforts as both schools anticipate enrollment growth over the next decade.

“Mike Hargett, Cuesta’s vice president for administrative services, said Friday that the community college has started to look at how it could provide housing, particularly for those students who move to the area to attend Cuesta,” Baker said. “It has been an issue in the past.”

Hargett emphasized that the partnership between Cuesta and Cal Poly is not yet written in stone. The community college will explore all sides of the issue, he said, and bring the information to the Cuesta College Board of Trustees.

“The issue has been a discussion for some time, but we are now in the planning stages,” Hargett said.

Cal Poly officials have taken steps in recent years to expand student housing options. Baker said the university plans to increase enrollment from 10,000 students to 15,000 by 2010. This will require the construction of new dormitories.

Hargett met with his Cal Poly counterpart, Frank Levens, and some of the university's administration and finance staff earlier this week to begin discussions that could lead to the possibility of the two schools working together on a joint student housing project.

The nature of such a cooperative arrangement remains to be seen. It is expected to go to the board within a month.
The following pages were part of the original response to comments for Letter 3. The responses are keyed to these pages.
FROM: John Mandeville, Long Range Planning Manager
BY: Arnold Jonas, Consultant
SUBJECT: Review and Comment on the October 10, 2000, Draft Cal Poly Master Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

1. Consider the recommended comments outlined in the staff report, and any additional recommendations from Council Members and/or the public.

2. Authorize the Mayor to sign a letter forwarding the City's comments to the University.

REPORT IN BRIEF

This report provides the City Council with its second formal opportunity this year to provide comments to Cal Poly regarding its proposed Master Plan update. In addition, comments are also provided on the accompanying Environmental Impact Report.

The first opportunity for the City to comment on the Plan, the “Text Preview Draft”, occurred on June 6, 2000. A number of suggestions were forwarded to University officials at that time. With few exceptions, City comments have been accommodated by revised text, evaluation in the Draft EIR, or will be addressed in further, more detailed studies that will follow adoption of the Master Plan document.

In this report, staff recommends that the University make further effort to accommodate the suggestions remaining from the June 6 review, in particular those submitted by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods. In addition, the following concepts are strongly encouraged.

1. Commitment to neighborhood preservation through redesignation of the remaining “ancillary activities” area at the Grand Avenue / Slack Street intersection to “natural environment”, and addition of another double-ended arrow indicating potential neighborhood conflicts.

2. Designate the hill area above the dorms as “natural environment”.

3. Incorporate provisions for retaining in open, undeveloped uses the lands shown as “outdoor teaching and learning”.

4. Elevate Stenner Creek to the same level of environmental protection and enhancement as Brizzolara Creek.
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5. Insure that retail and other support activities do not conflict with, or establish inequitable advantage over, similar facilities and services in the off-campus community.

6. Reinforce the recognition that housing impacts are the major community concern for additional University growth, and make every effort to provide on-campus housing for the greatest possible number of students, including fraternities and sororities.

7. Cite the Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan, and the Jones and Stokes Noise Study, and show their use in the evaluation of the future location of Mustang Stadium.

8. Include documentation on the generation of the 2,000 space parking reduction.

9. Clarify the purpose and potential future uses of the Goldtree site, and assure that any development there will not conflict with, or inequitably compete with, off-campus community resources.

10. Include a definitive process for Plan amendment, which assures community involvement and consultation.

DISCUSSION

Background and Overview

The stated goal of Cal Poly’s proposed new Master Plan is to provide principles and guidelines for the physical development of the University to sustain its distinctive mission as a polytechnic university into the 21st century. The Plan is designed to meet the educational needs of the campus, respond to external developments in higher education, and perhaps most importantly for the residents of San Luis Obispo, address the role of the University as a member of its larger community.

The current, or 4th, revision to the University Master Plan was adopted in 1970, and established an enrollment capacity of 15,000 Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Subsequent revisions to add or change building sites resulted from piecemeal planning for new projects - thus a major review was felt to be long overdue.

The projected increase in college-bound students in California referred to as ‘Tidal Wave II’ expands the need for higher education. The high demand for a Cal Poly education, particularly in programs not generally available at other public universities in California, brings that pressure to San Luis Obispo. The existing investment in specialized programs, the number and quality of applications for admission, and the economic and societal contributions of graduates all contribute to the perception of Cal Poly as a candidate for growth.

The Master Plan draft is the product of nearly four years, to date, of a joint University-community planning process at Cal Poly. During that time the University has involved large numbers of community members, including City residents, City Council members, City Advisory Body members, and staff, in various Task Forces and focus groups to assure that
community responsibility would be adequately accommodated in the final document. The Master Plan team applied principles from campus and community task forces to designate future land uses and develop physical plan elements.

As guidance for approximately the next 20 years, the Master Plan addresses academic program demand, physical and environmental constraints and opportunities, and capital and operating budget requirements to support a future enrollment of 17,500 net academic year, and 2,500 summer, full-time equivalent students (FTES). The Plan also anticipates a modest increase in technology-supported instruction and enhancements to curricula and advising to accelerate student progress to degree completion. Together these operational changes designed to increase summer enrollment, apply technology and facilitate student progress, are expected to increase college year enrollment by about 9 percent without increasing fall headcount.

The physical development portion of the Master Plan focuses on land use and circulation issues associated with increasing enrollment during the Academic Year, as this scenario involves the most extensive physical change on campus. Enrollment growth projections by Cal Poly, which are significantly below the 30% increase preferred by the Regents of the State University System, are for a 1.5% growth rate, considered a moderate growth rate by Cal Poly, translate into a Fall Quarter headcount (at the end of the Plan period) of approximately 20,900 students and about 3,200 regular faculty and staff - an increase of about 17 percent over present capacity. The increase is intended to be accomplished in phases, over approximately 20 years. The Master Plan redevelops and consolidates academic facilities within an expanded instructional core south of Brizzolara Creek.

At the same time, the Plan is designed to protect natural environmental features and agricultural lands that form the character of the campus. Two major components in this regard are the rehabilitation of a significant stretch of Brizzolara Creek currently used for instructional and support structures and related facilities, and administration of agricultural activities to minimize, or eliminate altogether, adverse impacts on sensitive habitat or biological areas on campus.

A central feature of the plan involves creating new student residential communities accommodating approximately 3,000 additional students on-campus, and provision of faculty and staff housing, outside the instructional core on University lands west of Highway 1, and possibly at other sites within the city. Student services, and recreational facilities, would be expanded commensurate with increased enrollment. Although parking may increase over existing numbers, the ratio of parking to students is planned to decrease during the planning period and emphasis on alternative forms of transportation to the automobile will be stressed.

The Master Plan takes a broad approach to the analysis of the most suitable future use of Cal Poly's lands in both San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz counties, including management practices to protect the University's unique natural environment, and integration within the context of the larger surrounding environment (including the City of San Luis Obispo). The following is a summary of land use concepts included in the Plan.
Natural Environment

Environmentally sensitive areas and assets are designated as an overlay, determined by physical and biological features of the land. Principle focus is on stewardship, protection and restoration.

Outdoor Teaching and Learning

"Living laboratories" (e.g., agricultural fields and units, ecological study areas, and design village) are central to Cal Poly's mission and will remain integrated with the campus. Sensitivity to the operation of these programs within the larger context of the campus ecosystem will be stressed.

Campus Instructional Core

Additional enrollment requires some expansion of the campus core for instruction and support. Principles focus on creating a compact, "student-friendly, learner-centered" area with more open space heavily emphasizing better pedestrian, bicycle, and alternative forms of transportation.

Residential Communities

New student housing complexes are conceived as living/learning communities, directly accessible to the campus instructional core. New undergraduate student housing on campus will reduce community impacts by providing housing to accommodate the whole of the projected student growth.

Recreation

Flexible outdoor recreational fields and indoor facilities will serve the changing student population.

Circulation, Alternative Transportation, and Parking

Circulation systems both provide access to the campus and movement within it. The Master Plan encourages alternative forms of transportation to reduce congestion and parking. Internal circulation focuses on "user-friendly" pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation access.

Public Facilities and Utilities

Essential support facilities will be located outside the campus instructional core unless they require a central location to function effectively.

Support Activities and Services

A wide array of academic and support activities will be available to serve Cal Poly's diverse student, faculty, staff and visitor populations - in both the instructional core and new residential communities.
Ancillary Activities and Facilities

A number of activities that serve the broader community as well as Cal Poly are considered complementary to the University's instructional mission. Not all of these facilities need to be provided within the campus instructional core, such as the applied research park, or conference center being suggested for the Goldtree area in the northwest corner of the campus.

Master Plan Development Process

The Plan development process has extended over several years, and included direct community input via the various Task Forces established for that purpose, a number of public meetings, and circulation of a Text Preview Draft, the May 1, 2000 Preliminary Master Plan Draft, and now the October 10, 2000 Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact report to Task Force members, interested regulatory agencies, and community organizations, groups and citizens, for review and comment.

Disposition of Previous City Comments

The May 1, 2000, Preliminary Draft plan was the subject of consideration by the City Council at their meeting held June 6, 2000. As a result of that meeting, a number of comments by city staff, Dr. and Mrs. Curtis Collins, and Residents for Quality Neighborhoods were forwarded to Cal Poly for consideration. Attachment A presents an annotated list of those comments, indicating their disposition relative to the current draft document. Cal Poly has prepared Attachment B, a response matrix for all comments received on the Preliminary Master Plan Draft.

With few exceptions, the city comments have been accommodated by revised text, evaluation in the Draft EIR, or will be addressed in further, more detailed, studies that will follow adoption of the Master Plan document. The Circulation and Parking section of the Plan, and the Draft EIR, addresses the Collins' comments. The RQN comments included a number of specific text proposals, which for the most part have not been incorporated into the current document. Cal Poly staff states that the proposed text was not incorporated because the total elimination of impacts on established residential neighborhoods, a basic precept of the RQN comments, is not technically possible. As a consequence, the University cannot promise to entirely eliminate impacts. They do note that the current version of the plan, and the DEIR, contain various sections that address the underlying issues raised by the RQN, and mitigate related impacts to the greatest extent possible. University officials also commit to working closely with neighborhoods as actual projects are developed, as the City has urged, and as further discussed later in this report relative to Chapter 7 of the Plan.

Cal Poly should continue to positively address the comments on the previous draft plan (Attachment 1) that were provided to them via the Mayor's June, 2000, letter. Although most of these earlier City comments have been addressed, as outlined in the analysis in Attachment 1, some continue to need further attention. Key among these are:
1. Additional consideration should be given to making a bolder, action based, statement promoting alternative transportation.  

2. Additional policy language should be added to the Master Plan text to insure that City design policies and standards are followed to the greatest extent possible for all off-campus housing developments.  

3. Cal Poly should make every effort to amend, or adapt, University System policy so that fraternal housing can be located on campus, as occurs at other state-funded universities.  

4. The Jones and Stokes noise study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex should be referenced in the Master Plan, and its use in the preparation of the Plan verified.  

5. The Plan should include a strong commitment to unified analysis and planning techniques with the City to facilitate a higher level of awareness and accuracy in both jurisdictions.  

6. The proposed Parking Management focused study, included as an implementation effort, should be given high priority considering the importance of parking impacts, and the need for strong commitment to effective mitigation measures.  

7. Inclusion of the suggested language by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods relating to light and glare is appropriate considering the EIR evaluation, an interest in reducing the need to refer to the EIR as well as the Plan, and for clarity in the Plan text.  

8. The Constraints Summary Map should be amended to include designation of the Goldtree site, and a double-ended arrow should be added at the southeast corner of the Slack Street/Grand Avenue intersection to indicate potential neighborhood conflicts in that quadrant of the intersection.  

9. The language proposed by the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods relating to environmental consequences of planned residential uses near existing neighborhoods, and Highway 1, should be included in the Plan text to insure compatible development in those areas.  

10. The Plan text should be amended to clarify what constitutes a “commercial component”, as well as the nature of anticipated uses in the instructional core and the Goldtree site to insure avoidance of impacts on residential neighborhoods, and potential competition with community business interests.  

11. Additional environmental review for future projects, as appropriate and necessary, should be confirmed by additional plan text.  

Comments on the October 10, 2000, Master Plan and Draft EIR  

Analysis of the current draft has generated the following comments in addition to those of the
Ch. 4, Existing Conditions

Page 58, Constraints Summary Map

The Constraints Summary Map includes several double-ended arrows showing general areas of potential neighborhood conflicts. An additional arrow should be added to the east side of Grand Avenue, south of Slack Street, to indicate that conflict potential will continue to exist in that area as well.

Ch. 5, Physical Plan Elements

Page 70, Land Use Map, San Luis Creek Watershed

This map includes several land use designations in the "outdoor teaching and learning" category, which covers the bulk of the campus property, encompassing all of the agricultural use and natural habitat areas. The steep hillside area to the east, or rear, of the residential dorm area is shown in the general outdoor classification, although it is otherwise surrounded by the "natural environment" category. Given the topography of this area, which does not appear suitable for agricultural use, and its relation to the campus core, this area should also be shown as "natural environment".

Page 71, Campus Development Map (re: Grand/Slack Neighborhood Interface)

The Campus Development Map has been modified from earlier versions so that it provides a diagrammatic indication of the ancillary facilities (additional residential dorms, and a visitors center, described at pages 194-195) now anticipated for the Grand Avenue/Slack Street site. The impression now created is that the remainder of the site, which is at the campus/community interface, will be left in a natural state. Given the sensitive nature of this location to the nearby residential neighborhood the area should, therefore, be shown as permanently in open space. This can be done by removing the pink shading indicating the possibility of future development, and replacing it with the Natural Environment land use category.

Page 78, Stewardship (re: Open Space Protection)

The Plan text discusses the concept of "outdoor teaching and learning" and "environmentally sensitive areas" (first paragraph, Plan Components — Land Use Designations, page 67) as designations for the natural and undeveloped open areas of the campus, setting them apart from the more typical "open space" designation found in most land use plans. The implication is that the campus lands are potentially more heavily used, at least in part, than their non-university, "open space" brethren. Regardless of these distinctions, the Plan should incorporate a commitment to retaining these lands in open, undeveloped use in a fashion similar to that of the City of San Luis Obispo open space lands. The section at page 78, Natural Environment, Stewardship, would be a logical location for such a commitment.
Page 98, Other Creek Enhancement Activities (re: Protection/Restoration of Stemmer Creek also)

This short paragraph deals with Stemmer Creek, which flows in large part through lands used mainly for agricultural related uses. The text promotes activities to ensure no further degradation of the creek area. This is in contrast to the preceding discussion of Brizzolara Creek, its relationship to the campus core, and restorative and/or enhancement activities proposed for that waterway. The two streams comprise the major waterways on the heavily used part of the campus, and are shown in the same land use designation on page 70. Given that, they should be recognized as equivalent resources and be provided equivalent levels of protection and restoration. This would require a commitment to activities beyond arresting degradation on Stemmer Creek, by extending and reinforcing the language on page 98 to activity levels afforded Brizzolara Creek.

Page 106, Uses (re: Provision of commercial activities on-campus)

The Plan anticipates provision of a variety of services and activities on-campus of a non-instructional character in support of the primary educational effort. General retail, franchised food outlets, personal services, rental of automobiles and recreation equipment, and entertainment facilities such as movie theaters, are examples listed. Cal Poly staff has stated that the recent University Union Master Plan was a major resource for defining the type and extent of the supporting uses, and will be attached to the Master Plan as an appendix. It would be helpful if the document were more readily available for community review prior to Plan adoption. The concept of providing such facilities and services, thus substantially reducing the need for off-campus trips by faculty and students, is sound. However, it needs to be balanced with community concern regarding duplication of services already provided off-campus, to assure that an atmosphere of unfair competition is not created, and that such uses do not draw from the larger community thus increasing impacts on adjoining residential areas. The provision of these facilities and services should be sufficiently explored prior to implementation to minimize community impact. If they are to be provided, utmost effort should be made for provision of the desired goods and services through contract, or other arrangements, with community sources. The potential of these services drawing non-students to the campus and further impacting the nearby neighborhoods should also be considered.

Page 128, Residential Communities, Feasibility

The Plan incorporates the admirable goal of providing new housing to accommodate any increase in the student population during the life of the plan. In this respect Plan policies conform to City General Plan policies (Land Use Element Section 1.4, and Housing Element Section 10.2.4) requiring mitigation of any additional impacts resulting from growth. New residential construction now underway (800 student beds) will be available early in the plan period, and development of the Request for Proposals for the next phases of student housing (approximately 1300 beds on two sites), as well as faculty and staff accommodations, is already underway. Given the incremental nature of housing
production, during the early life of the plan this activity could actually result in an increase in housing supply that will exceed the growth in student population. The requirement that student housing be self-supporting, however, gives rise to community concerns that providing additional housing to accommodate all new students might not be realized under some circumstances. This section should more clearly elaborate on the source of housing development funds, the nature and operation of "partnerships", the likelihood of funds being available when needed, and the potential for the California State University System imposing their preferred 33% student growth rate on Cal Poly, rather than the locally proposed 17% increase that would be accommodated by planned new housing.

Page 137, Introduction (re: Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan citation)

Reference is made in the second sentence to the Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan, but a citation to this document does not appear elsewhere in the campus plan document, or the Draft EIR. Given the importance of the Heery Plan as a basis for the amount, location and development of sports facilities on campus, and the sensitivity of the adjoining community to potential impacts from the operation of the facilities, the availability of this document for reference should be made clear.

Page 138, third paragraph, last sentence (re: Mustang Stadium location clarification)

The Plan states: "The football program, however, will remain at its present location at Mustang Stadium during the initial phases of the Master Plan", and the Recreation/Sports Facilities Map on page 141 shows the stadium at its present location. However, succeeding discussion of the athletic field house, page 142, Mustang Stadium, page 143, and Mustang Stadium impacts in the Draft EIR at page 290, result in a concern among community residents that the "initial phases" of the plan (at least relative to the stadium location) may not be long-lived. These various sections, and perhaps others pertinent to this topic, should be better integrated and coordinated so that the adjoining residential community has a clear understanding of the actual potential for change of the stadium location. Any relocation of the stadium will likely be strongly opposed.

Page 164, Pedestrian Circulation Map

The designation: "Controls to Inhibit At-Grade Pedestrian Crossing" should also be shown along the railroad right-of-way bounding the west side of the instructional core.

Page 165, second bullet

The citation should be "Americans With Disabilities Act".

Page 165, third bullet (re: creek side trail)

The pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek should be located outside the creek itself, or the adjacent riparian vegetation. The creek side trail should be shown to make use of the...
same creek crossing as the pedestrian path from the H-1, 2, and 3 residential areas to the campus instructional core to minimize the number of creek crossings.

Page 168, Campus Shuttle

An enhanced University leadership image, and additional air quality benefits, would result from employing electric or similar low-emissions vehicles for this service.

Page 170, second paragraph, last sentence

The referenced roadway section does not include an indication of pedestrian crossings.

Page 185, Parking Demand

The Plan proposes a reduction of 2,000 parking spaces at build-out as compared to the number required if present parking ratios were to continue. There appears to be no documentation in the Plan, or the Draft EIR, verifying the feasibility of this reduced number of parking spaces, or the basis of its generation. Inadvertent omission of an appendix to the traffic study included in the EIR may be the cause. Thus, the reader cannot confirm the viability of this desirable goal. Additional text clarifying this situation is very important, as campus generated parking demand is of critical concern to adjoining residential neighborhoods, and overall community impact.

Page 194, Issues (re: Goldtree Site concerns)

The issues included in this section, Ancillary Activities and Facilities, appear to be only introspective to the campus environment. However, given the non-specific character of examples of potential uses for the Goldtree site, there is the unknown potential for significant community conflicts as well. Competition with community businesses, sprawl of urban uses into planned rural areas, and generation of urban impacts such as aesthetics, traffic, noise, and light and glare, as well as impacts to wildlife corridors and habitat, should be more thoroughly evaluated before committing to this land use on even a conceptual basis. As with the comments concerning retail and other non-instructional uses above (Page 106, Uses), there is substantial community concern for establishment by the University of subsidized competition with off-campus locations and providers of identical (or at least similar) services and facilities. The Plan should be made explicit regarding the nature of the proposed development, and that it will be non-competitive with off-campus community resources.

Chapter 7, Implementation

Page 333, Communication and Consultation (re: Community and Neighborhoods)

This four-page section is one of the most important to the long run success of the Plan, relative to the surrounding community. It documents a process of on-going communication and consultation that is intended to verify University concerns for its
neighbors, and facilitate continuation of the interactive relationship established during plan preparation. It can be made even stronger through inclusion of a definitive description of the process that will be followed for Plan amendment.

Page 337. Studies, Standards and Guidelines

This section includes a number of proposals for Design Guidelines and Facility Standards, Focused Studies, and Area Studies that are intended to facilitate implementation of the adopted Master Plan. Some are already available, or in production. The list includes a significant number of items, but may not be comprehensive of all of the suggestions contained within the body of the plan text. The authors should assure that the list is comprehensive upon plan adoption.

Conclusion

The Master Plan is a well-written, logical document that deals with a number of issue areas associated with operation of the University. Once adopted and implemented, it has the potential for bringing order and greater efficiency to use of University resources, while fulfilling an even larger educational role than at present. Plan implementation should also reduce the impact of the University on the surrounding community, even with an expanding student population. The Plan contains proposals for reorganization, redevelopment and intensification of various land uses that are consistent with contemporary urban planning theory. Intensification of the instructional core, relocation and extension of circulation facilities, provision of perimeter parking facilities convenient to major university entrances, promotion of alternative modes of transportation, designation of protected natural areas, and an enlightened housing policy exemplify beneficial design features. At its heart, the Plan is driven by the educational function of the University, and thus contains a number of curriculum, organizational structure, and other elements that are of little direct concern to the city residents.

While this may be true, most persons in the community are concerned with those aspects of the plan that directly impact them and their daily lives, such as student housing, automobile traffic parking, and noise. The City provides a vital link between the University and the community and, therefore, focused its earlier comments, and those proposed in this report, on these concerns. A continued responsiveness to our comments, along with those offered by RQN, can go a long way toward addressing long-standing concerns and will usher in a new era of cooperation regarding campus growth and development issues.

Finally, one of the most significant contributions of the Master Plan is the open and inclusive process that has been followed during its development. A new paradigm of campus-community interaction has been established by utilizing community task forces, multiple, progressive draft document review, and public meetings for comment. University President Baker has stated that the Plan is intended to be a living document, and that he expects cooperative interaction to continue into the future. Continuing review and improvement activities could begin as early as the first quarter of 2001. The City is enthusiastic about participating in this opportunity to jointly guide the future development of our community and its surroundings. Through such cooperation,
realization of the University's educational goals can be achieved in the most effective and least disruptive manner to the larger community in which it is located.
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4. Draft letter from the Mayor concerning the current Draft Master Plan
June 12, 2000

Warren Baker, President
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Dr. Baker:

First, on behalf of the San Luis Obispo City Council, we wish to thank you for the inclusive and open process that has been followed in your preparation of the Preliminary Draft of the Cal Poly Master Plan. Allowing the various stakeholder groups to have early, substantive input has resulted in a document that appears to be very well done and broadly supported. Everyone associated with production of the document are to be commended for the effort.

As you know, the Preliminary Draft was initially introduced to the City Council in April. Since that time our staff has had the opportunity to review it in detail. On June 6, 2000, the City Council considered our staff’s recommendations, along with added public input. We now offer our formal comments on the draft, which are attached. We ask that you incorporate into the final draft as many of our suggestions as possible.

To put our comments into context, we recognize that the Master Plan effort is primarily driven by the University’s educational function, and so it contains several elements that are of little direct concern to our residents (i.e. curriculum, organization). Therefore, we have focused our comments on what most of residents are concerned with, which are those plan aspects that directly impact them in their neighborhoods – for example, student housing, automobile traffic and parking, lighting and noise. In this regard, we are also forwarding suggestions provided by Residents for Quality Neighborhoods (RQN). RQN represents those most directly affected by on-campus activities and development, and we ask that you give their suggestions very serious consideration.

Our single, strongest recommendation has to do with implementing the plan. We ask that you assure that the necessary resources are in place – and accountability appropriately assigned – so that future changes on campus are managed with a sincere commitment toward protecting existing neighbors. “Keeping the faith” in this regard is simply essential, if we are to overcome trust and other issues that have surrounded enrollment and campus growth issues for many years.

In closing, we wish to thank you once again for your diligence and inclusiveness in preparing a plan that not only addresses the needs of the University, but that is also sensitive to the very legitimate concerns of residents. This kind of continuing partnership bodes well for the future. We look forward to working with you as the plan is implemented over the next several years.

Sincerely,  

Allen K. Settle
Mayor

Attachments: 1. City Comments
2. RQN Comments
DISPOSITION OF CITY COMMENTS FROM THE JUNE 6, 2000,
CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Bold, italicized text relates to the disposition of each comment based on the October 10, 2000, Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report

Ch. 2 - Guiding Framework

Pg. 13, Transportation Programs (Question 3, second bullet)
Page 1 of 15

Solving transportation and access issues for the Cal Poly population is equally important with that of the housing issue. Commitment should be shown for addressing this area by having the transportation policy read as follows:

1. “Taking actions that cause students, faculty and staff to shift away from automobiles toward alternative transportation systems...”

Language unchanged. Additional consideration should be given to making a bolder, action biased, statement promoting alternative transportation.

Pg. 35, Question 3 - f.

Should include specific mention of resources such as sewer, water, etc. If the Plan is to be “self mitigating” there needs to be more focus on essential services (particularly water and sewer), and close coordination with service provider – the City.

The Master Plan includes a listing of current and projected Studies, Standards and Guidelines, starting at page 337, that are intended to facilitate implementation of the adopted Master Plan. Included is an item titled “Utility Capacity and Distribution Studies”, which will respond to this comment. The Plan also includes a specific section titled “Communications and Consultation”, page 333, which defines a commitment to interaction with appropriate community agencies, groups and individuals during Plan implementation.

Ch.3, Long-Range Enrollment Scenarios

Pg. 25, No More On-Campus Academic Year Enrollment

Cal Poly should give additional consideration to the use of evening programs to increase student capacity without increasing the Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) maximum. A well-planned and administered evening program would provide class availability to regular students who have employment or similar
conflicts during the day, as well as other community members who might not otherwise be able to take advantage of the University resource.

*Reflected in revised text, pages 26 and 27.*

**Pg. 27, Cal Poly Past and Alternate Future Growth Rates**

Cal Poly should work with the City when considering significant growth scenarios, relative to impacts to services and resource capacity. The City plans its resource capacities, e.g. sewage treatment upgrades, based upon a 1% planning growth rate. If Cal Poly accelerates its growth, it may outpace the capacity of shared City services. This should be recognized and addressed by the Master Plan.

*Utilities Capacity and Distribution Studies, and consultation with the City, are proposed, pages 333 through 338. Cal Poly staff indicates that the preferred 1.5% growth rate would not result in deficiencies in water supply when evaluated using the City's stringent drought analysis criteria.*

**Pg. 27, Enrollment Projections (table of numbers)**

Re-title “1999 Baseline – no increase in FTE” to “Current master plan limit: 15,000 FTE.” By including the date the reader can confuse the “Base Line” scenario with the actual 1999 enrollment forecasts.

*Title changed.*

**Ch.4, Existing Conditions**

**Pg. 46, Existing Conditions, Constraints and Opportunities Analysis: Railroad**

Union Pacific is probably not the only constraint to the location or relocation of “at grade crossings.” The California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) may also be involved in approving new locations.

*Text amended to reference Public Utilities Commission.*

**Pg. 49, Existing Conditions, Constraints and Opportunities Analysis: Traffic**

Highland Drive west of the Cal Poly campus is another student-impacted area where residents have complained about traffic speeds and volumes. The Murray Street area and bridging streets between California Boulevard and Grand Avenue—e.g. Fredericks Street—would also likely be affected.

*Reference to Highland Drive included in revised text.*
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Ch. 5, Physical Plan Elements

Pg. 59, Circulation, Alternative Transportation and Parking

The first sentence of this section states, "... most students, faculty and staff continue to commute by car." This plan section would benefit from a clear policy statement concerning how people should access the campus, and the purpose of on-campus parking.

Identified text (now located on page 69) is unchanged. However, pages 176 through 180 of the current text accommodate a specific section titled "Alternative Transportation". The initial sentence of that section indicates the importance of alternative transportation concepts to the campus community and the successful implementation of the plan. It reads: "The need to bring people to campus in a more efficient and environmentally responsible way is so important that the subject merits a separate element in the Master Plan".

Pg. 62, Faculty Housing West of Highway 1 (paragraph 3)

The plan states that faculty and staff housing may be built west of Route 1. One the physical challenges in developing this site is the potential visual impact of multi-story housing at this location. The City's Scenic Highway Section of its Circulation Element shows the adjoining highway section as having high value and the panoramic views of the Morros, with the City in the foreground. Therefore, lower scale structures should be considered - regardless of the type of urban land use that is established there.

A Master Plan implementation study titled "Highway 1 Housing Sites Study" is proposed at page 339, including coordination with CalTrans and the City. The Draft EIR also notes that consultation will be required. Additional policy language should be added to the Master Plan text to insure that City design policies and standards are followed to the greatest extent possible.

Pg. 71, Riparian Corridor Protection and Restoration

This section should mention recognition of Cal Poly's responsibility for "watershed protection" as well, to ensure that on campus activities, e.g. agricultural operations, don't negatively impact water quality. Riparian buffers may be insufficient on their own to ensure water quality protection. Nowhere in this chapter is water quality mentioned as either an issue, or as a plan component.

Water quality is addressed in the Draft EIR, pages 230 – 233. The conclusions are that water quality impacts resulting from plan implementation will be at, or can be mitigated to less than, significant levels.
Pg. 73, Best Management Practices.

Best Management Practices should extend beyond physical features, e.g. slope banks and riparian corridors, and include greater emphasis on operational programs, such as agricultural practices, dairy operations, farm waste disposal/management, and hazardous waste management.

The development of Best Management Practices (BMP) is included in the Implementation Chapter, page 338. BMPs are referenced in the Outdoor Teaching and Learning section, pages 86-99, relative to program issues as well as physical concerns.

Pg. 45, Plan Components - Overall Future Land Use (paragraph 4)

Presumably, the environmental impact report being prepared will evaluate the traffic impacts on the parking garage planned near the California-Foothill intersection. The EIR needs to look at alternative designs for the intersection including the western leg of Foothill Boulevard where it crosses the railroad. Under current conditions, the presence of the railroad complicates this intersection’s operation. And, it is especially unfriendly for bicycle and pedestrian access.

This issue is evaluated in the Draft EIR, with the Foothill/California intersection being projected at Level of Service (LOS) D following Master Plan implementation. LOS D is acceptable by City standards.

Pg. 112, Residential Communities, Existing Conditions and Issues, Issues (Off Campus Student Housing)

The plan mentions competition between Cal Poly and Cuesta students for off-campus housing. From the community’s perspective, another issue that must be addressed is competition of non-student households for rental housing with both Cal Poly and Cuesta students, and the cost disadvantage that they face. Maybe this could be identified as a positive effect of accommodating enrollment increases through the expansion of on-campus housing and through mandatory Freshman residency.

Non-student housing needs are recognized in the revised text at page 126.

Pg. 121, Off-Campus Student Housing Programs

There will be continued interest in cooperative efforts between the City and Cal Poly to explore on-campus options for locating fraternities. If it has not already been done, this factor could be explored as part of the residential communities component of the Plan.
The Plan notes at page 136 that State University policy requires non-discrimination in all on-campus housing. Fraternal and other organizations having qualified membership must, therefore, be located off-campus. In the short-run this approach conforms to City General Plan Housing Element Policy 8.3.4. However, that same policy promotes the long-run location of fraternity/sorority living groups on-campus.

Pg. 130, "Environmental Consequences" boxes

The 1997 EIR for the Cal Poly Sports Complex is referenced in these boxes. In addition, the August, 1997, Final Sound Study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex, prepared for the City by Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc., should be referenced and utilized during preparation of the environmental impact report for the Plan.

The Draft EIR discusses noise impacts on page 290 through 292. The Jones and Stokes study is not currently referenced, but should be to indicate and verify its use in preparing the document.

Pg. 141 (paragraph 4), Circulation

The plan seems to imply that off-campus bikeways are discontinuous. While this statement may apply to east-west pedestrian travel (which is complicated by the railroad), the City has installed continuous bike lanes leading to campus on Foothill and California Boulevards and on Grand Avenue. Bike lanes are also provided by the State on Route 1. Bike lanes may also be considered on Slack Street west of Grand Avenue (an active study item of the City's Bicycle Committee). In any case, the coordination and integration of bicycle routes on and off campus is critical to achieving the greatest level of success from this transportation mode. Also, the City has provided bicycle lanes and sidewalks that connect adjoining neighborhoods to the south of the Cal Poly Campus, thereby helping facilitate two additional alternative modes. In fact, installing bike lanes on all streets leading to the campus was our top priority.

Plan text, page 156, was modified to recognize this comment.

Pg. 143, Bicycle Friendly

Based on random-sample surveys conducted by the City of San Luis Obispo in 1990, 1997 and 1999, Cal Poly students have steadily reduced their use of bicycles while vehicle usage has increased. Improving bikeways on campus and reducing conflicts with motor vehicle traffic can help to reverse this trend. Cal Poly should also look at other incentives that might be provided such as the "Trip Reduction Incentive Program" established by the City for its employees - which might be adapted to address student and Cal Poly employee modal choices.
ATTACHMENT 2 PG. 6

Incentives are discussed on page 178, and a Bicycle System study is included as a Master Plan implementation effort at page 338.

Pg. 158. Principles

Cal Poly should provide for specific consideration of the future use of recycled water as a component or principal of this Master Plan. Cooperation with the City in the development of its water reuse program where feasible, would fit nicely with many of the principals for sustainability, resource conservation and integration of the campus with the community that already contained in the Plan.

Development of a "second use" water system for landscape irrigation is now included at page 154.

Pg. 162. Alternative Transportation, Plan Components

Here are a few additional thoughts:

- Involve the Transportation Engineering, Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Natural Resources Management Departments, and others, in integrating multi-modal concepts into their curricula and sponsoring demonstration projects and activities.

- Ensure that all new student housing projects include conveniently located and secure enclosed storage space for overnight bicycle parking, and short term bike racks for daytime access.

- Include in the Plan modal split objectives that allow for measuring the performance of transportation and parking programs, as recommended by the Circulation Task Force. Including them will allow translation of the associated goals into measurable targets that then can be tied to monitoring programs.

- Prepare and adopt an Alternative Transportation Enhancement Plan (ATEP) that spells out exactly how the broad programs described on page 123 will be implemented. This plan would also address mechanisms for reducing parking demand referenced on page 126.

These and related ideas will be addressed in the focused implementation study "Access and Alternative Transportation", noted on page 337, that is now underway.

Pg. 163. Modal Split Table
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ATTACHMENT 2

The modal split information included in the Plan indicates that almost 40% of the students are commuting to school by walking. The City's own random sample of households with San Luis Obispo show significantly different results, although both show a significant decline in the use of bicycles. Cal Poly and the City should work together to develop a unified approach that provides the best information.

No change in current text. The Communication and Implementation section, beginning on page 333, promotes cooperation between the University and the City in these types of planning activities. University commitment to this type of cooperation will facilitate a higher level of awareness and accuracy in both jurisdictions.

Pg 170, Parking, Parking Demand

It is difficult to evaluate the significance of the 2,000 parking space reduction without understanding what percentage of the new parking demand this figure represents. This percentage would better illustrate Cal Poly's commitment to demand reduction strategies. Also, it would be helpful to present the change in parking ratios between the current base year situation and the forecast year of 2021.

The revised text does not include a percentage relationship of the parking demand numbers. Page 185 does include a statement regarding the production of a campus access and parking management plan to implement the Master Plan, and a Parking Management focused study is included in the Implementation section, page 338. This study should be given high priority considering the importance of parking impacts, and the need for strong commitment to effective mitigation measures.

Pg 170, Parking, Freshman Parking

Strict controls on the use of automobiles by Freshmen, and all students who live within a specified distance from campus (say one mile), are especially attractive and are strongly supported by the City. Combined with other measures, they represent a proactive method for Cal Poly to address an important part of the parking and traffic congestion issues.

Freshman Parking, and Geographic (parking) Controls are included at page 185.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS

By telephone message to City staff, Dr. and Mrs. Curtis Collins, residents of Fredericks Street, expressed concern for exacerbation of parking and traffic problems in their neighborhood, particularly if the student population increases.

Parking and traffic problems in residential neighborhoods adjacent to campus are the concern of a number of community residents. The Circulation and Parking
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sections of the Master Plan, as well as the Draft EIR analysis pay particular attention to these issues. A number of policies and mitigations are included in various sections that aim to alter the use of automobiles by faculty and students, and thus reduce these impacts to acceptable levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RESIDENTS FOR QUALITY NEIGHBORHOODS FOR PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE CAL POLY MASTER PLAN (AND INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY)

1. RECOMMENDATION:

The Cal Poly Neighborhood Relations Task Force, hereinafter referred to as the “Task Force” contains the following simple Guiding Principle for Planning New Development on Campus:

“New development on campus shall be designed to eliminate impacts on established neighborhoods, rather than to create designs that generate ongoing conflicts between the University and residential neighborhoods.”

**Action:** Add this guiding principle directly in the text of the master plan.

**Rationale:** This demonstrates a real commitment to neighborhoods.

Recommended text not added to Master Plan. Cal Poly staff feels that the Master Plan and its associated Draft EIR mitigate the anticipated impacts (on and off campus) to the greatest extent possible, but that it cannot be promised to eliminate impacts entirely in either area.

2. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS: (additions are in underlined italics)

Page 13, Question 3, last bullet

**Action:** Change to read: “Planning future campus facilities so as to mitigate environmental impacts on and off campus as part of the project design”

**Rationale:** Question 3 deals with impacts of enrollment growth on the character and resource capacity of the surrounding communities. This answer makes that clearer.

Cal Poly staff states that the Master Plan / EIR process was structured to mitigate impacts (on and off campus) as the Plan was developed, through various appropriate changes to the Plan design. In many cases, future implementation of the various Plan programs and projects will require additional environmental evaluation to assure adequate mitigation based on a more complete understanding of project details.
Page 28. Paragraph 4
Action: Add the following, so that the paragraph reads:
"First, campus policy regarding the number or proportion of students to
be housed on campus contributes directly to the continuation and
reinforcement of Cal Poly's character as a residential university. There
is an existing shortage of affordable, desirable housing on campus.
This should be corrected. The assumption guiding the Master Plan is
the principle that Cal Poly should provide housing on campus for as
much of this existing shortage as possible and for all additional
undergraduate students. This principle includes provision of
appropriate housing types, support services and amenities to enhance
the residential environment as a place for learning."
Rationale: This is Task Force recommendation # 1, page 6-13 of the
staff report. It acknowledges the EXISTING, large backlog of housing
shortage on campus which has resulted from not building housing for
many years, as well as projected future shortages.

Suggested text changes are not included. The Plan section Residential
Communities, beginning at page 124, states that with the addition of 3,000 beds
during the plan period approximately one-third of the undergraduate student
population can be housed on-campus. Planned faculty and staff
accommodations would further mitigate the housing impact of enrollment
expansion. Appropriate locations for university related residential development,
and funding to produce such housing, are restraining factors on the total
amount of housing that can be provided.

Page 47. Last paragraph continuing on Page 49
"Policy Constraints"; [This is under the "Existing Conditions", section of the
Master Plan and it describes the four impacts of new campus
development on neighborhoods. It also contains the only discussion of
"Neighborhood Disputes" and neighborhood agreements in the Master
Plan.]
Action: add a final sentence so that the paragraph now reads,
"This category includes areas where campus or California State
University policy differs from city and county regulations and
practices, neighborhood disputes, and issues of concern to
students, staff and faculty. Dealing with these issues on the sports
complex and parking structure has resulted in agreements between
Cal Poly and adjacent neighborhoods to mitigate impacts. To
eliminate ongoing conflicts between the University and established
residential neighborhoods, the University shall be proactive in
enforcing its agreements, rather than reactive and complaint
driven."
Rationale: This is a Task Force recommendation for proactively eliminating ongoing conflicts between Cal Poly and neighborhoods.

The suggested text is not included in this paragraph, now located at the bottom of page 57. Cal Poly staff respond that the Master Plan / EIR process itself is proactive in anticipation of change and inclusion of appropriate mitigation. In particular, Chapter 7, Implementation, is seen as continuing community dialog into the future in a proactive fashion.

Background:

Both the Sports Complex and the Performing Arts Center parking structure mentioned above are defined in the Master Plan as "Facilities Ancillary Activities". The Task Force also addressed this type of campus facility:

"It should be recognized that large, new developments on campus which are dependent on both the student population AND a large commercial draw from non-student populations, may have significantly larger impacts on residential neighborhoods than those developments which depend upon the student population alone. Developments with a commercial component may also require proportionately larger efforts and costs to eliminate negative impacts on established residential neighborhoods."

Task Force recommendation #7, page 6-12 of the staff report.

Page 49. "Light and Glare"

Action: Change sentence to read, "This issue was important with the sports complex and parking structure, but these impacts will be mitigated by appropriate design".

Rationale: This is the one sentence in the Master Plan which proactively addresses light and glare impacts generated by campus development. This more clearly incorporates Task Force guiding Principle #2.

The suggested text is not included in this paragraph, now located at the top of page 59. Cal Poly staff indicates that the Draft EIR evaluates light and glare impacts and mitigation on pages 294 and 295. Inclusion of the proposed text is appropriate in light of the EIR evaluation and reducing the need to refer to that document, and for clarity in the plan text.

Page 49. "Traffic"

More detailed mitigations are on pages 140 -164 in "The Circulation Chapter", "the Alternative Transportation Chapter", and "The Parking Chapter". The city staff report also contains many comments on traffic impacts.
Comment noted. Response not required.

Page 49. "Noise"
Action: Delete existing sentence and replace with the following:
"This issue was important with the sports complex, but these impacts will be mitigated by appropriate design."
Rationale: The first sentence makes this consistent with the "Light and Glare section above. It also incorporates the guiding principle of the Task Force, that new development on campus shall be designed to eliminate impacts on established neighborhoods.

The suggested changes have not been made to this paragraph, now located on page 59. Cal Poly staff indicates that the Draft EIR evaluates noise impacts and mitigation on pages 288 through 292.

Page 48, Constraints Summary Map.
Action: This map should be expanded to show the Goldtree site in the Cheda Ranch to the North. The Goldtree site is shown on page vi as an "area suitable for ancillary activities and facilities" and described on Page 180 as having 35 acres with potential for development of "ancillary activities and facilities".
There should also be a "red arrow" signifying a "potential neighborhood conflict" placed on the east side of Grand Avenue at Stack Street in the Monterey Heights Neighborhood. This area is also identified on Page 179-80 as "one potential site for ancillary facilities".

The Constraints Summary map remains unchanged, but should be amended to include designation of the Goldtree site. The Goldtree area does appear on other maps, for example the Land Use map on page vi. The Goldtree site and related constraints are discussed in the text at pages 59-60, and 195-197. Chapter 7, Implementation, includes a proposed "Goldtree Area Service Provisions" study. Regarding the potential neighborhood conflict designation for Stack Street, east of Grand, Cal Poly staff comments that the map shows general areas of conflict rather than specific blocks or streets.

Page 49. "Development of New Areas"
Action: Add the following sentences to the end of the paragraph: The university should develop or maintain adequate natural or physical buffers between established residential neighborhoods and existing and future developments on the campus to avoid negative impacts. Because these are adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods, the uses will be compatible and new development will be designed to...
eliminate impacts on the neighborhoods. 

Rationale: This is a recommendation of the Task Force to eliminate potential conflicts with neighborhoods. Page 6-12, #8 of the Staff Report.

Cal Poly staff notes that, with the exception of an expanded visitor's center at the northeast corner of the Grand/Slack Street intersection, page 194, and an informal recreation field at the northwest corner of the same intersection, page 140-142, no new development is proposed adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Page 50. "Satellite Development"
Discussion: The Goldtree site in the Cheda Ranch near Stenner Creek Road and Hwy. l is identified on the map on page vi as one of two areas "suitable for ancillary activities and facilities'. Is this the site being discussed?

Yes. See discussion at pages 59-60, and 193-197.

Page 54. "Issues"
Discussion: This is great and is incorporated into the "compatibility" principles on Page 55

Comment noted; response not required.

Page 120. "Environmental Consequences" bottom box.
Action: Change this to read: "These two sites are adjacent to single family neighborhoods. The northeast corner of Slack and Grand is currently undeveloped and is bisected by a vegetated drainage. Development will be carefully designed to eliminate visual, noise, traffic, and light Impacts and to protect both natural features and the integrity of the nearby neighborhood. (It should be identified on the Constraints Summary on Page 48 as having visual, noise, traffic, and light impacts). The parcel to the west of Santa Rosa is currently undeveloped. This intersection of Scenic Hwy. I and Highland Drive is a gateway entrance to both Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. The City's Scenic Highway section of it's circulation element shows the adjoining highway section as having high value and a panoramic view of the Morros, with the City in the foreground. It is adjacent to, and higher than a neighborhood of single story, single family homes to the west. Development will be carefully designed to preserve the panoramic view of the Morros from the intersection of Highway I and Highland Drive and to eliminate visual, noise, and light Impacts on the adjacent single story, single family neighborhood.
The suggested text is not included. The area near the Grand/Slack Street intersection is being proposed for 136 beds of upper division or married student housing. See pages 120 and 132. Pages 134-136 discuss the staff/faculty housing proposed for two sites west of Highway 1, north of Highland. Housing is evaluated at several points in the Draft EIR.

Page 129. First paragraph, last sentence.
Discussion: This is very good. It parallels the Task Force guiding principle.

Comment noted; response not required.

Page 130. "Environmental Consequences" first box
Action: Add last sentence: The 1997 "Sound study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex" was also done. This facility shall be designed to eliminate noise, light, and visual impacts on and off campus.
Rationale: Internally consistent and it incorporates the guiding principle of the Task Force.

Specified text now at page 143. Suggested additional text has not been included. Additional wording which addresses this comment has been added at pages 143-145, and in the Draft EIR at pages 288-292. Cal Poly staff notes the need to cite the Jones and Stokes 1997 sound study more explicitly.

Page 130. "Environmental Consequences" second box
Action: Add a second section, "The 1997 "Sound study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex" was also done. This facility shall be designed to eliminate noise, light, and visual impacts on and off campus.
Rationale: Internally more consistent and incorporates the Task Force guiding principle.

Now located on page 144, the text of the referenced "environmental consequences" box has been changed, but does not include the suggested additional language because impacts cannot be "eliminated", but instead must be mitigated to an insignificant level. See response to preceding comment.

Page 131. "Environmental Consequences" second box
Action: Add sentence, "This facility will be designed to eliminate these impacts."
Rationale: This is the Task Force guiding principle.
Suggested additional language has not been included. The text of the referenced "environmental consequences" box, now located on page 145, has been changed to state that anticipated lighting and noise effects can be mitigated to a less than significant level. See discussion on pages 143-145 and 288-292.

Page 168. "Environmental Consequences" second to last bullet.
Action: Add, "but will be designed to eliminate these impacts".
Rationale: This is the Task Force guiding principle.

Suggested additional language has not been included. The "environmental consequences" box on page 184 notes that light and glare impacts from new parking structures are considered significant, but mitigable. Lighting impacts are discussed in the Draft EIR at pages 293-297.

Page 178. "Ancillary Activities and Facilities"
Discussion: This type of development has tremendous impacts on neighborhoods.

Comment noted. Response not required.

Page 179. "Issues"
Action: Add a new, last bullet item: "New developments on campus which are dependent on both the student population AND a large commercial draw from non-student populations, may have significantly larger impacts on residential neighborhoods than those developments which depend upon the student population alone. Developments with a commercial component may also require proportionately larger efforts and costs to eliminate negative impacts on established residential neighborhoods."
Rationale: This states Cal Poly's commitment to mitigate the impacts of this type of development on established residential neighborhoods. This is a Task Force recommendation. Page 6-12, #7 of the Staff Report.

Suggested language not included. Cal Poly staff notes that the Master Plan does not propose ancillary facilities with a commercial component. The Plan text should be amended to clarify what is intended as a "commercial component", as well as the nature of the anticipated uses.

Page 180. "Environmental Consequences" top box.
Action: Add: The environmental consequences of ancillary facility uses can be much greater than residential use impacts. The environmental consequences of all ancillary facility uses adjacent to the existing residential neighborhood will be explored. These include traffic, noise, light, and visual impacts.
Suggested language not included. The text included in the “environmental consequences” box, now on page 195, has been greatly expanded, indicating that anticipated impacts will be less than significant.

Page 180. “Environmental Consequences” bottom box.
Action: change the second last sentence to read, “Some of the area is visible from Highway 1 and the neighborhoods and the city’s open space on Bishop’s Peak. The environmental consequences of all ancillary facility uses in this remote site will be explored. These include traffic, noise, light visual and growth inducing impacts.

Suggested language not included. The text included in the “environmental consequences” box, now on pages 196-197, has been extensively modified and expanded, indicating in general that anticipated impacts could be mitigated to an insignificant level. Additional environmental analysis is recommended in several subject areas as part of future environmental review of specific projects.
November 14, 2000

Dear Cal Poly Campus and San Luis Obispo Community:

Some of you have asked why you do not see all of your earlier comments on the Preliminary Draft Master Plan reflected directly in the Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report published in October. We hope you do not feel that your ideas have gone unheard or unread. We have reviewed and discussed all the comments we received and incorporated them throughout the document. Indeed, you will see major changes in the October release of the Master Plan as a result of comments and suggestions on the Preliminary Draft.

As you know, Cal Poly has been developing the campus Master Plan through a process involving extensive participation by the campus and community. In spring 1999, we received over 500 principles recommended by task force members. During fall 1999 and winter 2000, the Master Plan team met with campus and community groups to discuss preliminary plan concepts. In spring 2000, we received many pages of comments from about 50 individuals and organizations. These included the following campus and community organizations and agencies: Cal Poly Academic Senate, Associated Students, Inc., Landscape Advisory Committee, Biological Sciences Department, College of Agriculture Land Use Committee, City of San Luis Obispo, County of San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, the local Air Pollution Control District, local chapter of the Sierra Club, and Residents for Quality Neighborhoods. We also received extensive input in the form of student projects from four classes in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and the College of Engineering.

In such an interactive process, many groups' and individuals' ideas have contributed to, and been incorporated into, the Master Plan. Sometimes this work appears explicitly in the document, but, more commonly, the text in the Plan represents a synthesis of ideas drawn from many sources. For example, the Cal Poly Academic Senate, Deans' Enrollment Planning Advisory Committee, and others expressed concern about operating budget support for the University, so we incorporated the intent (although not the literal language) of these groups' statements in the Guiding Framework and Implementation chapters.

This collaborative process contrasts with the formal response to comments that will occur with the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report. At that point in the process, as required by law, Cal Poly will respond point-by-point to each comment received.

We did not feel that it was necessary to provide responses in this form during the development of the Master Plan. Instead, we developed a matrix in spring 2000 that showed how the Master
Plan principles incorporated the 500-plus recommendations from the campus and community task forces. In the attached matrix, we have prepared a similar analysis showing where and how the Master Plan and Draft EIR integrated the comments received on the Preliminary Draft. This matrix shows that the Master Plan fully addressed many of the comments received and partially addressed others. In about half a dozen cases, the Master Plan team considered, but was not able to accommodate, a concern raised by a member of the campus or community—usually because the request asked for consideration of an idea that is not consistent with the Cal Poly academic mission and its responsibility as a member of the California State University system. Finally, a number of comments suggested additional detail and refinement that can be accommodated more appropriately in the follow-up studies and guidelines that will be developed to implement the Master Plan. It is important to keep the Master Plan itself at the level of principle and policy for review by the CSU Board of Trustees.

We thank you again for taking the time to contribute to the Cal Poly Master Plan, and welcome your additional comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Dalton, Ph.D., AICP
Vice Provost for Institutional Planning

Robert E. Kitamura, AIA
Director of Facilities Planning
Substantial Issues Raised by Comments on May 2000 Preliminary Draft of the Master Plan

Responsibility for Action

Executive Director

Executive Director

MP Team Analysis

MP Team Analysis

Executive Director

MP Team Analysis

Executive Director

Executive Director

Executive Director

MP Team Analysis

MP Team Analysis

Note: This table focuses on major policy issues and does not include a longer list of items that can be addressed as refinements to the plan and/or as environmental mitigation measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Kennedy</td>
<td>Cal Poly - President emeritus</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>CSU and community concerns</td>
<td>See Introduction, Guiding Framework, and Long Range Enrollment chapters</td>
<td>Ch. 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Close letter for staff report and residents’ letters; concern about commitment to implementation</td>
<td>See principles and implementation sections</td>
<td>15, 17, 7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>American President</td>
<td>12-Aug</td>
<td>Concern that plan depends on changes in student behavior</td>
<td>157, 170</td>
<td>Particularly with respect to alternative transportation, the Master Plan considers both policies and incentives to change behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES, Student</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>21-May</td>
<td>Need to credit other sources, e.g., LA GIS Lab</td>
<td>See acknowledgements</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES, HORST, DEN</td>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Add summary of impacts</td>
<td>See ES, DEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES, Student</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Illustration could be reviewed and modified</td>
<td>14, 177</td>
<td>Demographic discussion changed in response to multiple suggestions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>See high costs for plan implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>See aspirations and principles associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>10-Apr</td>
<td>See comments for responses to principles</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Enhance “available campus”</td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CADC, LA</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Consensus with sustainability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Recommendation for proactive, rather than reactive response by Cal Poly to neighborhood concerns</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>5-9, 15, 16-19; and Ch. 7 of CALIFORNIA's Master Plan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>15-Feb</td>
<td>More detail on parking opportunities</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Guiding Framework intended to be general; see latest draft for details</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, Students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - Academic Senate</td>
<td>8-Jun</td>
<td>Academic quality concerns</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academic quality addressed in principles and academic plans for academic growth</td>
<td>1-2, 11, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
- A = Addressed
- P = Partially addressed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Cal Poly -</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Operating budget and growth concerns;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11, 10, 220-31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>committee</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>institutional goals for enrollment growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>continued on wording for budget and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sen, Chuck</td>
<td>Cal Poly -</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>Concerned with enrollment increase,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLA, Psych</td>
<td></td>
<td>academic quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simele, Tony</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Suggestions to reorganize programmatic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13, 10-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Warding expected to identify responsibility for</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mitigation on and off campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concerned there is no willingness to identify</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impact areas or establish Co-Lead Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SLO East</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestions for stronger working on</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transportation, expanded self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mitigation to services and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SLO East</td>
<td>SLO County</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>RGN issues, Arroyo, Stadium, Oldfield</td>
<td>13 and elsewhere</td>
<td>13, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pirard</td>
<td>SLO County</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>RGN issues</td>
<td>13 and elsewhere</td>
<td>13, 10, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Title, Byrne</td>
<td>SLO County</td>
<td>15-Jun</td>
<td>The generic approach to issues: Include</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>all recommended principles in an appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Not convinced that Cal Poly needs to grow.</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SLO East</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>5/6 and 40</td>
<td>Suggested to study degree length,</td>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>criteria for enrollment, etc., clarify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanville, Tery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enrollment data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norman, Dal</td>
<td>SLO County</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Clearly enrollment numbers, clarify how</td>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exceptions are used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
A = Addressed
P = Partially addressed

Letter 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>&quot;Cal Poly should provide housing on campus for as much of [a] existing shortage as possible&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>150 beds to be built by 2002 reduce housing shortages and Master Plan student housing program accommodates all new undergraduates</td>
<td>15, 30, 124</td>
<td>Student housing projects are planned to be completed ahead of enrollment growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More detail regarding existing conditions, trends, and opportunities analysis</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>See revised wording</td>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>Chapter 4 represents a summary. See later elements and DEIR for more details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Developments in west side of campus can impact use of San Diego Open Space on Bishop's Peak; should identify noise &amp; light as impacts to Bishop's Peak area, support Neighborhood Task Force recommendations</td>
<td>35, 49</td>
<td>Existing Conditions chapter provides general overview, additional details on plan components in Ch. 5. See also discussion of environmental setting in Ch. 6, DEIR.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SLO Staff</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Proposed addition of Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Additional wording added</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SLO Staff</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Proposed addition to traffic issues</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Additional wording added</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Mapping of potential neighborhood conflict with Monterey Heights, east of Grand Ave.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53 Comment received; map shows general areas of conflict rather than specific blocks or streets</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about light and glare, noise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>See comments to mitigation in principles and provisions for noise in DEIR.</td>
<td>13, 216-219, 293-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about buffers for neighborhood</td>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>140-43 Visitor Plan proposes no new development adjacent to residential neighborhoods except for Visitor Center near Blackstone.</td>
<td>140-43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about bluffs area; ancillary activities in general</td>
<td>45-56, 180</td>
<td>53-180-47 Existing Conditions chapter provides general overview.</td>
<td>53-180-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More details on Land Use element</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69 Land use element extended on northside</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>San Luis, CA</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Concerns with scale of housing on other development west of Highway 1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>252-37 Visitor Plan proposes no new development adjacent to residential neighborhoods except for Visitor Center near Blackstone.</td>
<td>252-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about ecological integrity and sustainability of habitat areas and corridors</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79 Proposed in Natural Environmental Principle.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Cal Poly -</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>More detailed mapping and inventory</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>DEIR contains more detailed inventory of plant communities in area proposed for new development.</td>
<td>Appendix B to DEIR</td>
<td>Other areas will be mapped more fully during Master Plan Implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Serra Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
A = Addressed
P = Partially addressed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Diller, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Be aware of open lands – concerned about &quot;P&quot;, allow public access on Cal Poly lands; clean up Architectural Village.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>See Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements</td>
<td>76-48: 06-99</td>
<td>The &quot;P&quot; will be addressed in master plan implementation.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Rosenthal, Ruppel, Swadner, &amp; Segal</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Expand discussion of Monies as setting for SLO and campus</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Additional wording added. See also, DER.</td>
<td>76: 219</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Collins, Tanner</td>
<td>Skuna Club</td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>Oppose housing near Bicentennial Creek</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Bicentennial Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81: 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSM, BIO SCI</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Biological resources of Bicentennial Creek</td>
<td>71: 118</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Bicentennial Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81: 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Mann, Steven</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLI, English</td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>Housing in footprint (H-5 and H-6) is mistake. Need to apply Rev. Env. Principles.</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Bicentennial Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81: 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Staff, Data</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Consider protection for Cal Poly and Bicentennial Creek; restore Feetlitch area</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Bicentennial Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81: 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Concern with vehicular protection</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>See DER</td>
<td>230-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested expansion of SWPs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Additional reference to BMPs in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element</td>
<td>81: 94-99</td>
<td>To be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Scott, Ken</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGER, LAC</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>Show Pavilion on all maps; need to be incorporated in ICSC; housing facility not mentioned; Identify issues of how Pavilion will replace access provided by Bost Field; need some additional planning and design standards to be included in regulations</td>
<td>75-80: 82-85</td>
<td>Maps aligned; descriptions in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element modified</td>
<td>81-20: 24-26 and multiple exhibits</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Staff, Data</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Expand exception of how outdoor teaching and learning activities are integrated into campus</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Additional detail to be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- **A** = Addressed
- **P** = Partially addressed
- **I** = To be addressed during implementation

L. Delton
11/14/00

ATNMENT 3 PC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope for specific academic programs, disciplines or colleges</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Working modified</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Sandy, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Encouragement of visual diversity as well as continuity</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Working modified</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Monday club</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>19-May</td>
<td>Interest in possible historic buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>115-116</td>
<td>Historic preservation</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Monday club</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>19-May</td>
<td>Activities and design considerations at UUCentral Green area</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>104-114</td>
<td>Sight changes to Campus Instructional Core elements</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Kevin, Hiram</td>
<td>Cal Poly - Library</td>
<td>23-Jun</td>
<td>Current library space is inadequate; do not descriptor facility activities; need support of additional prep resources; Library would be more effective if all resources housed in single area</td>
<td>94-95, 102-12</td>
<td>94-95, 12-14</td>
<td>106-115, 115-14</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northeast area</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Monday club</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>16-May</td>
<td>Concern about heights in center of campus</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>110-111</td>
<td>Building massing studies show potential for greener building heights and gain of open space</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Staff, Dave</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CASD, IAC</td>
<td>16-Jun</td>
<td>Mission Bradley Park: SW quadrant; assess shaping of landscape improvements, supports finding good Poly Grove solutions;</td>
<td>101-102</td>
<td>101-102</td>
<td>115-120-2</td>
<td>Details of landscape guidelines and design of Bradley Park area as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Lawson, Navy</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, GRC</td>
<td>3-May</td>
<td>Are we upgrading Civic center playground?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Will and renovation are covered in the Master Plan, but not shown in detail in the maps</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Solomon, M.</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGI, BAAE</td>
<td>26-May</td>
<td>Concern about layout of new building for Student Center and Ag. Engineering</td>
<td>99, 95-96</td>
<td>99, 95-96</td>
<td>127, 127-12</td>
<td>Design of northeast area, including replacement of 600, 6 is part of implementation, with development of users</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Tanya, Roba</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, Paych</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Oak Development program would like to be in plan with lab, efforts at pre-school lab</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Details of program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Lyle, Larry</td>
<td>BLO AFOC</td>
<td>29-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestions for new areas on campus to reduce need for of-campus housing</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Details of program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Alan, Prentice</td>
<td>Cal Poly - SA, Housing</td>
<td>4-Oct</td>
<td>Working and tactical changes on housing section</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>BLO Staff</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>8-Jun</td>
<td>Role importance of student competition with non student households</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Working added</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Dallas, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Add even more housing-32% of students</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128-Master Plan calls for housing approximately one-third of undergraduate students on campus.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Sammii, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>2-May</td>
<td>Question about the likelihood that students will want to live on campus</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>128-34-Market studies have shown that students should be interested in apartment-style housing.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CSM, Bio Sci</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Housing units H-3 &amp; H-4 major disturbance to traffic corridor, so eliminate; build H-9, H-6, H-7 first; build housing near Slack and Grant to north side of drainage; perhaps use H-8 &amp; H-9 for student housing; hold H-1 and H-2 in abeyance and avoid if possible (could be a gradual relaxation site)</td>
<td>71, 118-Master Plan changes include rearrangement of student residential communities, particularly to allow for Branciforte Creek Enhancement Project. See DEIR too.</td>
<td>81, 97, 128-32-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Colman, Curtis</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about housing in southwest corner of campus</td>
<td>118-19-Residential Master Plan creates a full residential community in this area</td>
<td>132-54-P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>RNW</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about student residences near Grant and Black</td>
<td>120-Some students propose H-4 residential area be separated from Slack Street; and DEIR</td>
<td>130, 132-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>RNW, Ekron, Richard</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about residences west of Highway 1</td>
<td>120-Some discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>134-26-Prefer to have faculty and staff housing; keep a vehicle of the master plan to address community impacts.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Monday night.blob works</td>
<td>visitors</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff housing sites</td>
<td>131-Some discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>130, 132-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>CDO, Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff housing sites</td>
<td>131-Some discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>130, 132-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Markle, Pugsley, Saenger &amp; Sergi</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>15-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested wording change</td>
<td>129-Some discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>130, 132-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Markle, Pugsley, Saenger &amp; Sergi</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about noise related to sports facilities</td>
<td>130-Some discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>143-45, 248-92-P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- A = Addressed
- P = Partially addressed
- C = To be addressed
- I = To be addressed - needs implementation

L. Dalton
11/14/00
MP/Comments 11.44.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about noise related to sports facilities</td>
<td>120-31</td>
<td>See additional wording and DEIR discussion of noise issues and mitigation</td>
<td>143-45, 288-95</td>
<td>Need to cite Jones and Stokes 1987 sound study more explicitly</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>University,</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>10-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about possible relocation of Mustang Stadium</td>
<td>130-31</td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td>143-44, 290</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Dollar, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>Allow public access on Cal Poly land</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>See provision for trail</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Encourage use of recycled water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in plan components</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Request for policy about commuting and parking</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>See Circulation, Parking and Alternative Transportation elements</td>
<td>151; 170; 180; 03</td>
<td>The Land Use element provides an overview, leading to details in the subsequent elements</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paul, Douglas</td>
<td>Cal Poly - APO, UCI, Police</td>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td>Corrections on circulation and alternative transportation sections</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Collins, Curtis</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5/4 and 9/12</td>
<td>Circulation and parking impacts in Alta Vista area</td>
<td>140-41</td>
<td>155-48; 170; 79</td>
<td>Alternative Transportation programs are designed to reduce traffic circulation and parking requirements</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>California Fruitland and wine and turf issues</td>
<td>140-41</td>
<td>155-59; 182</td>
<td>Details will develop during implementation - particularly design of parking structure and new student housing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Clarification of bike connections and routes</td>
<td>141, 152</td>
<td>Wording modified</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Schmidt, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Alternative traffic calming; questions about feasibility and cost related to road separated pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>140-50</td>
<td>156-65</td>
<td>Suggestions to be considered during implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>LaRue, Jerry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>29-Jun</td>
<td>Accommodate electric bicyclists</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>156-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Monday, Anne</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>19-May</td>
<td>Bicycle circulation needs further development</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>156-97</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Schuberg, Stuart</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSAM, Meth</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Bicycles need to have adequate Class II around Highland and Palmview, and routes joining the north east of business building &amp; area like Vina to Cal Poly</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>156-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kelly Street, Kieran</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CASQ, ARCE student</td>
<td>9-May</td>
<td>Allow bicycles on inner Perimeter and Davier (anywhere else vehicles are allowed)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>155-57</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swannacott, Scott</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CASQ, CDS</td>
<td>17-May</td>
<td>Support bike paths and vehicle reduction</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>155-57</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Areta, Tony</td>
<td>Cal Poly, AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Bicycle lanes - bike force initiated</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>155-57</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paulson, Jacqueline</td>
<td>Cal Poly, AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>3-Aug</td>
<td>Service access should include buses, shuttles, etc.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wording added</td>
<td>158, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fosler, Joe</td>
<td>Cal Poly, AFD, RIPA</td>
<td>22-May</td>
<td>Ensure service routes are clearly marked for emergency use (concerned about making them too noticeable); access to campus is inadequate for emergency vehicles; need adequate access for delivery vehicles; expansion plan</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>157-18, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter and N. Perimeter to through traffic as well as other circulation changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Raver, Paul</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CLE, Music</td>
<td>12-May</td>
<td>Concerns re impacts from Perimeter being pedestrian only</td>
<td>155, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td>158, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter to through traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paulson, Jacqueline</td>
<td>Cal Poly, AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>19-Aug</td>
<td>Service access on campus</td>
<td>144, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td>157-18, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter and N. Perimeter to through traffic as well as other circulation changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Walker, Virginia</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CASQ, EHS</td>
<td>19-Aug</td>
<td>Residence halls are too close to EHS production and traffic too dense</td>
<td>148, 151</td>
<td>Circulation to residential complex north of Pico Street, noted.</td>
<td>161, 166</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Harenski, Dave</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CASQ, EHS</td>
<td>23-May</td>
<td>Serious concerns about roads accessing residential areas H-1 &amp; H-2 going by EHS</td>
<td>148, 151</td>
<td>Circulation to residential complex north of Pico Street, noted.</td>
<td>151, 166</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Santos, Kan</td>
<td>Cal Poly, CASQ, LUC</td>
<td>3-Jun</td>
<td>Need transportation plans for bus loads exiting at narrow, sharp bend of roads/dues or traffic plan; consider additional bridge over Sanacaria for parking structure; concerns about parking structure, Via Carla circulation</td>
<td>148, 157, 167</td>
<td>Circulation to extended campus added to plan components</td>
<td>96, 174</td>
<td>Detailed circulation plans to be part of master plan implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Lepke, Barry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Support for hip reduction, including student walking on campus; concern with financial support for public transit service by Cal Poly students.</td>
<td>153, 161</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment expressed in Master Plan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Herman, Dan</td>
<td>SLO COS</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Clarity parking strategy, looking for operational details of alternative transportation; supports barriers and pedestrian cores.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>178-80; 185-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional detail will be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Campbell, Cindy</td>
<td>Cal Poly - MTD, UHE, Police</td>
<td>5-Apr</td>
<td>Several suggested wording changes and comments to text; eliminate intersection language that rely on EB. Polices for management during exams; separate operational plan for alternative transportation.</td>
<td>162, 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Comment on different methods for determining modal split.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan does not list data; agreement that campus and city should coordinate future study</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestions for hip reduction.</td>
<td>143, 169, 162</td>
<td>178-80 266</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation element as well as DEIR</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>RON</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>26-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about parking structures.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>184 293-87</td>
<td></td>
<td>See additional wording; and DEIR</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Leake, Barry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>26-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about 4-way roundabout parking structures.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>260-87</td>
<td></td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Herman, Dan</td>
<td>SLO COS</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Parking analyses and student driving behavior.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>More parking analysis will be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Parking rules and restrictions.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185-85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan did not address the requested data diversity</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Parking restrictions encouraged.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>General restrictions are not incorporated as larger structures, as they do not show independently on maps.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Alumni, State and General</td>
<td>AS President</td>
<td>20-Aug</td>
<td>Sites for support services.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>151 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some services shown on revised illustrative diagram.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Safave, Barry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Concern about support services for residential communities.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>103-15, 127 107-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional planning for &quot;long-term&quot; vs. needs that occur on residential communities are designed</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code**
- **A** = Addressed
- **P** = Partially addressed
- **N** = Not addressed due to scope or implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>Cal Poly - English</td>
<td>7-Aug</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Diagrammatic illustration shows expanded child care center.</td>
<td>193, 194-97</td>
<td>Additional services will be considered as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Slover, Vicki</td>
<td>Cal Poly - MPO</td>
<td>5-May</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Water Center shown in more detail in Master Plan maps and text</td>
<td>193, 194-95</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department, Ashley, Phil</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSN, Bio Sci</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>71, 115</td>
<td>See additional wording and DEIR, Appendix C.</td>
<td>195-97</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Concerns about potential development with commercial component</td>
<td>195-97</td>
<td>The Master Plan does not propose ancillary activities with a commercial component</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>48-50, 180</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services in general</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Frizell, Prosser, Baechler, &amp; Segal</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Concerns about public debate about additional services</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Bish, Haynes</td>
<td>SLO County Supervisor</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Public debate about additional services</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Monday club members</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schwartz, Haynes</td>
<td>City Council Member</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>See additional wording</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monday club members</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>15-330-31</td>
<td>See additional wording in Guiding Principles, as well as Ch. 7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shaw, Church</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CCEA</td>
<td>8-Dec</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>229-36</td>
<td>Implementation and phasing should consider consideration of change processes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Powell, Swanson, Segal</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Concernment made as part of Master Plan process</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Staff, DATE</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CCEA</td>
<td>25-May</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Concerns about additional services</td>
<td>334-36</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tingle, Bryce</td>
<td>SLO County staff</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Intergovernmental recommendations lacking</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keckham, Gary</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAIR</td>
<td>8-Jun</td>
<td>Plan should have a comprehensive Farm and Ranch Maintenance Program covering costs, boundary fencing, farm roads, and communication within CAIR</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>333-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Judd, Eugene</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CENG, CE students</td>
<td>21-May</td>
<td>Public transportation should be addressed county - light rail, bus terminals &amp; shuttle; location of Parking Structure 3 should be thought about; attached several papers for CE 222</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CEN Student</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CENG, CE students</td>
<td>1-Jun</td>
<td>Several students proposed following similar format for Plan review; numerous comments on proposals for transportation and circulation and alternative transportation</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAIR</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAIR, CRP students</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>White paper on access and suggestions comparing an &quot;alternative&quot; master plan developed by the first year lab in City and Regional Planning over the 1999-2000 academic year</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPU</td>
<td>CRP 413</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAIR, CRP students</td>
<td>Winter 2000</td>
<td>Class report titled &quot;Environmental Quality Control: A Protocol for Pollution Prevention&quot;; issues include waste management, land use, wetlands, and transportation; environmental audit recommended</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 6, 2000

Warren Baker, President
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Dr. Baker:

The City of San Luis Obispo is greatly appreciates the opportunity to again review the evolving Cal Poly Master Plan, now including the Draft Environmental Impact report. The extensive and inclusive process of community involvement during preparation and refinement of the plan is evident, and we have been most impressed with your use of public meetings, the Internet and even CD’s.

As you recall, the City provided comments on the earlier draft of the plan, and we are gratified to see that, with few exceptions, those comments have been incorporated into the current Master Plan draft through changes to the plan itself, analysis in the Draft EIR, or by designation for analysis as part of future implementation studies. Our comments on the current draft are included as an attachment to this letter.

While the University is cognizant of the concerns of its neighbors, and is actively pursuing solutions to the issues presented, the comments provided by one of our citizen groups, the Residents for Quality Neighborhoods (RQN), were not incorporated to the same extent as those of the City. We recognize that this may, in part, be due to the inability of the University to guarantee the desired outcomes. However, the plan and the EIR deal with many of the issues raised by RQN, and inclusion of the requested language (or a reasonable modification) appears worthy of additional consideration. In some cases we even offer specific recommendations.

Notwithstanding the extensive analysis given to housing, traffic and parking, environmental protection, and other significant issues, our strongest recommendation continues to be for realistic and sincere implementation, once the plan is adopted. The closing section of the plan, Communication and Consultation, holds great promise that an active partnership of the University, the City, and its residents will continue unabated toward that end.

We look forward to working with you to the conclusion of the planning process, and the ultimate realization of its goals.

Sincerely,

Allen K. Settle
Mayor

Attachment: City comments on Master Plan draft and EIR

1B-43
Letter 3
Mr. John Mandeville
City of San Luis Obispo
December 5, 2000

[Note: The letter from the City contained several lists of points. For reference purposes, we have coded the first set as General, 1 through 12; the second set as Previous, 1 through 11; and then added the remaining comments.]

3-1 General 1. A. Commenter suggests reducing the size of ancillary activity area at Grand and Slack.

Response Exhibit I on page vi shows more limited area and adds a buffer at Slack and Grand.

3-2 General 1. B. Commenter suggests recognizing potential neighborhood conflicts at Grand and Slack.

Response A double arrow has been moved on Exhibit 4.10 to the east of Grand Avenue to indicate potential neighborhood conflicts.

3-3 General 2. Commenter suggests designating the hill above residence halls to Natural Environment.

Response This area is currently used for grazing, which explains the Outdoor Teaching and Learning designation. This is consistent with other designations throughout the Cal Poly campus.

3-4 General 3. Commenter suggests retaining Outdoor Teaching and Learning lands in open, undeveloped use.

Response See text addition page 98-99, clarifying future status of Outdoor Teaching and Learning lands. A fundamental concept to understand with regard to the lands of Cal Poly is that it is not appropriate to think of them as “open space.” Such a designation may work in a municipality, but university property cannot be viewed this way. The lands of Cal Poly must support its academic mission. They must possess academic “assets” or, in the most severe situation, they may be viewed as “surplus.” Much of Cal Poly’s 6,000 acres in San Luis Obispo County is in an open and natural state, and will remain this way. It remains thus because it offers grazing for campus livestock, or biological study areas, or watershed management projects or any number of other academic activities. Understanding and appreciating this concept will assist the City with its goal of preserving a natural green belt around its borders.

3-5 General 4. The commenter suggests protecting Stenner as well as Brizzolara creek.

Response The following text has been added at page 103: “Guiding Principles and Goals for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan” are located in Appendix F. The principles and goals will apply to all creeks on Cal Poly lands, including Stenner Creek. In addition, Cal Poly has partnered with the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. The Land Conservancy has undertaken several projects on Stenner Creek to reduce erosion and improve fisheries habitat, especially for the endangered steelhead. This enhancement work will continue with other reaches of the creek.
General 5. Concern about conflict/competition between on and off campus retail.

**Response** The vision of the Master Plan calls for a primary campus activity center near the University Union that is focused on students. The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown. Cal Poly understands that there is a delicate balance in determining how much of what services will be sufficient to support the campus community and manage commuting. Effective alternative transportation will allow students, faculty, and staff – as well as members of the broader community – to take advantage of the range of services and facilities both on and off campus without adding to traffic congestion. The Cal Poly Foundation is presently the exclusive provider of certain services – e.g., food service, vending machines and bookstore. Other services compete for campus outlets – e.g., travel service, ATMs. As planning for an increased range and volume of services occurs, the campus will need to determine which it should offer directly and which might be provided through franchise or “privatization.”

General 6. The commenter suggests affirming student-housing impacts as major community concern.

**Response** Text has been added under the new heading “Background and Issues” on page 129 to clarify the existing shortage and address the major impact which student housing could have on the community. In addition, the following has been added in a section entitled, Commitment to Student Housing on Campus: “The Master Plan takes the local housing situation into account and proposes measures that will help alleviate a portion of it. The Guiding Framework of the Master Plan calls for adding student housing to accommodate all new enrollment growth. The campus will be breaking ground in Spring 2001 to build apartment-style housing for 800 students. This facility is scheduled to be ready for occupancy in Fall 2002. The next phase calls for housing from 1150 to 1300 additional students by 2004 or 2005. In sum, Cal Poly expects to add 1950 to 2100 student beds in the next five years, but only about 1250 additional students during that same time period. Over the next two decades Cal Poly will increase the proportion of students who live on campus from about 17 percent today to over 30 percent in the future” (p. 136).

“Further, Cal Poly will monitor the local market closely, and, if continuing students are not able to find suitable housing, the campus will develop a strategy to house a larger proportion of the University’s students in the future. Strategies may involve working with off-campus partners to identify suitable housing locations and provide financing. Cal Poly and Cuesta College are also exploring ways to cooperate in assuring appropriate housing for their students. Finally, Cal Poly will participate with non-profit organizations in seeking broader solutions to community housing needs” (p. 136).

General 7. The commenter suggests making every effort to develop on-campus housing.

**Response** The Plan is exhaustive in its attempts to house all new enrollment on campus, as well as provide off-campus housing for faculty and staff. Fraternities and sororities cannot be provided for on campus because state law and California State University policy prohibits the funding of group housing with exclusive membership.

General 8. The commenter suggests citing Jones and Stokes sound study.
Response  The DEIR and the Master Plan have been amended to cite and incorporate the Jones and Stokes sound study completed for the Sports Complex.


Response  The Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan has been cited in the Master Plan and DEIR. Note that the Heery plan was developed by a consulting team to suggest the approach to all campus athletic facilities. The plan is not “adopted,” it is only advisory. The Master Plan team used the Heery plan as background information, incorporating some of its suggestions, but not all. For example, the football stadium design in the Heery Plan will not be followed.


Response  The following table has been used for estimating where savings would occur in parking demand. The Master Plan policy is to reduce parking demand by 2,000 spaces.

**Estimated Parking Demand Reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
<th>Safety Valve*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen restrictions</td>
<td>1,000 - 1,500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>some no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic controls</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/vanpools</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>As determined</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Fees</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transit</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City transit</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/ped enhancmt</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area mgt</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff incentives</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment scenarios</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: alternative transportation savings will be lower for Cal Poly because many of these programs are in existence and functioning well.

*Absolute controls will require provisions (safety valve) for hardships.

The University, as stated policy in the Master Plan, will reduce demand by 2,000 spaces. This reduction can be achieved through a number of measures. Over time, the feasibility and success of various measures will vary. For this reason, it is impractical to commit, at a Master Plan level, to absolutes. For example, an important idea is having an on campus and near campus shuttle. But this needs to be subjected to feasibility studies and trial programs, which the University will do.

To meet the parking reduction proposal of 2,000 spaces, Cal Poly intends to institute as a first, and most effective measure, that freshmen be required to live on campus and that they not be allowed to maintain cars on campus (with exceptions made for hardship and job-related
requirements). We believe that the inelasticity of demand Cal Poly will prevent this policy from having a detrimental effect on the dormitory market. This restriction exists at other universities, including UC Santa Cruz.¹

It is estimated that there will be about 4,000 new undergraduate students each Fall (about 3,000 freshmen) at Cal Poly under the full growth anticipated with the Master Plan. Currently, we house approximately 80% ~ 90% of our freshmen on campus, and the campus provides 1,530 parking spaces for residents (R1 & R2). At present ratios, approximately 1,800 spaces would be needed under the Master Plan for freshmen. Allowing for some hardship requirements for freshmen, it is anticipated that approximately 1,500 or more spaces could be reduced with this policy alone.

This policy will do more than just reduce cars on campus. It will change the culture of the campus, infusing a higher regard for the environment and a reduced reliance on the automobile. As students advance through the University, they will do so with the ability to use alternative modes of transportation.

3-12 General 11. The commenter suggests clarifying future uses in Goldtree area; concern with compatibility with off-campus resources.

Response At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. The facility has been sited in a location that has relatively low-value grazing land, low visibility from Highway 1, is adjacent to the City’s wastewater treatment plant, and near the California Men’s Colony. Additional environmental work will be undertaken when a project for the site has been developed.

3-13 General 12. The commenter suggests including the plan amendment process with provision for community notification, involvement and consultation.

Response A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7.

The Land Use and Project Review Procedures to be established to implement the Master Plan will include the following considerations.

- Establishment of a project development team that represents all affected University interests;
- Identification of responsibility for liaison with elected officials and local and regional agencies, as appropriate to the nature of the project;
- Identification of the appropriate neighborhood areas that may be affected by the project so that meetings may be held early in project planning and design regarding ways to relieve possible impacts.

3-14 Previous 1. The commenter suggests a bolder commitment to alternative transportation.

Response Text on page 188 (Principles, subheading Support) has been amended from “Cal Poly should continue to work with city and regional agencies to make alternative transportation increasingly convenient, including scheduling, access and quality of service” to say the

¹ http://www2.ucsc.edu/taps/students.html#fresh
following: “Cal Poly will continue to provide financial support for public transportation. Further, the campus should explore how the University can balance the allocation of resources toward trip reduction programs rather than toward the cost of providing more parking on campus.”

Cal Poly currently has the most successful alternative transportation program of any organization in the county.

3-15 Previous 2. The commenter suggests following City policies and standards for off-campus housing.

Response See text in Environmental Consequences discussion. Cal Poly reviewed City and County policies for the development of the Master Plan. To the extent that doing so does not interfere with the academic mission of the school, Cal Poly will strive to meet the spirit of the policies developed by its neighboring jurisdictions. The environmental review of the off-campus housing will include a discussion of consistency with City policies.

3-16 Previous 3. The commenter suggests seeking CSU policy change to allow fraternity housing on campus.

Response CSU policy does not permit campuses to provide housing for organizations with selective membership. Cal Poly will monitor this policy for any system-wide changes.

3-17 Previous 4. The commenter suggests citing and confirming the use of Jones and Stokes noise study.

Response The DEIR and the Master Plan have been amended to cite the Jones and Stokes sound study done for the Sports Complex. The study has been incorporated into the analysis of the FEIR at Chapter 6, Noise.

3-18 Previous 5. The commenter suggests making a commitment to unified analysis and planning with City.

Response As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan includes provision for consultation with elected officials and local and regional agencies.

3-19 Previous 6. The commenter suggests giving high priority to parking studies and mitigation.

Response Comment noted. The Master Plan specifies this plan as part of its implementation studies.

3-20 Previous 7. The commenter suggests clarifying language in EIR regarding light and glare.

Response Language regarding light and glare and the mitigation of impacts has been added to pertinent sections of the EIR.

3-21 Previous 8. A. The commenter suggests amending constraints summary to include Goldtree area.
Further discussion and a map has been added to the constraints summary to show the Goldtree area (pp. 64-65).

3-22 Previous 8. B. The commenter suggests amending constraints summary to include potential neighborhood conflicts near Slack and Grant.

Response A double arrow has been relocated on Exhibit 4.10 east of Grand Avenue to indicate the potential for neighborhood conflicts. It was the original intention of the constraints analysis to include this area, but the exhibit is not at a scale to identify this level of detail.

3-23 Previous 9. The commenter suggests including RQN language regarding environmental consequences on nearby residential neighborhoods.

Response Text on page 15 has been amended (Question 3, f, third bullet) from “Planning future campus facilities so as to mitigate environmental impacts as part of project design” to “Planning future campus facilities and support services so as to minimize and mitigate environmental impacts on and off campus to the full extent feasible as part of project design.”

3-24 Previous 10. The commenter suggests clarifying "commercial component" in campus core and Goldtree area.

Response The range of retail businesses and other activities in the campus core would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center. At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park.

3-25 Previous 11. The commenter suggests providing for additional environmental review for future projects.

Response Chapter 7 describes how future projects will be reviewed within the context of the program EIR for the Master Plan.

Following adoption of the Master Plan, Cal Poly will engage in a series of implementation studies (specified in Chapter 7). As projects are planned and built, they will be reviewed and monitored for compliance with the environmental analysis as well as with meeting plan expectations to reinforce the academic quality of the University. Many projects will require additional environmental review in the form of Negative Declarations or focused EIRs. The Campus Planning Committee will review the Master Plan annually so as to determine whether conditions have changed sufficiently to warrant a major update.

3-26 The commenter requests recognition of neighborhood impact at Grand Ave. and Slack Street.

Response A double arrow has been relocated on Exhibit 4.10 east of Grand Avenue to indicate the potential for neighborhood conflicts.

3-27 The commenter suggests designating hill above residence halls to Natural Environment.

Response This area is currently used for grazing, which explains the Outdoor Teaching and Learning designation.
3-28 The commenter suggests clarifying Visitor Center site and conference facility expectations at Grand and Slack.

**Response** Map change shows more limited area and adds a buffer; see also text changes on p. 206. A visitor center would provide a facility to welcome guests to the campus. It could include a station where visitors could obtain parking permits, campus maps, and directions to their destinations. The visitor center could serve as the starting point for campus tours conducted by Poly Reps. It could also include a small exhibit covering Cal Poly’s history and accomplishments.

No detailed program has been suggested for a conference center, yet the idea has been studied several times and continues to arise. Presently, Cal Poly’s Conference Services use regular campus facilities during times that they are not scheduled for instruction, and house attendees in some of the residence halls during the summer. The Master Plan calls for an expansion of alumni services near the present Alumni House, which may include small conference or retreat facilities. In addition, the area near Grand Avenue and Slack Street has been suggested for potential conference facilities. Cal Poly will continue to use its residence halls during the off-season to support conferences.

3-29 The commenter suggests adding specific language to retain environmentally sensitive areas in open, undeveloped use.

**Response** Text has been added on page 82, under “Stewardship” as follows: “The principle of stewardship includes permanent protection of environmentally sensitive areas as open, undeveloped lands. As noted by the commenter, the University’s approach to land use differs from that of the City and the County. There is no “Open Space” designation. With the update of the Master Plan, Cal Poly has designated all of its lands to a particular use. The areas designated Outdoor Teaching and Learning are, for most of the acreage involved, agricultural, and most of that is grazing. Some of the agricultural land may see improvements in the future that include accessory farm structures or teaching quarters. Specific “Ancillary” activity areas have been designated on the land use map (Exhibit i).

It is important to understand the fundamental premises in land use designations for Cal Poly, and how these differ from other jurisdictions. No development that is inconsistent with the land use designations will be allowed without a Master Plan amendment granted by the CSU Board of Trustees. Such changes would require CEQA compliance and public comment. Also, it is important to understand that all the land of the University must, in some sense, forward the academic mission of Cal Poly. Approaching areas of campus as “open space” question with CSU as to whether the land is necessary and should be surplused. That would be counter productive to any City strategy of protecting open space in its green belt.

3-30 The commenter suggests giving equivalent attention to Stenner Creek.

**Response** The following text has been added on page 103: “Guiding Principles and Goals for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan” are located in Appendix F. The principles and goals will apply to all creeks on Cal Poly lands, including Stenner Creek. In addition, Cal Poly has partnered with the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. The Land Conservancy has undertaken several projects on Stenner Creek to reduce erosion and improve fisheries habitat, especially for the endangered steelhead. This enhancement work will continue with other reaches of the creek.”
3-31 The commenter notes trade-offs between providing commercial services for students, faculty and staff on and off campus.

Response The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown.

3-32 The commenter suggests expanding commitment to student housing, timing and financial feasibility.

Response Additional sections have been added to the Residential Communities element to address these issues; please refer to pages 129 to 136.

3-33 The commenter suggests clarifying references to Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan, especially with respect to possible relocation of Mustang Stadium.

Response The Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan has been cited in the Master Plan and DEIR. Note that the Heery plan was developed by a consulting team to suggest the approach to all campus athletic facilities. The plan is not “adopted,” it is only advisory. The Master Plan team used the Heery plan as background information, incorporating some of its suggestions, but not all. Refer to the marginal note added on page 145 for clarification.

3-34 The commenter suggests clarifying the status of Mustang Stadium, including potential for remodeling rather than relocation.

Response Refer to page 146, text (formerly on p. 138) referring to Mustang Stadium has been deleted. Note that the Master Plan does not propose relocating Mustang Stadium. It does suggest that if it needs to be moved, the preferred location would be as suggested in the Heery plan, on the lower fields of the Sports Complex. Mustang Stadium can be remodeled, which was also suggested in the Heery plan. Nevertheless, any relocation of Mustang Stadium will require careful design in order to minimize impacts to adjacent neighborhoods, especially with regard to lighting and noise, as well as additional environmental review. See p. 151 for discussion of renovation of Mustang Stadium as the preferred option.

3-35 The commenter suggests adding "controls to inhibit at-grade pedestrian crossing" along railroad right of way.

Response The map (Exhibit 5.13) has been amended to show this change.

3-36 The commenter notes correction for "Americans with Disabilities Act".

Response This text correction has been made in the Circulation Element, page 174.

3-37 The commenter suggests siting a pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek outside riparian corridor; minimize creek crossings.

Response Text on page 174, second to last bullet, has been changed from “Develop a new pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek from the California/Highland intersection to the new
residential housing village at the Poly Canyon entrance. The path should be sensitively sited to support restoration of this natural creek corridor” to read “Develop a new pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek from the California/Highland intersection to the new residential housing community at the Poly Canyon entrance. The path should be sensitively sited to support restoration of this natural creek corridor. This path will be designed as part of the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project to ensure that it is located outside the riparian corridor. Creek crossings will be consolidated and minimized.”

3-38 Commenter offers supports for electric or low-emissions vehicles for shuttle service.

Response The following bullet has been added to page 177: “Use state-of-the-art technologies to add to the convenience and efficiency of transit use.”

3-39 Commenter notes roadway section does not show pedestrian crossings.

Response Text on page 179 has been corrected.

3-40 The commenter suggests confirming feasibility of reduction in parking demand.

Response Please see Response 3-11, above.

3-41 Commenter raises concern that development of ancillary activities in the Goldtree area may create community conflicts and compete with off-campus activities and generate impacts.

Response At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. Ancillary activities would not create significant peak traffic demand. They would also be contained within facilities so concerns about aesthetics, light and glare would need to be addressed during site and building design and development.

3-42 The commenter suggests the need to strengthen discussion of process, particularly for plan amendment.

Response A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7.

3-43 The commenter suggests reviewing the list of implementation guidelines, standards, and studies for completeness.

Response Chapter 7 has been revised to include a more comprehensive list of implementation studies.

3-44 Comment incorporates letter dated December 3, 2000 from Bishop's Peak neighborhood residents to SLO City Council.

Response See December 8, 2000 correspondence from Bishop's Peak neighborhood residents (Letter 52).

3-45 Comment incorporates letter from RQN dated December 4, 2000 to SLO City Council.

Response See RQN correspondence from December 4 and June 6, 2000 (Letter 58).
3-46 Comment incorporates e-mail message from Richard Kranzdorf dated 12/5/00 to SLO City Council.

Response See Kranzdorf correspondence of December 5, 2000 (Letter 23).

3-47 Comment incorporates testimony and correspondence from Naoma Wright to SLO City Council, 12/5/00 and 12/6/00 -- request for Cal Poly and Cuesta to provide more student housing.

Response See additional sections added to Residential Communities element (p. 136).
COUNCIL MEMORANDUM

December 5, 2000

To: Mayor Settle and City Council

Via: John Dunn, City Administrative Officer

Ken Hampian, Assistant City Administrative Officer

From: John E. Moss, Utilities Director

Subject: Cal Poly Master Plan comments relative to water.

At the request of Council member Malholland I have provided an additional review of the Cal Poly Master Plan and DEIR relative to their discussion of Utilities impacts, particularly water.

The Master Plan and DEIR identifies that Cal Poly at full implementation of the Master Plan will have some Class II, significant but mitigable, impacts. Table 6.23 on page 302 of the DEIR shows that at buildout, Cal Poly will have a deficit of 165 acre feet per year of available water supply, based on their safe annual yield from Whales Rock of 1,384 acre feet per year, and a combined domestic and agricultural demand of 1,549 acre feet per year at buildout. The mitigations proposed for this deficit are to implement a water conservation program, develop a drought contingency plan, and to investigate the availability of additional supplies over the next 20 years.

Suggested DEIR Comments:

1. It does appear that at least some information is lacking from Table 6.23 on page 302 of the DEIR and should be addressed in the PEIR. In the discussion of the Physical Planning Elements on page 147 and 148 of the Master Plan and DEIR, the discussion of the available water resources for the University includes two deep-water agricultural wells north of Brizzolara Creek which supply an additional 450 acre feet per year for agricultural irrigation. The supply of water available from these two wells and any corresponding demand being satisfied by these two wells should be included in Table 6.23 for clarity. Once properly included, there may or may not be the identified deficit in available yield.

2. In Table 6.1 summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, on Page 213, the DEIR identifies that "The University should develop a program designed to reduce overall water consumption on campus." It has been the experience of the City and other agencies in California, that domestic water consumption may be reduced by as much as 10 to 14% through the installation of water-saving fixtures alone. The University should consider as a policy statement in the Master Plan that the University will develop and implement a water demand management program which at a minimum, will retrofit the existing campus with water-saving fixtures and ensure that all new development includes the installation of water-saving fixtures only.
3. The City is pleased to see that the University is proporsing to prepare a drought contingency plan as a proposed mitigation. The University should be aware that water shortage contingency planning is one of the required best management practices (BMP's) for all signatories to the California Urban Water Conservation Council's (CUWCC) MOA, and while the University may not be a member of the CUWCC, the City appreciates the University's consideration of developing a drought contingency plan and recommends that the University consider adoption of all BMP's identified by the CUWCC. The City is signatory to the CUWCC MOA and does comply with the BMP's. The City would appreciate the University's consideration of adoption of the BMP's in this Master Plan, regardless of required mitigation.

As a matter of information for the Council, Pg. 306 of the DEIR under Water, identifies that the City and University are currently working on a project to recycle water for irrigation of the sports complex. In previous comments on the draft Master Plan, the City Utilities Department had requested that the University include reference to the possible cooperation between the City and Cal Poly for the use of reclaimed water on campus, and in particular for use on the sports complex. Council recently approved design of the Phase 1 water reuse system, which does not include extension of a line to Cal Poly. However, reclaimed water service to Cal Poly is identified as an alternative future project and staff feels it is appropriate for this citing in the DEIR to remain.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum please feel free to contact me at 781-7205.

c: John Mandeville
Letter 4
Mr. John Moss
City of San Luis Obispo
December 5, 2000

4-1 Regarding a lack of sufficient water supplies for the Master Plan, the commenter notes the University should incorporate agricultural irrigation wells as part of the supply.

Response Comment noted. The actual yield of agricultural wells is uncertain; the University has five wells, two of which draw from shallow, creek-fed water tables. The other three are located on Chorro Ranch and their capacity is also unknown. The text has been changed to reflect the uncertainty of agricultural well supplies. The University continues to have a long-term potential for deficiency.

4-2 Consider a policy to implement a water demand management program that, at a minimum, will retrofit existing fixtures.

Response Comment noted. The mitigation includes incorporation of water-saving fixtures into all new development, retrofit of older facilities over time, and modification of landscaping irrigation requirements. This effort is part of the Master Plan implementation program set forth in Chapter 7.

4-3 Consider adopting the California Urban Water Conservation Council’s best management practices as part of the University’s drought contingency plan.

Response Comment noted. The University is currently working with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to develop its comprehensive Water Quality Management Plan in order to adopt BMP’s as standard practice.
Date: December 12, 2000

Robert E. Kitamura, AIA
Director of Facilities Planning
California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo
Facilities Planning Department
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

SUBJECT: COMMENTS RE: CAL POLY MASTER PLAN & DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Dear Mr. Kitamura,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Cal Poly Master Plan and commensurate draft Environmental Impact Report. While the drafts of these documents have been circulating since late October, we unfortunately did not receive a copy of the technical appendices regarding the traffic analysis until the week of December 4, 2000. Hence, we have expedited this comment letter regarding the circulation element of your plan and the associated technical analysis of the DEIR.

Cal Poly Master Plan Draft EIR

Traffic Operations – Intersections, pages 269-278

Our concern regarding this section of the DEIR is that the forecast and analysis for the intersection of Foothill Blvd./California Avenue is not indicative of existing or future conditions. In exploring this issue we discovered that the existing traffic volumes collected by the DEIR consultant for the segment of Foothill west of California appears to be substantially in error with previous studies on this segment. Table 1 below compares the historic volume counts recorded along this segment to those used in the DEIR.

Table 1 – Volume Comparison Foothill w/o California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>18050</td>
<td>23469</td>
<td>16660</td>
<td>22300</td>
<td>14,604</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Taken from the Cal Poly Sports Complex EIR
b) Denotes a summertime count taken when Cal Poly is not in full session

As you can see, the ADT recorded by the consultant for use in the DEIR is substantially below any count previously recorded including a year 2000 summertime count taken when Cal Poly was not in full session.

The City of San Luis Obispo is committed to include the disabled in all of its services, programs and activities.

Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (805) 786-7416.
It is difficult to determine if this error has led to a mis-forecast of the intersection analysis because volume count and survey sheets are not included in the technical appendices of the DEIR. In addition, the traffic consultant appears to analyze this intersection as if it is “actuated & coordinated” within the City’s traffic signal system. Foothill/California is not currently contained within the signal system and should be analyzed as an “actuated” signal only. It is unknown what affect this distinction will have on the DEIR analysis. Tim Bochum has discussed these issues with ATE (your traffic consultant) and they are aware of these issues.

**Recommendation:** The traffic consultant should verify these errors and modify the DEIR accordingly. City staff believes that the realignment/redistribution of up to 5,000 vehicles a day to the California and Foothill corridors will have a significant operational impact upon the intersection that is not currently identified in the DEIR.

---

**Trip Reduction Assumptions and Alternative Transportation, pages 269-278**

(See additional comments below under Master Plan section)

In general, the City concurs with Cal Poly’s approach to utilizing alternative transportation, TDM and other incentives to reduce vehicular trips and parking requirements for the expansion components of the campus. The DEIR consultant has been very generous in reducing the net increase in vehicle trips assigned to the expansion plans.

However, there are no assurances in the Master Plan that the assumed modal splits will absolutely occur. Therefore, making a conclusion that the impacts are “less than significant” based solely on these assumptions does not appear to be adequate. It should be incumbent on Cal Poly to quantify (which has only partially been done in the DEIR) what the modal split objectives are and establish a mitigation monitoring program to ensure that these goals are reached. The DEIR falls short in this regard but does make the following statement, “Any reduction in financial incentives for the student and staff use of bus service will have a negative effect on the use of transit.”

**Recommendation:** The Master Plan (or DEIR) should quantify necessary modal split objectives (or general trip reduction amounts) and put forth a mitigation monitoring program to ensure that the trip reduction assumptions made in the DEIR become reality. The City believes that without this level of specificity, a finding of Class III impact regarding this component of the circulation element is not a valid finding.

---

**SLO Transit Impacts**

The DEIR and Master Plan state that “...Cal Poly will work with SLO Transit (City operated local bus service) and CCAT to develop the transit plan for the campus.” The report seems to assume that either or both transit systems have unlimited ability to expand service to carry all new on-campus students and staff. However, Cal Poly is not located within the City boundary and therefore no additional City transit funding will ensue from population increases for student housing within Cal Poly. Thus, the assumptions are basically flawed.

The level of transit analysis in the DEIR is not sufficient to determine if the SLO Transit local service
can absorb the additional transit trips that will be generated by the proposed expansion plans of Cal Poly. What we do know is that SLO Transit is currently running tandem bus service along our highly populated student routes and sometimes must leave riders at the curb because standing room only capacity is exceeded on the buses (see attached). Additional ridership implied in the DEIR will have significant impacts that will necessitate leaving more riders at the curb if current service levels are in effect. It is incumbent upon the DEIR to investigate this issue and make recommendations regarding the service requirements that will be necessary to meet the objectives (see trip reduction comments above) of the Master Plan.

Recommendation: 1) Include a mitigation measure: Cal Poly will establish a Short Range and Long Range Transit Plan with the goals, programs, policies and objectives that will ensure meeting the modal split objectives outlined in the DEIR and Master Plan. 2) Establish a mitigation monitoring program to measure results and effectiveness of the Master Plan transportation programs and implement needed additional measures as necessary.

General Comments

The DEIR should be clear that capital improvements projects such as the California Street extension, and Parking Garage II, which are contained in this program level EIR, will need to conduct project level environmental review to avoid impacts not included in this document.

Cal Poly Master Plan Comments

Chapter 5 – Physical Plan Elements

Page 162, California Boulevard, Foothill Boulevard and Campus Way

The consultant will need to amend this section accordingly based upon the comments and issues identified in the DEIR. The current wording found in this section is not reflective of the DEIR.

Page 176-179, Alternative Transportation Element

The City concurs with Cal Poly's approach to utilizing alternative transportation as a means to accommodate part of the future growth of the campus. However, there are no assurances in the Master Plan that the assumed modal splits will occur.

The Master Plan (or DEIR) should quantify the necessary modal split objectives, or if flexibility is wanted: general trip reduction amounts, and a commensurate monitoring program to ensure that the trip reduction assumptions made in the Master Plan will become reality. The Master Plan unfortunately does not commit the University to this philosophy; it merely identifies alternative transportation as a possible component of the future campus system.

Finally, there appears to be some discrepancy between the traffic study, DEIR and the Master Plan on the level of participation necessary to achieve the trip reduction assumptions. The traffic study clearly identifies mandatory parking pass restrictions and as other TDM percentages that are not carried
over to the DEIR or Master Plan. It is important to be consistent between these documents so that assumptions are clearly visible and the Master Plan reflects the true transportation picture for the growth of the campus.

We suggest the following additions to this element of the Plan:

1) Pursuant to the comments mentioned regarding the DEIR, Cal Poly should establish clear modal split objects and an annual monitoring program to gauge success or failure with Master Plan objectives. The City's General Plan currently does this and if Cal Poly would duplicate the effort, that effort would make our two documents complimentary on this very important transportation issue.

2) The Master Plan should recommend that Cal Poly work with the City, the County and SLOCOG to develop a Short Range and Long Range Transit Plan for the University.

3) It should be made clear on page 179, that there are potentially severe Environmental Consequences of the Master Plan if the trip reduction assumptions contained in the DEIR and traffic study are not achieved after implementation of elements of the Master Plan. This statement is not only fair to the casual reader of this document it is accurate as well. Cal Poly has done an excellent job of mitigating the increased on-campus student population from a transportation perspective. However this excellent work is based upon a "house of cards" of assumptions unless they become reality. Solid and strong mitigation measures and monitoring program is the necessary glue to make that house of cards solidly built and successful.

We thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on these important documents for our community and the University. If you would like to discuss these issues further, or have any additional questions, please contact Timothy Scott Bochum, Deputy Director of Public Works, or myself at (805) 781-7203.

Sincerely,

Michael McCluskey
Director of Public Works

Cc:  City Council
     John Dunn
     Ken Hampian
     Timothy Scott Bochum
     John Mandeville
     Chris Clark, CMCA
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5-1 Commenter suggests that traffic volumes reported for the Foothill Boulevard/California Avenue segments of the circulation system appear to be in error. This could substantially change the impact analysis for the intersection at Foothill and California.

Response The traffic volumes (ADT) were reported in error. These figures have been corrected in the text of the Final EIR. However, the intersection volumes were taken separately from the roadway ADT count and are correct. The level of service (LOS) for the Foothill/California intersection was calculated assuming actuated signal control (rather than actuated-coordinated as reported in the study). The resulting LOS are shown below in Table A.

Table A
Foothill/California Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>12.2 Sec / LOS B</td>
<td>21.7 sec / LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>13.8 Sec / LOS B</td>
<td>25.5 Sec / LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline + Project</td>
<td>14.3 Sec / LOS B</td>
<td>30.4 Sec / LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>16.3 Sec / LOS B</td>
<td>36.1 Sec / LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative + Project</td>
<td>16.8 Sec / LOS B</td>
<td>42.7 Sec / LOS D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-2 Commenter suggests an inadequacy in the environmental analysis of the impacts to circulation because the plan does not mandate trip reductions through alternative transportation and other means. The plan should quantify necessary modal split objectives.

Response The plan does mandate trip reductions. The fundamental trip reduction mechanism is housing all new enrollment on campus. This would be the functional equivalent of the City adding a new residence for every new job created within San Luis Obispo. Furthermore, the campus will institute a policy of restricting freshmen from having automobiles on campus. The Master Plan states as policy that the demand for 2,000 parking spaces will be eliminated. The following table has been used for estimating where savings would occur in parking demand.

ESTIMATED PARKING DEMAND REDUCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
<th>Safety Valve*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen restrictions</td>
<td>1,000~1,500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>some no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic controls</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/vanpools</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>As determined</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Fees</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transit</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City transit</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Relative Cost</td>
<td>Safety Valve*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/ped enhancmt</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area mgt</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff incentives</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment scenarios</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: alternative transportation savings will be lower for Cal Poly because many of these programs are in existence and functioning well.

*Absolute controls will require provisions (safety valve) for hardships.

The University, as stated policy in the Master Plan, would reduce demand by 2,000 spaces. This reduction can be achieved through a number of measures. Over time, the feasibility and success of various measures will vary. For this reason, it is impractical to commit, at a Master Plan level, to absolutes. For example, an important idea is having an on campus and near campus shuttle. But this needs to be subjected to feasibility studies and trial programs, which the University will do.

To meet the parking reduction proposal of 2,000 spaces, Cal Poly intends to institute as a first, and most effective measure, that freshmen be required to live on campus and that they not be allowed to maintain cars on campus (with exceptions made for hardship and job-related requirements). We believe that the inelasticity of demand Cal Poly will prevent this policy from having a detrimental effect on the dormitory market. This restriction exists at other universities, including UC Santa Cruz.²

It is estimated that there will be about 4,000 new undergraduate students each Fall (about 3,000 freshmen) at Cal Poly under the full growth anticipated with the Master Plan. Currently, we house approximately 80% ~ 90% of our freshmen on campus, and the campus provides 1,530 parking spaces for residents (R1 & R2). At present ratios, approximately 1,800 spaces would be needed under the Master Plan for freshmen. Allowing for some hardship requirements for freshmen, it is anticipated that approximately 1,500 or more spaces could be reduced with this policy alone.

This policy will do more than just reduce cars on campus. It will change the culture of the campus, infusing a higher regard for the environment and a reduced reliance on the automobile. As students advance through the University, they will do so with the ability to use alternative modes of transportation.

5-3 Commenter suggests transit impacts are not adequately quantified in the DEIR. The capacity of the transit system to absorb the necessary increase in ridership has not been established. Further suggests that mitigation and monitoring be added to reinforce transit objectives.

Response The enrollment increases will take place over the next twenty years. During this time, Cal Poly will work with the transit providers to enable the increase in capacity necessitated by this and other growth. The City will also increase, both in residences and jobs (especially the latter) and will also require additional transportation alternatives. Cal Poly will work with the

² http://www2.ucsc.edu/taps/students.html#fresh
City to monitor the use of transit services. In addition, Cal Poly will begin a feasibility study, as part of the implementation of the Master Plan, for a near campus shuttle system, which could reduce the impacts on the local transit providers.

5-4 Commenter suggests that the DEIR be clarified regarding the need for project level environmental review for capital projects such as California Boulevard extension and Parking Structure II.

Response Comment noted. Individual projects will be subjected to additional environmental review. Chapter 7 describes how future projects will be reviewed within the context of the program EIR for the Master Plan.

The Land Use and Project Review Procedures to be established to implement the Master Plan will include the following considerations.

- Establishment of a project development team that represents all affected University interests;
- Identification of responsibility for liaison with elected officials and local and regional agencies, as appropriate to the nature of the project;
- Identification of the appropriate neighborhood areas that may be affected by the project so that meetings may be held early in project planning and design regarding ways to relieve possible impacts.

5-5 Commenter notes that page 162 of the plan (new page 171) will require modification consistent with comment number 5-1.

Response The text has been modified.

5-6 Commenter offers concern that the modal split objectives have no assurance that they will be achieved. He further suggests that further mitigation (see 5-9 below) and monitoring be instituted.

Response The Master Plan proposes housing all new enrollment on campus. All of these on-campus residents will use a mode of transportation that is an alternative to vehicular use, namely, walking. In addition, freshmen will be restricted from using automobiles.

5-7 Commenter notes discrepancies between DEIR, plan, and traffic study as to required level of participation necessary to achieve trip reduction assumptions.

Response The Master Plan has been clarified to identify how trip reduction would be achieved, providing a commitment to funding the bus subsidy at least at current amounts (see p. 189).

5-8 Commenter suggests adding clear modal split objectives and an annual monitoring program.

Response Please see Response 5-2, above.

5-9 Commenter suggests Cal Poly work with the City, County, and SLOCOG to develop a Short Range and Long Range Transit Plan for the University.
Response Text which read “City Transit Improvements - Continue to work with transit providers to improve local transit to campus to meet future needs” has been changed to read “Integrated Transit Plan – Work with SLOCOG, City and County to develop both short and long term transit plans” (p. 189).

5-10 Commenter suggests the “potentially severe environmental consequences” will result if the trip reduction assumptions in the plan are not achieved.

Response Many commenters, including the City of San Luis Obispo, Caltrans, SLOCOG, and others have stated strong concerns with Cal Poly’s alternative transportation approach in the Master Plan. Michael McCloskey, Director of Public Works for the City of San Luis Obispo, observes that Cal Poly’s vehicle trip reduction program is “based upon a ‘house of cards’ of assumptions” which will collapse unless recommended mitigation measures are made reality. This description is apt.

The Cal Poly Master Plan was initiated in part by the California State University’s proclamation that it would endeavor to educate the growing ranks of students referred to as Tidal Wave II, the children of the baby boom. Cal Poly would take its reasonable share of those students. At the outset of the Master Plan process President Baker declared, as a matter of policy, that all new enrollment would be housed on campus. The University would not exacerbate an extremely tight housing market in the community by asking it to accept and find homes for an additional 3,000 students.

This on-campus housing requirement presented the Master Plan team with its greatest challenge. Although Cal Poly maintains 6,000 acres of campus in San Luis Obispo County, only a small portion of that fit the profile of appropriate housing sites. A student residence must be built at the intersection of low environmental/educational sensitivity, and proximity to the instructional core of campus. And more than just being within walking distance to classes, it needed to configure a community that would foster academics and citizenship.

An important component of the proposed student housing is the fact that under present conditions six of ten freshmen and eight of ten upper class students will want to bring cars to campus. In order to meet the anticipated demand, Cal Poly would need to develop approximately two additional parking structures beyond the two currently proposed. Realizing that having five parking structures on campus was difficult to accept, the Master Plan team sought alternatives.

The result was a three-pronged strategy to manage this demand:

• Policy-driven reduction of parking spaces. A reduction in the projected number of parking spaces that would be required under the Master Plan if the campus were to continue to provide parking in accordance with current ratios.

• Improved transit and other alternative transportation approaches. These are listed below.

• Moderation of impacts to neighborhoods. Any reduction in parking availability will immediately increase the pressure on local neighborhoods for parking. The city and university have previously cooperated on residential parking restrictions. As mitigation for the reduction, this program will be reviewed and expanded.
The University, as stated policy in the Master Plan, would reduce demand by 2,000 spaces. This reduction would be achieved through a number of measures. Over time, the feasibility and success of various measures will vary. For this reason, it is impractical to commit, at a Master Plan level, to absolutes. For example, an important idea is having an on campus and near campus shuttle. But this needs to be subjected to feasibility studies and trial programs, which the University will do.

To meet the parking reduction proposal of 2,000 spaces, Cal Poly intends to institute as a first, and most effective measure, that freshmen be required to live on campus and that they not be allowed to maintain cars on campus (with exceptions made for hardship and job-related requirements). We believe that the inelasticity of demand Cal Poly will prevent this policy from having a detrimental effect on the dormitory market. This restriction exists at other universities, including UC Santa Cruz.\(^3\)

It is estimated that there will be about 4,000 new undergraduate students each Fall (about 3,000 freshmen) at Cal Poly under the full growth anticipated with the Master Plan. Currently, we house approximately 80% ~ 90% of our freshmen on campus, and the campus provides 1,530 parking spaces for residents (R1 & R2). At present ratios, approximately 1,800 spaces would be needed under the Master Plan for freshmen. Allowing for some hardship requirements for freshmen, it is anticipated that approximately 1,500 or more spaces could be reduced with this policy alone.

This policy will do more than just reduce cars on campus. It will change the culture of the campus, infusing a higher regard for the environment and a reduced reliance on the automobile. As students advance through the University, they will do so with the ability to use alternative modes of transportation.

Additional measures to further reduce demand will be instituted. The following table presents a list of actions the university will explore and implement if feasible. Note that some of these measures will be more successful than others. For example, restricting students who live close to campus from getting parking permits will be difficult to enforce, but other campuses have found workable ways to do so. For example, UC Santa Barbara issues no campus parking permits to students living within two miles of campus. In addition, Cal Poly already has one of the most successful alternative transportation programs in the region. This means that the return on additional investment in some of these programs will be relatively marginal.

**PROPOSALS FOR MANAGING PARKING AND VEHICLE TRIPS ON CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Freshmen restrictions</th>
<th>• Bike/pedestrian enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Geographic controls</td>
<td>• Continued bus subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Car/vanpools</td>
<td>• Faculty/Staff incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking Fees</td>
<td>• Entertainment/services on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-campus shuttle</td>
<td>• Enrollment scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City transit shuttle</td>
<td>• Remote parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many comments on the Master Plan have raised concerns about the continuation of the fully subsidized bus passes for Cal Poly students and employees. The current bus subsidy is an element of a negotiated arrangement between Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. The

\(^3\) http://www2.ucsc.edu/taps/students.html#fresh
current agreement is for four years and ends on June 30, 2001. The negotiations are complex and are influenced by ever increasing costs. In addition, Cal Poly’s current funding (through parking fines) has been and continues to be relatively stable, meaning it has not been increasing commensurate with increased transit costs. Because the subsidy is the result of two party negotiations, it is not possible for the University to predict that it will always be able to reach an agreement with the city. Nevertheless, Cal Poly is committed to maintaining the funding for the bus at least at the currently designated level, and is exploring funding sources, such as an increase in parking fees, to fully cover the subsidy.

To conclude this discussion, it is important to review the pieces of the puzzle. In lieu of building two additional structures of steel and concrete, Cal Poly has chosen to erect a “house of cards” dependent on an interlocking set of incentives and policies. The “house of cards” for alternative transportation and parking demand management will be held together by the following important elements.

Cal Poly will:

- house all new enrollment on campus, eliminating the majority of new vehicle trips that would otherwise occur with off campus residences. Cal Poly is also undertaking faculty and student housing projects that will further reduce demand;
- institute restrictions on freshmen parking;
- maintain, at least at current levels, the bus subsidy;
- study the feasibility, and if appropriate, institute a campus shuttle system;
- study the feasibility, and if appropriate, institute geographic restrictions on parking permits;
- *not* build the two structures that otherwise would have been required to meet parking demand;
- work with the City to manage any resulting impacts to neighborhoods; and
- continue its aggressive and successful alternative transportation program.

Without this structure, the campus will not function in accord with the Master Plan. Air quality and transportation impacts will be significant. Community concerns will be heightened and the quality of the university experience will be diminished.
December 7, 2000

Robert E. Kitamura  
Director of Facilities Planning  
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

SUBJECT: Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft EIR.

Dear Mr. Kitamura,

Thank you for providing the District with the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft EIR. We previously commented on the Preliminary Draft Cal Poly Master Plan (enclosed for your convenience) in a letter to Deby Anderson of Cal Poly dated June 20, 2000, that is incorporated here by reference. Since we have previously reviewed the Draft Master Plan, most of our comments in this letter will focus on the Draft EIR.

Master Plan

General Comments

To reiterate the sentiments expressed in our June 20, 2000 letter, the proposed Cal Poly Master Plan presents a variety of policies and guiding principles that will aid the growth of the campus in ways that will reduce air quality impacts associated with additional student enrollment. The document appears well-written and well thought out, and incorporates essentially all of the land use and circulation policies contained in the District’s Clean Air Plan. Our congratulations to the many individuals and groups responsible for its development.

Specific Comments

1. (Circulation Principles, Public Transportation, page 158) District staff concurs with the statement that “additional public transportation could greatly reduce the need to increase the University parking supply to accommodate enrollment growth.” We further praise the commitment to fully integrate public transit routes and stops into the campus circulation system. Student patronage of the public transit system has been very impressive, due largely to University support of a free student bus pass program. Future on-campus enhancements and increased integration of the public transit system in conjunction with continued financial support of the free student bus pass program will greatly reduce parking demand and air quality impacts.
Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft EIR
December 7, 2000
Page 2

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Specific Comments

2. (Table 6.1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, page 209; and Mitigating Measures page 287) The DEIR concludes that “[t]raffic-related air quality impacts from traffic are mitigated by policies contained in the Master Plan (Class III).” While we agree that portions of the Master Plan will reduce traffic-related air quality impacts, we disagree with the conclusion that the impacts are fully mitigated to Class III less than significant levels that require “[n]o additional mitigation.” Traffic-related air quality impacts at build-out (2020) are estimated in Appendix E using the Californix Air Resources Board land use model URBEMIS7G (see Table 6.20). The results of this analysis indicate that motor vehicle-related air quality impacts will greatly exceed the District’s upper Tier II significance thresholds; enough to be considered Class I. As stated in our June 20, 2000 letter, past subsidized student access to public transportation is one of the most important contributing factors to Cal Poly’s impressive average student vehicle ridership rate. Ongoing funding for this program has historically been uncertain; thus, it cannot be assumed that the program will continue unless a permanent funding solution is identified. Continued, long-term financial support for this program is essential to minimizing the air quality impacts associated with the future growth of the university. We therefore request that the DEIR strike the conclusion that the project’s air quality impacts are Class III and insert as mitigation of traffic-related impacts the requirement to continue financial support of the free student bus pass program.

3. (Table 6.1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, page 209) Mitigation is suggested for stationary sources which are expected to result in Class II impacts. Suggested mitigation includes shade tree planting and orientation of buildings to take advantage of natural lighting and heating/cooling. However, the potential addition of boilers to the heating plant (2 existing boilers) on page 147 of the Master Plan do not appear to be considered in the discussion of “stationary sources.” Permits will need to be obtained from the District prior to the installation of any new boilers or stationary power generation equipment. Questions regarding new equipment permits or modification of existing permits should be directed to Gary Willey of the District’s Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912.

4. (Operational Impacts; Table 6.20, page 284-285) Table 6.20 separately compares vehicle and stationary operational impacts to the District’s thresholds of significance. In fact, the sum of vehicle and stationary emissions should be compared to the District’s thresholds to assess the project’s level of significance. In this case, total operational NOx emissions are estimated at about 80 lb/day, approximately 55 lb/day above the District’s upper Tier II significance threshold.
5. **(Mitigating Measures, Operational Emissions, Traffic, page 287)** While District staff recognize the beneficial nature of a number of policies and goals contained in the Master Plan, air quality impacts at build-out are projected to significantly exceed the District’s Tier II significance threshold. As stated in Comment 2 above, continued support for free student access to the public transportation system (SLO Transit and CCAT) is an extremely effective and tested means of reducing student transportation related air quality impacts. We therefore request that student bus pass subsidies be included as mitigation under the “Traffic” heading.

6. **(Mitigating Measures, Parking Structures, page 287)** District staff concur that proposed parking structures should be “designed with multiple exits in order to reduce the time required to vacate the cars after large events” to reduce the potential to create CO hotspots. We further recommend review and evaluation of the results of the CO monitoring program currently underway to evaluate the newly constructed Grand Ave. parking structure prior to the design and construction of any new parking structures on campus. Significant attention will need to be afforded the concept of parking structure design and siting if the monitoring data indicate exceedences of state or federal air quality standards.

7. **(Construction Impacts, Air Quality, Toxic Substances, page 305)** As stated in the DEIR, asbestos containing materials (ACM) may be present within existing structures that could be disturbed during demolition and renovation activities. This project is subject to the requirements stipulated in the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), which includes but is not limited to: 1) notification requirements to the District, 2) asbestos survey conducted by a Certified Asbestos Inspector, and, 3) applicable removal and disposal requirements of identified ACM. Please contact Tim Fuchs of the APCE Enforcement Division at 781-5912 for further information regarding asbestos and lead abatement issues.

8. **(Construction Impacts, Mitigating Measures, Equipment Emission Control, page 310)** The first paragraph on page 308 indicates the likelihood that equipment emissions (primarily diesel powered) will likely exceed the District’s construction phase significance thresholds at the H1, H2, Goldtree site, the off campus housing site, and the Grand and Slack housing sites. There exists; therefore, strong justification for implementing significant mitigation measures aimed at reducing public exposure to diesel exhaust. The fine particulate fraction of diesel exhaust has been listed by the State of California as a toxic air contaminant (TAC), recognizing both chronic and carcinogenic health risks. We therefore recommend that the list of mitigation measures presented on page 310 be revised as follows:

- The project owner shall require that all fossil fueled equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned according to manufacturer specifications.

- The project owner shall require that all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment,
including but not limited to bulldozers, graders, cranes, loaders, scrapers, backhoes, generator sets, compressors, auxiliary power units, shall be fueled exclusively with CARB certified diesel fuel.

- During construction activities at each of the locations identified above where equipment emissions are projected to exceed the District's thresholds, the project owner shall install catalytic soot filters on the two pieces of equipment (per site) projected to generate the greatest emissions. Where the catalytic soot filters are determined to be unsuitable, the owner shall install and use an oxidation catalyst. Suitability is to be determined by an independent California Licensed Mechanical Engineer who will submit for District approval, a Suitability Report identifying and explaining the particular constraints to using the preferred catalytic soot filter.

9. (Construction Impacts, Mitigating Measures, page 310 and Appendix E. Mitigation Monitoring Program, page E-6) A list of dust control measures are presented. Item "O" states "[t] shall be the University's sole discretion as to what constitutes a nuisance." Prohibitions against the generation of nuisance, and the definition of nuisance, are presented in Section 41700 of the California Health and Safety Code (H&SC) and District Rule 402: Nuisance. Enforcement of nuisance from emission of air pollutants falls under the authority of the District. Please remove item "O".

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this project. Please feel free to contact me at 781-5912 with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Barry Lajoie
Air Quality Specialist

cc: Gary Willey, SLOAPCD (permit issues)
    Tim Fuhs, SLOAPCD (Asbestos/lead issues)

Enclosure: June 20, 2000 letter to Deby Anderson of Cal Poly.

BPL/ing
June 20, 2000

Deby Anderson
California Polytechnic State University
Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

SUBJECT: Preliminary Draft Cal Poly Master Plan (May 1, 2000)

Dear Mrs. Anderson,

Thank you for providing District staff with the opportunity to review the Draft Cal Poly Master Plan (May 1, 2000). The following general and specific comments are respectfully provided for your consideration.

General Comments

The Draft Cal Poly Master Plan (Plan) appears to provide a sound roadmap towards a more compact, accessible, self-sufficient university in the future. District staff appreciate the understanding and inclusion of goals and policies encouraging alternative modes of transportation. Combined with continued support for the local transit systems that serve the university, we anticipate further improvement in the university's already impressive and diverse reliance on alternative modes of transportation.

Specific Comments

1. (University Land Uses, Principles, pages 54-57) District staff applaud the understanding of, and inclusion of, the principles of proximity, compactness, and community into the Draft Master Plan. District staff have reviewed past surveys of student and faculty commute modes to/from Cal Poly and have concluded that on-campus housing is one of the most effective means of reducing student automobile dependence. The development of future on-campus student housing as a "mixed-use residential community with a range of support services" directly accessible to the campus instructional core (10 minute walk) will contribute greatly to reduced automobile reliance and trip generation.

2. (Residential Communities, Housing Types, page 113) The inclusion of a mix of housing types in the Master Plan will enhance the marketability of living on campus for a broader range of students while simultaneously reducing student trip generation rates. Again, we applaud the Master Plan.

3. (Residential Communities, Support Services, page 114) The inclusion of on-campus support services such as personal services, retail food, meeting rooms, recreation and entertainment will augment on-campus living while again, reducing student trip generation and automobile use. We suggest that on-campus banking (ATM machines), postal service, and subsidized bus service continue to be offered and expanded as the student population grows.
4. (page 119/120) Page 119/120 (front and back) is out of order, being ahead of page 117/118 in the copy reviewed by District staff.

5. (Circulation, Principles, pages 142-144) As with the Residential Communities element of the Plan, the Circulation Element contains a number of guiding principles that will greatly enhance the viability of alternative modes of transportation to/from Cal Poly. District staff are very pleased with the attention given to public transportation, vehicle trip reduction, campus access, pedestrian and bicycle access, and the integration of the various circulation systems. These various principles, if adhered to during the growth of the campus, will provide students and faculty with viable alternatives to driving to work.

6. (Circulation, Campus Bikeway Map, page 151) The Campus Bikeway Map identifies principal bicycle storage areas. District staff recommend that some of these sites should be configured to accommodate the growing population of electric bicycles. A very successful electric bicycle program has been developed by Dr. Mostafa of the Engineering Department. The program currently includes six electric bicycles and solar powered charging stations that are available to students and staff on a two week basis. At this point, he has successfully demonstrated the viability of, and consumer satisfaction with, electric bicycles. We encourage the authors of this Plan to consult with Dr. Mostafa on this issue.

7. (Circulation, Campus Connection to Public Transit System, page 153) District staff agree with the need for Cal Poly to continue to work with local transit providers to enhance access to the campus. In particular, we strongly encourage the continued subsidization of student bus passes. Ridership data from SLO Transit suggests that students are one of the largest groups of patrons of the local bus system. Continued financial support from the university is essential to maintain this very encouraging trend and to help maintain the very impressive average vehicle ridership (AVR) rates experienced by Cal Poly at large.

8. (Alternative Transportation, Principles, page 161) District staff are encouraged by the content and direction of this section. However, while “education”, “encouragement”, and “convenience” are admirable principles to help foster the use of alternative modes of transportation, District staff recommend the inclusion of a forth principle, Support. We strongly recommend that Cal Poly continue to support the high student ridership rates currently experienced by SLO Transit. Free bus access has resulted in very high transit ridership rates amongst students, a fact that is supported both by ridership data and the large groups of students waiting at some of the communities transit stops during peak student commute hours. We recommend including continued financial support for SLO Transit in this section of the document; this would represent very effective mitigation of future air quality impacts that will accompany the additional student population growth. Options such as using student and faculty parking permit fees to subsidize free bus passes should be considered.

9. (Parking, Parking Supply, Environmental Consequences, Shaded box, page 168) As documented in the Final EIR for the Grand Avenue Parking Structure, localized concentrations of carbon monoxide could exceed state standards in the vicinity of parking structures. We therefore recommend careful consideration of the siting of any parking structures relative to both on and off campus residential areas.

10. (Parking, Parking Demand, page 170) District staff support the goal of “achieving a reduction in parking demand to a level of 2,000 spaces fewer than would be required if present parking ratios were to continue.”
Please feel free to contact me at (805) 781-5912 with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Barry Lajos

BPL/bpl
HIDAPLANRESPONSE2246rev4.doc
6-1 The commenter concurs with the air quality benefits of integrating transit with the future development of the Cal Poly campus.

Response No additional response is necessary.

6-2 The commenter expresses the desire to make mitigation of traffic impacts contingent on public transit subsidy.

Response Many comments on the Master Plan have raised concerns about the continuation of the fully subsidized bus passes for Cal Poly students and employees. The current bus subsidy is an element of a negotiated arrangement between Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. The current agreement is for four years and ends on June 30, 2001. The negotiations are complex and are influenced by ever increasing costs. In addition, Cal Poly’s current funding (through parking fines) has been and continues to be relatively stable, meaning it has not been increasing commensurate with increased transit costs. Because the subsidy is the result of two party negotiations, it is not possible for the University to predict that it will always be able to reach an agreement with the city. Nevertheless, Cal Poly is committed to maintaining the funding for the bus at least at the currently designated level, and is exploring funding sources, such as an increase in parking fees, to fully cover the subsidy.

6-3 The comment questions the conclusion that emissions associated with operational motor vehicles will be less than significant when compared with the Air Pollution Control District’s thresholds for significance and the need to make mitigation of traffic impacts contingent on public transit subsidy.

Response Table 6.20 provides a summary of estimated unmitigated emissions associated with the buildup of the university in accordance with the various uses and transportation strategies included in the Master Plan. The emissions were calculated based on the net traffic generation associated with the campus as described in Appendix C of the Draft EIR (Parking and Traffic Study, Associated Transportation Engineers, 2000) and assumes incorporation and implementation of transportation control measures and other aspects of the Master Plan that reduce overall trip generation. When compared with the District’s thresholds, the resulting unmitigated emissions exceed the Tier 2 threshold for Nox by about 55 pounds per day but are less than the Tier 3 threshold of 25 tons per year. According to the District’s CEQA Guidelines, when a project is expected to exceed the Tier 2 threshold, an EIR should be prepared and all feasible “standard” and “discretionary” mitigation measures should be implemented. The commenter refers to ongoing funding for subsidized student access to public transit as a feasible mitigation whose implementation is uncertain under the present wording of the Master Plan.

6-4 The comment refers to the District permit requirements for boilers that can be a source of stationary emissions.

Response This comment is noted and the permitting requirements will be forwarded to the Director of Facilities Planning.
6-5 The comment notes that the correct characterization of emissions associated with the project should combine stationary and mobile source estimates.

Response The resulting total is about 55 lbs/day above the District’s Tier 2 threshold, as described in response No. 6-2, above.

6-6 Commenter notes need to make mitigation of traffic impacts contingent on public transit subsidy.

Response Many comments on the Master Plan have raised concerns about the continuation of the fully subsidized bus passes for Cal Poly students and employees. The current bus subsidy is an element of a negotiated arrangement between Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. The current agreement is for four years and ends on June 30, 2001. The negotiations are complex and are influenced by ever increasing costs. In addition, Cal Poly’s current funding (through parking fines) has been and continues to be relatively stable, meaning it has not been increasing commensurate with increased transit costs. Because the subsidy is the result of two party negotiations, it is not possible for the University to predict that it will always be able to reach an agreement with the city. Nevertheless, Cal Poly is committed to maintaining the funding for the bus at least at the currently designated level, and is exploring funding sources, such as an increase in parking fees, to fully cover the subsidy.

6-6 The comment recommends incorporating the information gained from currently ongoing carbon monoxide monitoring of the recently-completed parking structure to help shape the design of future structures in a manner that minimizes CO exposure.

Response This comment is noted and will be forwarded to the Director of Facilities Planning. The monitoring of the parking structure has been going on since October 2000. To date, the highest level of CO has been less than 3 parts per million, considerably below the state and federal thresholds. This monitoring will continue until September 2001. The only significant concern with the new parking structure has been the exit time, sometimes exceeding thirty minutes. This is because, pursuant to an agreement with the Alta Vista Neighborhood Association, there is only one regularly operated exit. The new structures will be designed, to the extent feasible, with multiple exits.

6-8 The comment notes that the project will be subject to the requirements contained in the National Emissions Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants with regard to asbestos abatement and removal.

Response This comment is noted and will be forwarded to the Director of Facilities Planning. The University has undergone extensive asbestos removal in building renovation and demolition. The University will comply with asbestos and related regulations.

6-9 The comment recommends additional mitigation measures to address diesel emissions associated with construction activities at off-campus housing sites.

Response The following items have been added to the list of Equipment Emissions Control in the EIR at page 326:

The project shall require that all fossil-fueled equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned according to manufacturers specifications.
The project proponent shall require that all off-road and portable diesel-powered equipment including but not limited to bulldozers, graders, cranes, loaders, scrapers, backhoes, generator sets, compressors, auxiliary power units, shall be fueled exclusively with CARB certified diesel fuel.

During construction activities at each of the locations identified above where equipment emissions are projected to exceed the District’s thresholds, the project proponent shall install catalytic soot filters on the two pieces of equipment (per site) projected to generate the greatest emissions. Where the catalytic soot filters are determined to be unsuitable, the project proponent shall install and use an oxidation catalyst. Suitability is to be determined by an independent California Licensed Mechanical Engineer who will submit for District approval, a Suitability Report identifying and explaining the particular constraints to using the preferred catalytic soot filter.

6-10 The comment refers to the regulation of, and definition of, a “nuisance” provided in the Health and Safety Code that will determine the University’s exercise of discretion with regard to the abatement of nuisances associated with construction-related dust. The comment states that the abatement of a nuisance associated with air pollutants (such as dust) falls under the discretion of the Air Pollution Control District.

Response This comment is noted and will be forwarded to the Director of Facilities Planning.

6-11 The comment provides support for Land Use principles.

Response No response required.

6-12 The comment provides support for mix of housing types.

Response No response required.

6-13 The comment provides support for expanding services for students living on campus.

Response No response required.

6-14 The comment notes pages are out of sequence in review copy.

Response Noted - October 10 and January 23 plan pagination is sequential.

6-15 The comment provides support for Circulation principles.

Response No response required.

6-16 The comment suggests the University consider electric bicycle use and storage.

Response Ed Johnson, Facilities Planning, has received a grant to test the feasibility of using electric bicycles on campus. The first bike arrived on campus at the end of last year.

6-17 The comment provides strong support for coordination with local transit providers and continued bus subsidy.
Response  No response required. See Response 6-2, above.

6-18  The comment suggests adding Support as a principle for alternative transportation.

Response  Text on page 189 has been added to read that “Cal Poly is committed to maintaining the funding for the bus at least at the currently designated level.”

6-19  The comment notes concern with air quality associated with parking structures.

Response  Please refer to comment 6-6 above. The new structure, even during event conditions, has operated well below state and federal requirements.
The comment provides support for reduction in parking demand.

Response

The following table has been used for estimating where savings would occur in parking demand. The Master Plan policy is to reduce parking demand by 2,000 spaces.

**ESTIMATED PARKING DEMAND REDUCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
<th>Safety Valve*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen restrictions</td>
<td>1,000 ~ 1,500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>some no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic controls</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/vanpools</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>As determined</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Fees</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transit</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City transit</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/ped enhancmt</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area mgt</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff incentives</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment scenarios</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: alternative transportation savings will be lower for Cal Poly because many of these programs are in existence and functioning well.

*Absolute controls will require provisions (safety valve) for hardships.

To meet the parking reduction proposal of 2,000 spaces, Cal Poly intends to institute as a first, and most effective measure, that freshmen be required to live on campus and that they not be allowed to maintain cars on campus (with exceptions made for hardship and job-related requirements). We believe that the inelasticity of demand Cal Poly will prevent this policy from having a detrimental effect on the dormitory market. This restriction exists at other universities, including UC Santa Cruz.4

It is estimated that there will be about 4,000 new undergraduate students each Fall (about 3,000 freshmen) at Cal Poly under the full growth anticipated with the Master Plan. Currently, we house approximately 80% ~ 90% of our freshmen on campus, and the campus provides 1,530 parking spaces for residents (R1 & R2). At present ratios, approximately 1,800 spaces would be needed under the Master Plan for freshmen. Allowing for some hardship requirements for freshmen, it is anticipated that approximately 1,500 or more spaces could be reduced with this policy alone.

This policy will do more than just reduce cars on campus. It will change the culture of the campus, infusing a higher regard for the environment and a reduced reliance on the automobile. As students advance through the University, they will do so with the ability to use alternative modes of transportation.

4 http://www2.ucsc.edu/taps/students.html#fresh
November 16, 2000

Mr. Robert Kitamura  
Director of Facilities Planning  
Cal Poly State University  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Mr. Kitamura:

COMMENTS ON CAL POLY MASTER PLAN AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. We also appreciate the opportunity to participate in developing this plan.

Since the Master Plan addresses water quality issues in a very general manner, we have no specific comments at this time.

We also received the Cal Poly Water Quality Management Plan. Thank you for the obvious efforts dedicated to developing a comprehensive and practical approach to water quality protection. We are in the process of reviewing this document and anticipate we will have comments in the next week or two.

If you have questions, please call Sorrel Marks at (805) 549-3695 or Gerhardt Hubner at (805) 542-4647.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Roger W. Briggs  
Executive Officer
Letter 7
Mr. Roger Briggs
Regional Water Quality Control Board
December 5, 2000

7-1 No specific comments were received from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Response None required.
December 7, 2000

Mr. Robert Kitamura
Facilities Planning
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Mr. Kitamura:

Caltrans District 5 staff has reviewed the above-referenced document. The following comments were generated as a result of the review:

1. (Reference Page 130) - Caltrans staff is encouraged to see that this plan proposes an aggressive development of on-campus housing. This approach will do much to address A.M. peak hour demand on adjacent State Highway facilities at California Boulevard and Highland Avenue. Caltrans suggest that this concept be taken one step further by offering more on-campus services such as retail, laundry, banking and medical facilities.

2. (Reference Page 275) - District staff agrees that financial incentives to students to use transit services should be maintained and expanded.

3. (Reference Page 279) - Please be advised that Caltrans will consider participating financially with the installation of a traffic signal at the California Boulevard/State Route 101 north bound ramps. For specific information concerning what is involved in requesting State funding please contact Ms. Julie Gonzalez, District Traffic Electrical Engineer at (805) 549-3048.

I hope this letter gives your institution a better understanding of Caltrans concern with this plan. If you have questions or comments about this letter please contact me at (805) 549-3683. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Larry Newland, AICP
District 5
Intergovernmental Review Coordinator
Letter 8  
Mr. Larry Newland  
Department of Transportation  
December 7, 2000

8-1 Caltrans commends the development of on-campus housing and encourages more on-campus services to further reduce trips.

Response The Master Plan proposes several activities and services that will be attractive to students and reduce the number of trips to downtown and other locations. These are detailed in the University Union Plan and in the Campus Instructional Core section of chapter 5 of the Master Plan. See pp. 16, 133, 189, and 202.

8-2 Caltrans agrees that financial incentives should be maintained and expanded for transit.

Response Cal Poly recognizes the importance of maintaining the subsidy for free bus ridership with the local transit providers. A healthy ridership on local buses will continue to be an important component in reducing area traffic and air pollution. Cal Poly will continue to provide incentives for transit and other alternative transportation.

An important question is whether Cal Poly will be able to subsidize 100% of the transit use into the foreseeable future. That question depends on a number of factors that cannot be determined at this time. It is important to understand the background of the transit subsidy in order to understand why this is so. Every several years, the transit contract between the University and the City is renegotiated. Factors used to determine costs include the number of students using the system, the overall cost, and projections of use into the future.

See also text additions to p. 188-199.

8-3 Caltrans is considering participating financially in the development of a signal at the California Boulevard/State Route 101 northbound ramps.

Response With the extension of California Boulevard to Highland Avenue, approximately 5,000 additional vehicle trips per day could be redirected onto this roadway. The northbound off ramp at California Boulevard is an attractive alternative to Grand Avenue. Drivers exit onto their own westbound lane of California Boulevard as opposed to the required crossing of Grand Avenue without benefit of traffic controls. A signal at California and Highway 101 should improve traffic conditions at that intersection, especially as traffic increases on that road segment.
December 4, 2000

Robert Kitamura
Director of Facilities Planning
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Re: Cal Poly Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Kitamura:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Cal Poly Master Plan. Overall, we support the policies and programs in the twenty-year Master Plan and believe it will help Cal Poly grow in the right direction. We have provided some general comments about on-campus housing, but the majority of our comments are focused on the transportation components of the plan.

Residential Communities
We support the proposal to construct new student housing on campus. We strongly support the following language of the plan as it relates to mobility for the new housing units: "The purpose of the Master Plan is . . . to change the culture of the campus in a way that reduces the dependence on the automobile" (Page 183). In light of the proposed apartment-style living, we strongly support provisions for retail food shopping on-campus, among other amenities, to reduce the need for driving off-campus.

Circulation, Alternative Transportation, and Parking
1. Page 156: Stenner Creek Entrance - In the Existing Conditions, the campus entrance at Stenner Creek and Highway 1 is recognized as "very dangerous." Does the Master Plan recommend its closure or other mitigation?

2. Page 158: Innovative Transit Financing - We support an integrated Public Transportation system for on and off-campus circulation. We encourage Cal Poly to use innovative financing to preserve the current subsidized public transit program.

3. Page 158: Vehicle trip reduction - We support the language on vehicle trip reduction. We look forward to working with Cal Poly in its effort to develop and fund more specific programs. We recommend a provision to provide preferential parking for carpools linked with a transferable parking pass for multiple vehicles.

4. Page 159: Bicycle access on service roads - Service access roads should be developed to accommodate bicycle access where possible.

5. Page 163: RR Ped/Bike trail - We support the improved pedestrian connections to and from Cal Poly along California from Foothill to Highland recognized in the Plan. We believe the plan should also recognize the segment along California from Foothill to the south (towards downtown SLO).
6. **Page 163: Transit Improvements** - On-Campus transit facilities should strive for state-of-the-art technologies, including universal transit passes for students (swipe card), real time bus arrival/Departure information, and sufficient capacity for peak transit loading. We also recommend all bus stops include shelters, benches and informational signs as documented in the SLOCOG Bus Stop Improvement Plan.

7. **Page 168: Campus Shuttle** - The shuttle should serve the parking garages, among other areas, and be funded through dedicated funds such as parking fees.

8. **Page 171: California Blvd.** - We strongly support the proposed extension of California Boulevard through to Highland Drive, and support provisions for Class II bike lanes (at a minimum) along this roadway.

9. **Page 173: Intersection designs** - We support the proposal to explore a range of alternative intersection designs (including engineered roundabouts) and suggest similar flexibility for other roadways. For example, reducing the width of automobile travel lanes could be considered to accommodate Class II bicycle lanes as allowed by revised AASHTO standards.

10. **Page 178: Financial Feasibility** - Cal Poly should be commended for providing an Alternative Transportation section in the Master Plan. We are pleased to see the Plan recommends a study of expanded incentives for alternative transportation. When will this study begin? Please include SLOCOG in all correspondence related to this project.

11. **Page 179: Vague Plan Components** - Are these plan components part of the plan? While the programs listed are supported by SLOCOG, they are listed here only as "possibilities" and no beneficial impacts can be credited to the Plan unless they are proposed as Programs.

12. **Page 179: Parking fees** - SLOCOG supports exploring the adjustment of parking fees to assist with alternative transportation. Cal Poly should take a leadership role and seek modifications to CSU policy to provide greater flexibility in the use of parking funding.

13. **Page 182: Parking location** - We support the general concept of peripheral parking structures to reduce impacts of automobiles on campus linked with bike routes. We strongly support a shuttle service, especially for peripheral parking areas.

14. **Page 184: Parking structure locations** - SLOCOG will evaluate the proposed parking structure locations during the environmental review of those structures. We support the general policy of locating the garages near main entrances.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Peter Rodgers on my staff at 781-5712 if you should have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. De Carlo
Executive Director
Letter 9  
Mr. Ron DeCarli  
SLOCOG  
December 7, 2000

9-1  Does the Master Plan recommend closure or other mitigation at Stenner Creek and Highway 1?

**Response**  Cal Poly is currently in discussions with Caltrans to seek improvements along the Highway 1 corridor to improve safety and access to the University’s many properties and activities along that route. Ideally, there would be a consolidation of access points along that segment of Highway 1.

9-2  SLOCOG supports innovative transit financing.

**Response**  Cal Poly will continue to look for funding mechanisms such as grants and partnerships, as well as modifications to parking fees, to support student, staff and faculty access to local transit systems. In order to accomplish the parking demand reduction goal of 2,000 spaces, the university must support a robust alternative transportation program. See also page 189.

9-3  SLOCOG supports the Master Plan language on trip reduction and recommends preferential parking for carpooling linked with a transferable pass for multiple vehicles.

**Response**  Cal Poly supports this recommendation. The trip reduction program, its operation and administration, will be part of the more detailed implementation measures developed subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan. See also page 189.

9-4  Bicycle access should be accommodated on service roads.

**Response**  Services roads on campus will be primarily for pedestrian use. A bicycle access plan is on exhibit 5.14 of the Master Plan that includes most of the major routes to and on campus. Text on page 167 under “Bicycle Friendly” has been amended to include the following sentence: “Where appropriate bicycle routes may follow service access roads.”

9-5  SLOCOG supports improved pedestrian connections along California and would like that expanded to include the segment south of Foothill.

**Response**  Cal Poly will work with the City of San Luis Obispo in coordinating pedestrian and bicycle access routes. See text addition, p. 171.

9-6  Transit improvements should strive for state-of-the-art technologies.

**Response**  Cal Poly will seek funding for research and implementation of innovative alternative transportation systems such as those described in the comment. See text additions, pp. 177 and 189.

9-7  Campus shuttle should serve parking garages and be supported by dedicated fees.

**Response**  The campus shuttle would serve nearby residential areas and the parking structures. This program, its operation and administration, will be part of the more detailed
implementation measures developed subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan. The following paragraph (with amended text in italics) now appears on page 178: “In order to encourage alternative transportation and to provide access to and from nearby student residential complexes, parking lots and outdoor teaching and learning facilities, Cal Poly should undertake a financial feasibility analysis to institute a campus shuttle service with dedicated funding. Routes should be designed to serve regular locations on a frequent schedule. In addition, the shuttle service feasibility study should include an analysis of the ability to provide ad hoc access for student field trips and other activities in the Extended Campus away from the instructional core. The shuttle should have regular loading and unloading points at key buildings, parking lots and structures. Consideration should be given to using electric or similar low-emission vehicles for the shuttle service.”

9-8  SLOCOG supports extending California through to Highland and including Class II bikelanes.

Response  The extension of California Boulevard is the first priority for major circulation improvements at Cal Poly. The current design of the extension has Class II bicycle lanes included.

9-9  SLOCOG supports innovative intersection designs and decreased roadway widths to accommodate bicycles.

Response  Intersection design will begin with the development of detailed plans to push Highland Avenue around to connect with Grand Avenue. The intersection at Highland and Via Carta will be challenging. It must accommodate increased automobile traffic with the continuation of the road, and increased pedestrian activity with the construction of student apartments north of Brizzolara Creek. Engineered roundabouts are preferred because they maintain a steady flow of traffic, however, they are inconvenient in proximity to pedestrian crossings (you cannot stop in or near a round about). The following text has been added to the paragraph that discusses Key Intersection Designs: “…Intersection redesign needs to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles as well as motorized vehicles” (p. 183).

9-10  SLOCOG supports expanded incentives for alternative transportation and asks when planning will begin.

Response  This program, its operation and administration, will be part of the more detailed implementation measures developed subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan.

9-11  SLOCOG notes that the plan components for alternative transportation are “vague” and should be proposed as “programs.”

Response  The Master Plan has been revised to clarify its intention of providing alternative transportation incentives and components. It is the intention of the Master Plan that some or all of these proposals be put in place. There are in fact necessitated by the stated policy of reducing parking demand by 2,000 spaces. Without improved alternative transportation, the campus will face severe parking inadequacies in the future. These programs, their operation and administration, will be part of the more detailed implementation measures developed subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan.

9-12  SLOCOG supports adjusting parking fees.
Response Parking fees for faculty and staff are controlled, in part, by collective bargaining. The campus controls student fees, subject to provisions of California State University fee policies. This program, its operation and administration, will be part of the more detailed implementation measures developed subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan.

9-13 SLOCOG supports peripheral parking structures, better bicycle access, and shuttle service.

Response The parking structure locations were part of the Walker 1988 Parking Master Plan. This plan examined the parking needs of the entire campus and proposed a comprehensive program for improving parking and access for the campus.

9-14 SLOCOG generally supports the proposed location of the parking structures and will evaluate them closer during environmental review.

Response Each of the structures will be designed and reviewed in much greater detail during their development phase. Each will have at least a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared pursuant to CEQA, which will give SLOCOG and others an opportunity to comment further.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS— .00/
RESOLUTION ON
HOUSING AND THE MASTER PLAN

Background: Cal Poly currently has approximately 17,000 students and would be permitted to
increase the number of student to 17,900 under the current Master Plan. Cal Poly is in the process
of revising its Master plan to allow for an increase of 3,000 students. This would bring
enrollment at Cal Poly to nearly 21,000 students when completed.

Cal Poly is under pressure from both the CSU and the State to increase enrollment to meet the
needs for Tidal Wave II. However, the enrollment at Cal Poly represents only 5% of the total
CSU enrollment. The 3,000 increase in enrollment would represent less than 1% of the total
enrollment in the CSU. This increase would hardly solve the CSU enrollment problems
associated with Tidal Wave II.

During the Spring of 2000 the Academic Senate passed the resolution entitled “Resolution on the
Growth Component of the Master Plan.” The resolution addressed the failure of the CSU to
reimburse Cal Poly for increased enrollment at the marginal cost of adding additional students.
Adding additional students would mean a further deterioration of the quality of education at Cal
Poly. The resolution called for the removal of the growth component from the Master Plan.

This fail the availability of housing for students was far less than the demand for housing. In an
attempt to deal with this shortage of housing, utility rooms in the Cal Poly dorms were converted
to living spaces for students. This additional housing was still not nearly enough to meet the
demand for housing. There were stories of students bidding against each other for the limited
number of housing spaces available in the community. There were further stories of students
living on couches. In addition, an unknown number of students chose to leave Cal Poly because
they had been unable to find housing.

Compounding the housing problem, Cuesta College has continued to increase its enrollment.
Many of these Cuesta students come from outside the area and as a result are competing with our
own students for the limited number of available housing spaces.

Cal Poly is in the process of building a new dormitory that would house 800 students.
Unfortunately, this dormitory might fail to meet the demand resulting from the increase of 900
students to the current Master Plan ceiling. Furthermore, this new dormitory would not address
the current shortage of housing for students nor would it address the continued impact of the
rising enrollment of Cuesta College.
Further complicating the housing issue is the impact of the hiring of new faculty to replace those faculty members who will be retiring over the next several years. Young faculty moving to the area will have the dubious distinction of having to pay very high prices for houses. Those who choose to rent will find themselves competing in a very limited housing market with students. The competition for housing will result in extremely high rental costs for our new younger faculty members.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has passed the “Resolution on the Growth Component of the Master Plan” which called for the removal of the growth component from the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The availability of housing in the community is not nearly adequate to meet the demand for housing for our students; and

WHEREAS, The extent of this shortage in housing is not known; and

WHEREAS, The housing shortage is exacerbated by the continued increase in enrollment of Cuesta College; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly will add an additional 900 just to reach the current Master Plan ceiling of 17,900 students; and

WHEREAS, The revision to the Master Plan allows for adding an additional 3,000 students which would bring enrollment at Cal Poly to 20,900 students; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly engage in a thorough analysis of the housing situation in the community similar to that undertaken by the UC campuses at Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly create a plan to address the housing shortage; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the presentation of the revised Master Plan to the CSU Board of Trustees be delayed until such time the plan to address the housing shortage is complete; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to the CSU Board of Trustees, State Senator Jack O’Connell, and Assemblyman Abel Maldonado; and be it further

RESOLVED: That State Senator Jack O’Connell and Assemblyman Abel Maldonado be invited to a meeting of the Academic Senate to address the housing and enrollment issues.

Proposed by: Harvey Greenwald
Date: November 1, 2000
Letter 10  
Dr. Harvey Greenwald  
Academic Senate  
November 1, 2000

10-1 Dr. Greenwald submitted a “Resolution on Housing and the Master Plan” to the Academic Senate Executive Committee on November 1, 2000. While this resolution was not forwarded to the full Senate, it raised a number of issues of importance to the Master Plan. The resolution recommends Cal Poly prepare a study on the housing shortage on campus and in the community.

Response A discussion of the Market Analysis prepared prior to the Master Plan has been incorporated into the Residential Communities Element in pages 129-130. The analysis provides information on current deficiencies in the San Luis Obispo housing market, and the feasibility of providing housing on-campus.

10-2 The resolution further suggests that Cal Poly develop a plan to address that housing shortage.

Response The Residential Communities element has been reorganized and now includes a more substantial discussion of existing deficiencies and plans to reduce the impacts of this shortage on students and faculty, as well as the larger community. See pp. 136-137, where the following language has been added.

Cal Poly has sponsored two recent studies of the housing market as it affects students, faculty and staff. In 1998, the Division of Student Affairs retained Gordon Chong and Partners and the Sedway Group to analyze the student housing market and explore the potential for new student housing on campus. The findings from this study contributed to the University’s decision to build apartment-style units to house an additional 800 students on campus. The Cal Poly Foundation contracted with Anderson Strickler, LLC, to investigate the need and potential for University-sponsored housing for faculty and staff. Their 2000 Employee Housing Study found that housing cost is a significant factor in faculty recruitment and retention. Their report is guiding the development of faculty and staff housing on two sites west of Highway 1, as identified in the Master Plan.

Cal Poly will review and revise these market studies to inform each phase of Master Plan housing development and enrollment growth. Relevant comparative data includes vacancy rates, rents, land available for housing, financing options, and the nature and importance of amenities. Studies will also address student housing preferences and challenges in locating suitable off-campus housing.

10-3 The proposed resolution calls for Cal Poly to delay submittal of the Master Plan to the Board of Trustees pending completion of the housing plan.

Response Cal Poly will submit the Master Plan to the Board of Trustees for its March 2001 meeting. This date has been in the plan development program for three years. As stated in the plan, increased enrollment will follow the development of additional student housing. Thus, the Master Plan enrollment increases will not exacerbate the housing shortage. In addition, an 800 bed residential facility will begin construction this year. Plans for the development of faculty housing are underway.
Commenter suggests that state legislators as well as Board of Trustees be engaged in helping address housing and enrollment issues.

Response Please refer to the discussion in Chapter 3 reflecting enrollment pressures associated with demand for Cal Poly’s programs.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

In classes I have taken, I have taught lab in the ecological study area where the housing is being proposed. These labs have studied California's natural vegetation at the site and animals inhabiting the area. I hope you will take these into consideration.

When revising the current draft, I have used strongly as well as depended on by the biological sciences department classes.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

FROM:
Name: JASMINE WATTS
Address: 3775 Estrellas Court, Apt 4A
SLO, CA 93401

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
Commenter is concerned about effects on biota from the housing near the Ecological Study Area.

**Response** The housing proposed at H-2 is adjacent to one of the campus’ Ecological Study Areas at the mouth of Poly Canyon (see Exhibit 5.9). This facility will be designed to stay southwest of the ecological study area. The area will be enhanced in the future with native grasses and the introduction of Cambria Morning Glory, a plant listed by the California Native Plant Society. The DEIR addressed impacts associated with the housing development.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan.

I think that a big project like this should be publicized more. Neither I, nor my parents who pay tuition, have heard nothing about this. Do you not care what the students think?

I hope you will take these into consideration when revising the current draft.

Sincerely,

Ali Schlageter

FROM:
Name: Ali Schlageter
Address: 300 N. Santa Rosa
          APT 71C
          San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

TO:
B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
Commenter suggests the Master Plan was inadequately publicized.

Response  Cal Poly’s Master Plan team has been preparing the Master Plan for the past three years. Following a series of meetings during the Fall and Winter quarters of the 1998-1999 academic year, over one hundred members of the campus and community participated in task forces during Spring 1999 to develop the guiding principles for the plan. The plan was first presented in draft form to the public in the Spring of 2000. Numerous press releases and public meetings accompanied the release of this early version of the plan. The formal plan and Draft EIR were presented to the community in the Fall of 2000. The March date for the Board of Trustees presentation has been presented to the public for over three years. See discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.
MESSAGE
Date: 11/2/2000 at 10:53
Subject: Possibility of moving a College of Agriculture facility... Contents: 3
Creator: Linda Dalton /cpslo,employee

Item 1
FROM: Dana L. Arens /cpslo,employee
TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee
CC: Rex M. Wolf /cpslo,employee

Item 2

Bonnie,

Here’s another note from the student asking about the parking structure.

Dana

Item 3

MESSAGE
Date: 11/2/2000 at 16:53
Subject: Possibility of moving a College of Agriculture facility... Contents: 3
Creator: Andre von Mahlen /cpslo,student5

Item 3.1
FROM: Andre von Mahlen /cpslo,student5
TO: Linda C. Dalton /cpslo,employee

Item 3.2

APPA MESSAGE HEADER

Item 3.3

Hi Linda,

You may have read Joe Jen’s response to my e-mail about moving the irrigation training facility near Via Carta to another location. Can you clarify the position of the College of Agriculture on this?

The Facilities Planning Office has written in the May of 2000 version of the Cal Poly Master Plan that an alternative location for the third parking structure would be on lot H-16 and over part of your facility. Is this an option, and if so, how much trouble would that be for the College?

I'm writing a project on the location of third parking structure and would appreciate an official reply from the College of Agriculture, so I can include that in the project.

Sincerely,

Andre von Mahlen

\> Please talk to Vice Provost Linda Dalton and BRAS Dept Head Ken Solomon.
\> As far as I know, that is NOT an option. May be you are looking at an old version of parking structure plan. Joe Jen

\> HI Dr. Joseph,
\> I'm doing a project on parking at Cal Poly and noticed one of the options for the third parking structure would be located at the irrigation learning facility along Via Carta and north of Heissolara Creek. I would appreciate if you could tell me what the College of Agriculture's response is about moving this facility somewhere else, and
> how much trouble that would be.
> Sincerely,
> Andre von Mahlen
> >
> PS: My project is for an English 218 class with Professor Mary Forte.
MESSAGE  Dated: 11/2/2000 at 10:47
Subject: Possibility of moving a College of Agriculture facility ... Contents: 3
Creator: Linda Dalton /cpslo,employee

Item 1
FROM: Dana L. Areedo /cpslo,employee
TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee
CC: Barbara J. Fenske /cpslo,employee
Joseph J. Jen /cpslo,employee
Ken Solomon /cpslo,employee
Rex M. Wolf /cpslo,employee

Item 2
Bonnie,

Perhaps you could enlighten him. I do believe he's looking at an old
version?

Dana

Item 3
REPLY  Dated: 11/2/2000 at 10:47
Subject: Possibility of moving a College of Agriculture facility ... Contents: 2
Creator: Joseph Jen /cpslo,employee

Item 3.1
TO: Andre V. Muhlen /cpslo,student5
CC: Linda C. Dalton /cpslo,employee
Barbara J. Fenske /cpslo,employee
Ken Solomon /cpslo,employee

Item 3.2
Please talk to vice provost Linda Dalton and NRAX Dept Head Ken Solomon.
As far as I know, that is NOT an option. Maybe you are looking at an
old version of parking structure plan. Joe Jen

> Hi Dr. Joseph,
> I'm doing a project on parking at Cal Poly and noticed one of the
> options for the third parking structure would be located at the
> irrigation learning facility along Vida Carta and north of Brizzolara
> Creek. I would appreciate if you could tell me what the College of
> Agriculture's response is about moving this facility somewhere else, and
> how much trouble that would be.
> Sincerely,
> Andre von Muhlen
> PS: My project is for an English 218 class with Professor Mary Forre.
Letter 13  
Mr. Andre von Muhlen  
November 2, 2000  

13-1 The commenter seeks clarification on the location of Parking Structure III, and whether it would impact the irrigation training facility.

Response An early version of some planning studies showed the structure using part of the land now occupied by the irrigation training facility. Subsequent discussions with the College of Agriculture Land Use Committee informed the Master Plan team that this location would not be appropriate. The proposed location in the Master Plan is on parking lot H-12 at the northwest corner of the intersection of Via Carta and Highland.
B. Lowe, Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Gentlemen,

I would like to make the following comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan. After seeing the plan, I feel that it is a fine plan, and could be even better with a few adjustments. I appreciate that the campus core will be relatively vehicle free, and because the nearest available parking space for those with paid parking permits may continue to be as much as a half mile away from their class, students will likely ride either from home or from their vehicle to the bike rack nearest to their class. That is fine, but more needs to be done to accommodate the bicycle traffic that is being encouraged. The bicycle and pedestrian traffic on campus needs to be separated for safety. I would like to have seen more dedicated bike lanes which are completely separate from pedestrian walkways. It is too confusing for bicyclists to determine where they can and cannot ride on campus, and current signage is inadequate. With dedicated bikeways, clear rules can be established regarding safe bike access to the campus core, such as no riding outside the bike lanes. If this is the rule now, notice is not being spread widely enough.

My second comment concerns the proposed residential dormitories on the perimeter of the campus core. The new structures proposed near the mouth of Poly Canyon are too high up on the slope, and would be an eyesore for residents on the slopes of Bishops Peak and Cerro San Luis. Even though it would be more expensive, the parking ought to be beneath them, so the fluids leaking from vehicles will not be washed by rains into Brizzolari Creek. I saw no such remediation in the Master Plan.

I am happy to see that the dormitories are located along what the planners appear to be establishing as the edge of campus. I like the concept of classroom facilities in the core, then dormitories on the perimeter, then open space all the way to Santa Margarita on the other side of the mountains. That is a very good way of assuring that development of campus facilities will not be pushed further into the foothills. I just wish you had pulled that perimeter back from the steep slopes. It shows no example of restraint. I think Cal Poly's earlier stewardship was hinting at preservation of some open space on the valley floor when they named Perimeter Drive. The name suggests it is the perimeter of the campus core. Anyway, it is probably not feasible to build any higher up on the slope.

Sincerely,

Bob Ladd

118 East Morrison Avenue
Santa Maria, CA, 93454-6620
805-928-6663

Bob Ladd

12/4/87

RECEIVED
Letter 14
Mr. Bob Ladd

December 4, 2000

14-1 The commenter suggests that more needs to be done to accommodate the bicycle traffic on campus, including greater separation between pedestrians and bicycles for safety.

Response A detailed bicycle planning will be included in the implementation plans.

14-2 The commenter is concerned that the student housing is to be developed too high up the slope of the hills on the eastern edge of the campus instructional core. This could negatively impact the views from residences on the slopes of Bishops Peak and Cerro San Luis.

Response As part of the constraints analysis undertaken at the outset of the Master Plan process, the team identified steep slopes on campus (Exhibit 4.6) that would be inappropriate for development. Further, the team established a limit for construction line on slopes (see text on p. 59). This limit was designed to be consistent with policies in adjoining jurisdictions, the City of San Luis Obispo and the County of San Luis Obispo. Some of the new housing will be visible to established housing across the valley and elsewhere. Because of the distance of these residences from the proposed housing, the impact to visual resources is not significant.

14-3 Parking should be beneath the housing to reduce the possibility of water quality impacts.

Response All campus parking will be designed with drainage facilities that prevent the deterioration of water quality from automobile-related pollutants, whether they are within a structure, or a surface parking lot. A Water Quality Management Plan is under development that will provide best management practices for all development, including parking, on campus. See text addition on p. 195, which indicates that the Plan calls for us to “integrate parking into other structures at ground level or below as feasible.”
To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

- Why not build up instead of out?
  - By building up the natural resources and area, land won’t be disturbed.
  - With more housing comes more and more people. Preventing freshmen to arrive can have a positive effect on reducing traffic.

- Parking should be increased by taking me 2 hrs.
  - Big bus to get to Pomona Wise School.

I hope you will take these into consideration when revising the current draft.

Sincerely,
Letter 15
Anonymous

December, 2000

15-1 Commenter suggests “building up instead of out,” thereby preserving natural resources and open land.

Response Several commenters have suggested the University develop housing in a more compact form to save land, especially through the use of taller buildings – “up not out.” Housing on campus was designed to meet several parameters. One was to avoid the development of high-rises. Student housing is effective when it provides an atmosphere of community. This requires air and open recreation space, as well as a connection to everyday living patterns. Taller structures create a disconnection between the student and the student community. In addition, taller structures increase the risk of catastrophe from fire or seismic events. Nevertheless, the proposals are compact, at a density equal to or greater than that elsewhere on campus. Furthermore, a constraints analysis undertaken at the outset of the Master Plan process identified areas appropriate for housing development. The housing proposals are consistent with that analysis. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis in Chapter 4.

15-2 Commenter notes that housing will bring more cars. Transit services must be improved if measures like freshmen restrictions are implemented.

Response Comment noted. Cal Poly will continue to provide financial support for public transportation. Further, the campus will explore many ways in which to balance the allocation of resources toward trip reduction programs rather than toward the cost of providing more parking on campus.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following
Comments regarding the Cal Poly
Master Plan:

I would like to see some assurance
of sustainable practices in planned
development.

In my mind, planned development
involves not only planned decisions,
but also input and comments from
interested parties.

I hope you will take these into consideration
when revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tobias Hahn
Assistant Planning Director
Letter 16
Ms. Brianna Holan
December, 2000

16-1 Commenter requests assurances of sustainable practices in planned development.

Response The following has been added to the Master Plan (pp. 162-163):

Site selection, site planning and building design should account for solar exposure, prevailing wind direction, and patterns of light and shade to minimize energy requirements and enhance the quality of outdoor space. Design guidelines and processes for implementing the Master Plan should encourage energy efficient building design and resource conservation. The campus landscape plan should consider the impact of vegetation and water use on the resource efficiency of facilities and the creation of comfortable and functional outdoor space.

Design for renovation of existing buildings and new construction should consider ways to maximize energy efficiency and take advantage of the mild climate in San Luis Obispo. Alternative, renewable energy sources should be used to the greatest extent possible to offset growth in demand. As costs escalate for traditional energy sources, other options to consider include integrated photovoltaic and solar generation for electricity, passive and low energy cooling strategies for buildings (including materials, solar control, natural ventilation, thermal mass), passive solar space and water heating, and effective use of day lighting. New buildings should be well ventilated using natural ventilation, and existing buildings should be retrofitted where feasible to make them usable and livable during the summer without requiring air conditioning.

Consistent with Cal Poly’s mission, the campus should explore an integrated approach to sustainable, or “green” design for research, education and operational applications in new and renovated buildings and in the campus landscape treatment. In addition to the energy conservation measures noted above, these efforts should address water conservation and reclamation, re-use of materials and products, and life-cycle costing in general. Several opportunities for resource recovery projects with educational and research potential as well as operational value include water supply and waste treatment for animal facilities, enhancement of Brizzolara Creek and the construction of new student residential communities.

16-2 As to the location and effect on environment from planned development, commenter suggests that there are alternatives, such as underground parking.

Response Several commenters have suggested the University develop housing in a more compact form to save land, especially through the use of taller buildings – “up not out.” Housing on campus was designed to meet several parameters. One was to avoid the development of high-rises. Student housing is effective when it provides an atmosphere of community. This requires air and open recreation space, as well as a connection to everyday living patterns. Taller structures create a disconnection from the student to the student community. In addition, taller structures increase the risk of catastrophe from fire or seismic events. Nevertheless, the proposals are compact, at a density equal to or greater than that elsewhere on campus. Furthermore, a constraints analysis undertaken at the outset of the Master Plan process identified areas appropriate for housing development. The housing proposals are consistent with that analysis. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis. Where feasible, the
Master Plan calls for “integration of parking into structures at ground level or below” (page 195).
To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

- The displacement of dorms in the Brizzedan Creek flood plain is completely ridiculous! After conducting an analysis (LA-184) and extensively analyzing this area, it seems as if a class field ionizing placement for inhaled, it is as though all consideration of slope, hydrology, and interclimax have been ignored.

Please consider this placement and the effects it will cause. Stirring water could also harm wildlife and destroy their habitat.

Sincerely,

Bruce Scared
A concerned Cal Poly student
Letter 17
Ms. Brooke Saavedra

December, 2000

17-1 Commenter questions wisdom of placing student housing in the Brizzolara Creek floodway.

Response Student housing was proposed near Brizzolara Creek in the Spring 2000 draft of the Master Plan. This housing was relocated to accommodate the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project. No housing will be located in the floodway. See Exhibit 5.9. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis in Chapter 4, as well.

17-2 Housing will impact wildlife and habitat.

Response Please refer to Exhibit 5.9. Housing has been located only on previously utilized land (for example the Bull Test area —H-1 and H-2, or the parking lot behind the North Mountain dorms—H-5), with the exception of the small area to the south of Yosemite Hall (H6). The DEIR addresses impacts from the housing proposals.
To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

The new developed housing should be built on already existing areas as in by

The site is too small, and we need a carefully

and Building.

I hope you will take these into consideration

When revising the current draft.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

FROM: Chad Gifford
Name: 800 N. San Marino
Address: San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

RECEIVED
DEC 5 2000
FACILITIES PLANNING
Letter 18
Mr. Chad Gifford

December, 2000

18-1 Commenter suggests new housing should be developed on previously developed areas.

Response Please refer to Exhibit 5.9. Housing has been located only on previously utilized land (for example the Bull Test area—H-1 and H-2, or the parking lot behind the North Mountain dorms—H-5), with the exception of the small area to the south of Yosemite Hall (H6). See Constraints and Opportunities analysis in Chapter 4.

18-2 Commenter suggests building taller structures to save land.

Response The proposed housing will range from two to four stories, although the University prefers not exceeding three stories. The reasons for not developing taller structures have to do with safety and community. The taller the structure, the greater the fire and seismic hazards. Furthermore, taller structures are not conducive to creating an atmosphere of community. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis in Chapter 4. Where feasible, parking may be incorporated into structures at or below ground level to allow for more compact development (refer to page 195).
To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

FROM:
Chad Gifford
Name:
Address: 200 N. Santa Rosa St.

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

I hope you will take these into consideration when revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

Comment

There were some issues at the meeting about students not wanting to live in dorms. For one, it is too long a walk from Brizzioli Creek to far sides of the campus. My main issue is that I don't want to see development in and around poly canyon unless it is most accessible and already developed unit since it is most accessible and already developed. It was said that part of the wetlands on Cal Poly and will be altered and used in develop process. I'm heavily against this too. Maybe the challenge is to not accept as many students as status quo.

Thank you!
Letter 19
Mr. Chad Gifford

December, 2000

19-1 Commenter reiterates previous comments and adds that housing near Brizzolara Creek will be too far from the far side of campus.

Response The so-called “10-minute rule,” was used to define the campus instructional core, and guide the placement of housing. The rule intones that a student should be able to traverse campus, from one class to the following, within 10 minutes. The housing at H-1 and H-2 will be the furthest residences from classes in the College of Business, for example, and some students may need to allow more than ten minutes to cover this distance. However, once within the campus core, students should be able to move from class to class within ten minutes.
Comment

Has any effort been made to better utilize existing dam reservoirs such as North Mountain which is only two stories high?
Commenter asks if any effort has been made to better utilize existing dormitories, such as North Mountain, which are only two stories.

Response
Yes. The redevelopment of North Mountain dormitories is shown on Exhibit 5.9 as proposed housing H-4. See Residential Communities element.
Dale Sutliff’s comments on the Master Plan and Draft EIR:

November 18, 2000

To: Linda Dalton

By: Dale Sutliff, Prof.
Chair, Landscape Advisory Committee

Comments on Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft EIR

Comment:

Broad question: Is there a list compiled (beyond the list at back of document) that identifies all of the additional studies and actions necessary to accomplish and implement the master plan (which are listed throughout the document)?

Comments and suggestions (suggested changes/additions shown in *italic*):

p.14, Guiding Framework
Add two principles to Land use overall direction:
* long term sustainability and adaptability of facilities
* energy efficient planning, design, and management

p.15, Guiding Framework
Q6. j. add at end: *sense of place and purpose.*

Change margin comment to include: *...maintain academic and environmental quality. So that this statement is more clearly incorporated in body of text for Q7.*

p.65, Physical Plan Elements
Environmental Suitability and Sustainability
Add and end of statement: *...become degraded, including the upgrading of both buildings and grounds within the campus instructional core.*

p.67, Physical Plan Elements
Outdoor Teaching and Learning
Add at end: *All facilities should be designed and managed to promote an integrated teaching and learning environment where both buildings and spaces are central to the learning experience.*

p.79, Physical Plan Elements
Enhancement
Insert: *...conduct research, and implement actions to incorporate appropriate management and enhancement practices.*

p.92, Physical Plan Elements
Foresight
Add: *Each college and program should identify outdoor teaching and learning needs.*

Investment
Add: *Needed investment in outdoor teaching and learning should be identified by the colleges and programs.*

Protection
Change heading to: *Protection and Management*
p. 93, Physical Plan Elements
Visibility
Change: statement to read: The centrality of outdoor teaching and learning calls for these lands and facilities to be a highly visible, even tangible, part of the main campus image – not just on outlying lands.

Integration
Add at end: Constant contact with outdoor teaching and learning lands and facilities by all campus users should be built in to project and academic planning for the campus.

p. 98, Physical Plan Elements
RiverCreek Enhancement Activities
Question: Why not designate Steiner Creek as an Enhancement Area now, with similar approach as Brizzolara Creek?

p. 99, Physical Plan Elements
Design Village
Add: Future development should adhere to environmental sensitivity principles contained in the campus master plan.

Campus Core
Add to end of first bullet statement: Horticulture, and the general campus population
Change second bullet statement: Exhibit and demonstration areas...

p. 101, Physical Plan Elements
Issues
Add to 11th bullet: Environment and teaching mission.
Add to last bullet: Inconsistent and confusing building signage and references.

p. 103, Physical Plan Elements
Circulation
Add: Pedestrian circulation and orientation, whether...

p. 115, Physical Plan Elements
Southwest Area
Comment: Need Specific Plan for this area, to include incorporation of other facilities as part of parking structure. The illustrative plan shown in the draft master plan raise many issues.

p. 117, Physical Plan Elements
North Perimeter Pedestrian Way
Comment: N.Perim Dr. should NOT become a BROAD pedestrian way. Rather, the scale of the street should be reduced from its automobile requirements to a scale to better accommodate pedestrian and bike flow. This will contribute to a “more compact campus core”.
Change: statement to include: The way should form a “spine” connected to a series of pedestrian plazas and paths accessing...

p. 119, Physical Plan Elements
Green Space Plan
Comment: This plan needs further resolution, along with the illustrative plan, to show key nodes and plazas related to the pedestrian/bike system, changes to the southwest area configuration, to associate new services (shopping, food, etc.) with the North Perimeter Pedestrian Precinct, etc.
p. 121, Physical Plan Elements
Campus Landscape Plan
   Add, last paragraph: ...It should also provide guidance and standards that ensure that each project should contribute to the common vision for campus development and of the campus landscape...

p. 137, Physical Plan Elements
Outdoor Fields
   The second paragraph is out of date. Conditions no longer exist.

p. 150, Physical Plan Elements
Solid Waste and Recycling – Distribution
   Comment/Red: As part of Cal Poly’s mission, the campus should establish a recycling center and laboratory for research and re-use of materials and products, requiring re-utilization, where feasible, in campus projects.
Commenter asks if a complete list of implementation actions are included in the plan.

**Response** The current version of the Master Plan has been modified to include a list of all suggested implementation measures for the Master Plan. See Chapter Seven, Implementation Activities. See Chapter 7, updated.

Commenter suggests a number of text changes to the Master Plan, specifically on pages 14, 15, 65, 67, 79, 92, 93, 99, 101, 103, 121 and 150 (pages per the October 10, 2000 Plan).

**Response** Most changes were made consistent with the intent of this suggestion. Text changes can be found on pages 16, 17, 69, 71, 84, 96, 97, 98, 103, 106, 108, 127. The alteration suggested for recycling (draft plan page 150) was not incorporated into the plan at this location. Instead, a new section on Sustainable Campus Planning and Design was added at the end of the Public Facilities and Utilities element. This section includes the following language: “… these efforts should address water conservation and reclamation, re-use of materials and products, and life-cycle costing in general” (pp. 162-163).

Commenter suggests the need for a more specific plan of the southwest area of campus.

**Response** Chapter 7 identifies the Southwest Area for one of several implementation studies.

Commenter suggests North Perimeter should not become a “broad pedestrian way.”

**Response** The text has been changed to reflect this comment; “North Perimeter Drive should become a human-scale pedestrian way …” (p. 122).

Commenter suggests that the green space plan needs further refinement, showing key pedestrian nodes and plazas and other features.

**Response** Chapter 7 identifies pedestrian systems as one of several implementation studies.

Commenter suggests a number of text changes to the Master Plan, specifically on pages 121, 137, and 150.

**Response** Environmental quality is addressed in question 2.

Designate Stenner Creek as an Enhancement Area now.

**Response** The following has been added to the Master Plan (p. 103): “Guiding Principles and Goals for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan” are located in Appendix F. The principles and goals will apply to all creeks on Cal Poly lands, including Stenner Creek. In addition, Cal Poly has partnered with the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. The Land Conservancy has undertaken several projects on Stenner Creek to reduce erosion and
improve fisheries habitat, especially for the endangered steelhead. This enhancement work will continue with other reaches of the creek."

**21-8**  The discussion in the Recreation, Athletics and Physical Education element entitled “Outdoor Fields” is out of date.

**Response**  With the completion of the Sports Complex, the discussion in the Master Plan has been modified to reflect current conditions (p. 145).
Received via e-mail 12/5/00

Hello Ms. Lowe

I represent the NRM Department on the CATLUC committee. Our NRM Dept. is "very" concerned about the proposed remote parking lot that is proposed in or near the area currently known as the NRM Logging Sports and Tree Farm (along Stoner Creek Road). We use this area to a great extent both for class demonstrations and as a laboratory site. Building a parking lot in this vicinity would significantly impact our NRM teaching program. We request that significant discussion with our department must occur to work out a possible solution to what we consider to be a major conflict and impact on our NRM teaching program. This discussion must be timely as we are constantly investing people, time, and money into our current NRM site off Stoner Creek Road. For example, we are presently discussing relocating the Tree Farm to the upper field by Stoner Creek Road given the drainage and soil problems we have in the lower field tree farm site we are currently using. We have even considered building a greenhouse in this area. Any decision to relocate the Tree Farm or build a greenhouse in our current site would in turn be affected by a decision to put a remote parking lot in this vicinity. Bottomline, NRM needs a outdoor laboratory site for forestry field lab, logging sport competitions, field demonstrations (e.g., we regularly use the current site for fire control, forest measurements, silviculture, forest harvesting operations), Enterprise projects, and of course propagation of trees. We need a large enough area to accommodate large equipment such as Fire Engines, dozers, large trucks. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to further discussion on this subject.

Best Regards
Doug Plato
Letter 22
Dr. Doug Piirto
CAGRLUC

December 5, 2000

22-1 Commenter, on behalf of the NRM Department and CAGRLUC, raises concerns about the proposed locations for remote parking. Commenter notes that the proposed lot is on or near the area of their Forestry Demonstration Area and Christmas Tree Farm.

Response The Master Plan Land Use map (Exhibit i) identified two general locations where a remote parking lot could be developed. The locations will be refined as discussed in new text on p. 195: “Planning for development of a remote parking site that would involve moving any Outdoor Teaching and Learning activities, such as the forestry demonstration area or sheep grazing, would follow the principle that a new site for their operations would need to be identified and developed first, so as to minimize disruption.” It is important to note that the development of remote parking is a contingency predicated on the inability to reduce parking demand through restrictions described in the Alternative Transportation element of the Master Plan.
160 Graves
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

December 4, 2000

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
c/o Crawford Multari Clark and Mohr
641 Higuera Street, Suite 302
San Luis Obispo, CA 93402
Attention: Nicole Phillips

Fax to: 541-5512

Re: Cal Poly State University

Dear Ms. Phillips:

I am hereby submitting my comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft
Environmental Impact Report. The comments are in four parts. Part I are general in
nature. Part II concentrate on one particular aspect of the Plan, the proposal for a
Visitors’ Center and other ancillary projects on the west side of Grand Avenue between a
line of trees and Slack Street. The third part are comments on other aspects of the Plan.
Finally, there is a brief concluding statement.

General Comments

As a long-term faculty member at Cal Poly who is interested in the environmental
dimension of projects involving the University, I am pleased to note that far more
attention has been paid to environmental issues in the Master Plan than in other recent
efforts including the Cal Poly Sports Complex.  I applaud those responsible for the shift
in emphasis.  For instance, efforts to make the campus less auto-centric is to be
commended and, to some extent, so are the constraints on additional parking spaces
commensurate with planned new student housing.

I am distressed, however, at the time-line for review of the Draft EIR.  I understand the
desire by this campus to move with all due speed so that the Final EIR can be sent to the
Chancellor’s office early in 2001.  One of the pleasures in serving on the Land Use Task
Force in the spring of 1999 was having the time to think about and then discuss proposals
regarding land use matters on the campus.  At the present critical stage of the process,
however, those who are interested in our campus and community do not have the same opportunity. This is a major shortcoming.

Comments on the Proposed Ancillary Activities and Facilities Abutting Slack Street East of Grand Avenue

In the interest of openness, I want to first be clear that my house at 160 Graves is only a stone's throw from where the proposed Visitors' Center and possibly other structures would be located according to the Master Plan. As one who may retire from full-time teaching in a year or two and possibly move, my comments are directed towards the future of the neighborhood where I have lived since 1983 rather than simply catering to my own wants.

The neighborhood is amazingly quiet given its proximity to the University and the fact that 50 percent or more of the houses are student rentals. One of the reasons for this happy state of affairs, I submit, is the buffer between the neighborhood and campus residence halls in particular and University structures in general. A second reason, already mentioned, is the mix of occupants in the immediate area.

I wish I had been on campus last spring when, according to the DEIR, the proposal was first made to house a Visitors' Center adjacent to this quiet, residential neighborhood. Alas, I was teaching overseas and was thus not "in the loop" during the formative stages of the proposal. I realize I am submitting my comments at the 11th hour but that is, by itself, insufficient reason to have the proposal go forward if there are serious problems as I believe there are.

When one talks about environmental considerations, you must be concerned both with natural habitat and human habitat. The maps and text of the DEIR designates the area in question as "Suitable for Facilities Expansion." In other words, it is not just a proposed Visitors' Center that is at issue but basically the reconstitution of the entire area. For instance, on page 195 one reads that the relatively small area may also be suitable for "additional conference facilities."

What is particularly disappointing is that those who put the DEIR together, I am told, refused to designate the ancillary structures as even leading to the possibility of "Potential Neighborhood Conflicts" (see map on page 58). Given that the map on page 61, for instance, shows the entire area in question as "Suitable for Facilities Expansion," it is hard to know how such a designation could escape being listed as one of Potential Neighborhood Conflict.

In page 61 of the Executive Summary it is stated that "the team [working on the DEIR], in most instances, [chose] the environmentally superior approach." I can only conclude that the word "most" was used because this case (and perhaps others) could not be classified as "environmentally superior." The Land Use Task Force, on which, as previously stated, I was a member, had a list of guiding principles. I'll quote six:
1. Strive for compact development of buildings and sites. New development should be concentrated in the campus core (There may be a difference in classification but I certainly question the proposal under discussion as being within the campus core);

2. Campus land uses should be located so that adjacent uses are compatible with respect to their activities and environmental impacts;

3. Campus facilities, land use patterns, support facilities, signage, etc. should be compatible with their surroundings;

4. The concerns of neighbors regarding traffic, noise, lighting, views, etc. need to be considered in conjunction with educational and facility needs of the campus;

5. Effective buffers should be established and maintained between campus lands and activities and natural or built environments of both campus & surrounding community;

6. Buffers should be provided to offer protection from dust, pesticide drift, odors, noise, visual, traffic and public safety.

The proposed ancillary projects will surely result in the destruction of a buffer between the campus and the adjacent community. The cumulative impacts including noise, lighting, traffic, aesthetics, and ambiance will change this neighborhood forever. We often hear the phrase "urban sprawl." The proposed activities represent "campus sprawl."

You will note that I have not uttered a single word about new housing south of Yosemite Hall. Development between Yosemite and the last line of trees before Slack Street is appropriate and still leaves the campus-neighborhood buffer. Perhaps the Visitors' Center or some other ancillary structure could be placed in that same general location. In other words, I understand the need for such a structure or even ancillary structures. The question is location, location, location. The DEIR location and the designation adjacent to Grand Avenue and Slack Street is simply wrong, wrong, wrong.

Other Aspects of the Plan

Others are commenting on the future student housing plan (designated as H-2 and H-3 on DEIR maps) near the north bank of Brizzolara Creek and the mouth of Poly Canyon. Again, as with Slack Street, there is the lack of adequate buffers. Similarly, the quarry south of Poly Canyon Road is an eyesore and an embarrassment. I should like to think what close monitoring might discover.

In order to lessen the "footprint" for future student housing, the planned parking component should be reconsidered. By building multilevel parking structures (either
below- or above-surface), the land necessary for such structures can be reduced. In short, additional consideration should be given to building up or down, not out, when necessary.

I am also unaware that provisions have been considered as to how students in the planned Briziovara housing area will be fed. It's true that the new housing structures will consist of apartments with kitchens but I'm dubious how often they will be used. The last thing this campus needs are students driving off-campus for their meals or even driving to on-campus locations. This is an issue that needs to be confronted now, not later.

Concluding Statement

As mentioned at the outset, those steering the three-year Master Plan process are to be commended. Compared to other projects instituted during my almost three decades at Cal Poly, the Master Plan is a giant leap forward.

But as the Plan enters the crucial endgame, much remains to be done. Again, getting the job done quickly should not be the major goal; getting it done right is far more important. I know others have spent many hours in studying the Master Plan DEIR. So have I. We are talking about the next 20 years at least. Important matters have yet to be fully thought out. Having come this far we all need to make the extra effort to intelligently and with environmental-sensitivity deal with the remaining issues. As I wrote earlier, the remaining issues include both natural and human habitat.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Kranzdorf

cc:  Sun Luis Obispo Mayor Allen Settle
     Councilmember John Ewan
     CouncilmemberJan Mars
     CouncilmemberChristine Mulholland
     CouncilmemberKen Schwartz
     Sydney Holcomb,Chairperson,Residents for Quality Neighborhoods
Letter 23  
Dr. Richard Kranzdorf  

December 4, 2000  

23-1   Commenter lauds efforts to reduce reliance on the automobile.  

Response   Comment noted for the benefit of the decision makers. No response required.  

23-2   Commenter concerned about the short time frame for review of the Master Plan.  

Response   Cal Poly’s Master Plan team has been preparing the Master Plan for the past three years. Following public meetings during the Fall and Winter quarters of the 1998-1999 academic year, over one hundred members of the campus and community participated in task forces during Spring 1999 to develop the guiding principles for the plan. The plan was first presented in draft form to the public in the Spring of 2000. Numerous press releases and public meetings accompanied the release of this early version of the plan. The formal plan and Draft EIR were presented to the community in the Fall of 2000. The March date for the Board of Trustees presentation has been presented to the public for over three years. See discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.  

23-3   Commenter is concerned about development proposed at the northeast corner of the intersection of Slack Street and Grand Avenue and that it is not a “Potential Neighborhood  

Response   The map has been modified to show a more limited area of development, and a buffer has been added. The Constraints Summary (Exhibit 4.10) has been modified to more specifically identify potential neighborhood conflicts on the east side of Grand Avenue. Shifting this arrow in no way implies that the west side of Grand is now in a changed condition relative to neighborhood impacts.  

23-4   Commenter notes that he has no objection to development located immediately south of the Yosemite Hall dormitory buildings.  

Response   This area is still several hundred feet from the residential development and is buffered by vegetation located in a drainage swale.  

23-5   Commenter echoes concerns raised by others regarding development near Brizzolara Creek and Poly Canyon.  

Response   Concerns are noted. The Master Plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the H-1 and H-2 housing units at a suitable distance from the creek corridor that resulted in the creation of the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project and the re-adsorption of units initially proposed for location along the creek (namely H-3). The additional beds were the result of partial absorption of the H-4 housing unit which could not be relocated in its entirety elsewhere on campus. The EIR addresses the impacts of the proposed housing project.  

23-6   Commenter suggests additional structured parking to reduce the need for development of more land.
Response  See Constraints and Opportunities analysis. Text has been added to the Plan to include parking under structures where feasible (p. 195).

23-7  Commenter raises concerns about students living north of Brizzolara Creek and their need to drive off campus for food.

Response  The proposed new residences will be apartment style dwellings. Each will contain a kitchen. The Master Plan proposes additional markets on campus to support student needs. See Support Services element, p. 199, 202-203. Nevertheless, students will need to leave campus for some shopping. These trips are included in the traffic analysis.
Eugene Jad  
Faculty CE  
Cal Poly  
756-1729  
December 8, 2000

Dear Mr. Kitamura,

Comments about the Master Plan/EIR,

The master plan exercise is a positive endeavor. I would like to comment about transportation as follows.

1. General
   The emphasis on alternative transportation is laudable but some signals we send out are confusing, e.g.
   1.1 Both master plan drafts show an incorrect map of "existing bus routes" (exhibit 5.22).
   For two years we have had new SLO Transit bus routes numbers 1 through 6 in operation.
   1.2 Financing of the free bus is still uncertain. Attractive transit must be seen as a commodity such as water or electricity supply with secured long term financing.
   1.3 The city of San Luis Obispo has measurable modal split objectives on page 10 of their circulation element. We do not have such a tool, which would lend full credibility to our plan.
   1.4 The long-term transportation plans of the city and the county mentioned the possibility of a regional light rail system. Cal Poly should be a leader in investigating such possibilities, also near or on campus.

2. Comparison with other campuses (Appendix 1)
   The comparison with six other campuses indicates a high car use at Cal Poly, given the fact that our campus is relatively close to downtown. At UC Santa Barbara bike use is six times higher than at Cal Poly. Santa Barbara reported that, on a nice day, out of 20,000 students 14,000 reach the campus by bike.
   The yearly parking fees at Cal Poly appear to be three times less than at the UCs of Davis, San Diego and Santa Barbara, and slightly less than at the state universities of Chico and Pomona. Some campuses restrict parking permits through lotteries. The traffic reduction measures at some campuses are impressive. The number of buses on campus per day is considerably lower at Cal Poly than at the campuses of Pomona, Chico and Santa Barbara.

3. Future design possibilities
   Students have done several studies about the following.
   3.1 Public transportation facilities
   Two main bus (light rail) terminals, eventually connected by a central underground tunnel for transit and service vehicles only, could make sense. Such a connection was suggested by CCAT and can be seen in Appendix 2.
3.2 Pedestrians crossing East Perimeter Road

Traffic calming appears to be the most appropriate solution. Even a "semi pedestrian zone", with cars allowed at low speed, should be possible. Examples with similar pedestrian and car volumes as we have on our campus operate successfully in Chambery, France and Burgdorf, Switzerland and in Australia.

3.3 Parking structure #3

Moving this parking structure immediately to the west of the railroad should be considered. The walking distances would still be acceptable but there would be considerably fewer disturbances by traffic on the campus.

4. Level of Service calculations

4.1 On campus

The traditional LOS calculations do not make sense in locations with heavy pedestrian traffic because only delays for car drivers are calculated but not delays for pedestrians. The quality of the pedestrian experience is not included in these LOS calculations. Therefore several towns have made special rules for calculating the LOS of pedestrians and the Institute of Transportation Engineers has set up a 100-person committee to issue guidelines and to further better planning for a real pedestrian and bike friendly atmosphere.

4.2 Off campus

When predicting future traffic (cumulative impact) the background traffic growth has to be taken into consideration. This is the general traffic growth that would occur over time even if Cal Poly did not add one more student. It is unclear to us which background traffic growth was assumed around Cal Poly, for example on highway one.

Unrealistically low assumptions of traffic growth lead to higher LOS than occurs later in reality. We are under the impression that Cal Poly's traffic consultants have consistently underestimated the background traffic growth for example in the EIRs for the parking garage and the sports complex.

However, if the real LOS are lower than estimated by the consultants we do not imply that mitigation measures should necessarily consist of widening roads and intersections. Mitigation measures could actually mean a better atmosphere for pedestrians and enhancing all modes of alternative transportation.

Thank you for considering these remarks.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Eugene Joad, fellow Institute of Transportation Engineers

Appendices
Appendix 1

University Transportation Survey

Compiled by: Ryan Hayes
For: Prof. Eugene Jud
CE 424 – Public Transportation
11/27/00
University Transportation Survey Summary

Report Summary:
This report is the final compilation of information gathered by the fall quarter, 2000 Public Transportation, (CE 424), class taught by Eugene Kud. The surveys include information from a diverse group of seven universities throughout California with populations between roughly 13,000 and 38,000 students, staff and faculty.

The purpose of the study was primarily to show the similarities and differences between these universities. Certainly the success of the other colleges to encourage alternative transportation should be researched further by Cal Poly in order to improve our own campus. Ideas which have been shown to discourage single occupation vehicles at other campuses should be considered if Cal Poly is serious about becoming a campus friendly to a variety of users.

However, there are also differences between campuses, especially with regard to the topography of the area, which effect the viable transportation options. Whereas Davis and Santa Barbara are in flat areas and are subsequently more bicycle friendly, areas with more hills such as Cal Poly should be content with smaller percentages of bicycle riders. However, this should also encourage Cal Poly to explore better transit options more suited to the area.

Many schools do not have a very defined future vision so the information on this subject is included at the end of the report specific to each school rather than in a comparative format.

Schools Surveyed (Abbreviation in Parenthesis):

| 1. California Polytechnic State University, Pomona (Pomona) |
| 2. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (SLO) |
| 3. California State University, Chico (Chico) |
| 4. University of California, Davis (Davis) |
| 5. University of California, San Diego (San Diego) |
| 6. University of California, Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara) |
| 7. University of California, Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Demographic Data</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Students &amp; Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>18,424</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>21,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>16,296</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>18,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>16,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>24,596</td>
<td>11,154</td>
<td>35,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19,918</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>38,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>20,056</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>13,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.2 Number of Students Living on Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>% of Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>15.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>26.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>20.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Campus Location in Relation to City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Distance from downtown</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>4 miles from downtown</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>1 mile from downtown</td>
<td>SLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Adjacent to downtown Chico</td>
<td>Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>1.8 miles from downtown</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14 miles from downtown San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>10 miles from downtown Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>3 miles from downtown Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Basic Transportation Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Modal Split of Daily Traffic</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Car 96.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car/Vanpool 3.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike 5.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Bus 2.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Bus 1.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk 0.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Car 56.0%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car/Vanpool 24.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike 4.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Bus 2.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Bus 2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk 3.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Basic Transportation Infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Parking Spaces and Types:</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>General Permit</th>
<th>Metered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>6,539</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage/Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Lot</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage/Structure</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Surface Lot</td>
<td>Garage/Structure</td>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5,182</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Information for UC Davis

3.2 Number of Bus Routes on Campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Number of Buses Entering Campus per Day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Number of Bike Parking Spaces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>4,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Is there a strong incentive program for alternative transportation in place?

Pomona: Yes. 500 cars/day are allowed to park just as close and sometimes closer than faculty/staff for carpooling.

SLO: Several TDM measures in operation (e.g. free bus) but not as far reaching as e.g. Santa Cruz

Chico: Yes. Faculty, staff and students ride the city and county buses for free.

Davis: Yes, city buses are free to all faculty, staff and students.
San Diego: Yes. Express shuttle on campus all day, rideshares, and commuter rail connector shuttles, as well as free busing.

Santa Barbara: 1. No parking passes sold to undergraduates within 2 miles of campus.
2. 6 free days of parking given to those who use alternatives to get to campus regularly.
3. Carpools with emergency ride home options.

Santa Cruz: Excellent TDM. E. Jud has info

4. Cost and Rules for Transportation:

4.1 Charges for student parking permits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>$/day</th>
<th>$/quarter</th>
<th>$/semester</th>
<th>$/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>492.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>456.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>similar to Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Is there a lottery for parking spots or a price difference based upon distance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lottery?</th>
<th>Price difference?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Charges for Bus Pass:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$/day</th>
<th>$/quarter</th>
<th>$/semester</th>
<th>$/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Free for students, but not yet for staff and faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Plans:

**Pomona:** (Goal year is 2007-2008)
- **Population:** Several changes to the campus are planned. First, the number of students is expected to rise to 25,500, and the number of faculty and staff to 3,800 for a total expected population of 29,400.
- **Housing:** 700 new on campus housing spaces are planned, as well as 400 new off campus spaces for upper level students.
- **Parking:** The parking additions include 739 new faculty and staff spaces, 2243 new general permit spots, 120 more spaces for visitors, 1000 for residents, and 11 for state vehicles.

**SLO:** (Goal year is 2020)
- **Population:** The planned number of students is to be 20,900, with the number of faculty and staff rising to 3,200, and the total number on campus 24,100.
- **Housing:** Plans call for housing capable of handling a total population of 5,840 students on campus.
- **Parking:** New parking structures on campus will add a total of 1,300 new vehicle parking spaces. Most of these new spots will be for general permits.

**Chico:** The main future plan for CSU Chico is the purchase of more land in order to build more campus parking.

**Davis:** (Goal year is 2005)
- **Population:** The new expected student population is 23,920, with a faculty and staff increasing to 14,045 and a total population count of 37,965.

**San Diego:** (Goal year is 2005-2006)
- **Population:** A goal of 25-30% growth has been instituted for the university. The planned increase calls for a student population of 22,507, a faculty and staff count of 18,792, and a total of 41,300.
- **Housing:** The projected number of students living on campus will increase about 2800 students to accommodate a total of 8,099.
- **Parking:** An increase of parking structure spaces for faculty and general permit to 2100 and 3500, respectively, along with a gain of 50 metered spots will add 970 total spots.

**Santa Barbara:** No information for UC Santa Barbara.

**Santa Cruz:** No information for UC Santa Cruz.
Contacts:

Pomona:
Address of Campus: 3801 West Temple Ave., Pomona, CA 91768

1. Transportation Management of Campus:
   Name: Ray Rizzuto
   Ph. #: (909) 869-2598
   Title: Director of Parking Services
   e-mail:

2. Long Range Planning:
   Name: Ray Morrison
   Ph. #: (909) 869-4993
   Title: Campus Master Planner
   e-mail:

3. Other:
   Name: Pillar Arranaga
   Ph. #: (909) 869-3233
   Title: Rideshare Coordinator
   e-mail:

SLO:
Address of Campus: 1 Grand Ave., San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

1. Transportation Management of Campus:
   Name: Debby Andersen
   Ph. #: (805) 756-6806
   Title: Facilities Project Coordinator
   e-mail: danders@calpoly.edu

2. Long Range Planning:
   Name: Rex Wolf
   Ph. #: (805) 756-2112
   Title: Architect
   e-mail: rwolf@calpoly.edu

Chico:
Address of Campus: 400 West First St., Chico, CA 95929

1. Other:
   Name: Bill McGinnis
   Ph. #: (530) 898-5522
   Title: Assistant to V.P. for Administration
   e-mail: bmcginnis@citychico.edu

Davis:
Address of Campus: 1 Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616

No Contacts listed.

San Diego:
Address of Campus: 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093

1. Transportation Management of Campus:
   Name: Parking Services
   Ph. #: (858) 534-4223
   e-mail: parking@ucsd.edu
2. Long Range Planning:
   Name: Network Administration
   Ph. #: (858) 822-1538
   Title: e-mail: jawhite@ucsd.edu

3. Other:
   Name: Rideshare Operations
   Ph. #: (858) 534-RIDE
   Title: e-mail: rideshare@ucsd.edu

Santa Barbara:
   Address: Santa Barbara, CA, 93106

1. Transportation Management of Campus:
   Name: James Wagner
   Ph. #: (805) 893-5475
   Title: Program Mgr., Transportation Alternatives Program
   e-mail: James.Wagner@park.ucsb.edu

Santa Cruz:
   Address of Campus: 1156 High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064

   No Contacts Listed.
Letter 24
Mr. Eugene Jud

December 8, 2000

24-1 Commenter notes the need to correct bus routes on Exhibit 5.22

Response Exhibit 5.22 has been modified to show the correct bus routes.

24-2 Commenter notes the need secure funding for local bus service.

Response Many comments on the Master Plan have raised concerns about the continuation of the fully subsidized bus passes for Cal Poly students and employees. The current bus subsidy is an element of a negotiated arrangement between Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. The current agreement is for four years and ends on June 30, 2001. The negotiations are complex and are influenced by ever increasing costs. In addition, Cal Poly’s current funding (through parking fines) has been and continues to be relatively stable, meaning it has not been increasing commensurate with increased transit costs. Because the subsidy is the result of two party negotiations, it is not possible for the University to predict that it will always be able to reach an agreement with the city. Nevertheless, Cal Poly is committed to maintaining the funding for the bus at least at the currently designated level, and is exploring funding sources, such as an increase in parking fees, to fully cover the subsidy.

24-3 Commenter notes the need measurable modal split objectives.

Response The following table has been used for estimating where improved alternative transportation and savings in parking demand would occur. The Master Plan policy is to reduce parking demand by 2,000 spaces.

**Estimated Parking Demand Reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
<th>Safety Valve*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen restrictions</td>
<td>1,000~1,500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>some no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic controls</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/vanpools</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>As determined</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Fees</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus transit</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City transit</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/ped enhancement</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area mgt</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/Staff incentives</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment scenarios</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: alternative transportation savings will be lower for Cal Poly because many of these programs are in existence and functioning well.
*Absolute controls will require provisions (safety valve) for hardships.

The University, as stated policy in the Master Plan, would reduce demand by 2,000 spaces. This reduction would be achieved through a number of measures. Over time, the feasibility and success of various measures will vary. For this reason, it is impractical to commit, at a Master Plan level, to absolutes. For example, an important idea is having an on campus and near campus shuttle. But this needs to be subjected to feasibility studies and trial programs, which the University will do.

To meet the parking reduction proposal of 2,000 spaces, Cal Poly intends to institute as a first, and most effective measure, that freshmen be required to live on campus and that they not be allowed to maintain cars on campus (with exceptions made for hardship and job-related requirements). We believe that the inelasticity of demand Cal Poly will prevent this policy from having a detrimental effect on the dormitory market. This restriction exists at other universities, including U.C. Santa Cruz.5

It is estimated that there will be about 4,000 new undergraduate students each Fall (about 3,000 freshmen) at Cal Poly under the full growth anticipated with the Master Plan. Currently, we house approximately 80% ~ 90% of our freshmen on campus, and the campus provides 1,530 parking spaces for residents (R1 & R2). At present ratios, approximately 1,800 spaces would be needed under the Master Plan for freshmen. Allowing for some hardship requirements for freshmen, it is anticipated that approximately 1,500 or more spaces could be reduced with this policy alone.

This policy will do more than just reduce cars on campus. It will change the culture of the campus, infusing a higher regard for the environment and a reduced reliance on the automobile. As students advance through the University, they will do so with the ability to use alternative modes of transportation.

24-4 Commenter suggests the potential for Cal Poly leadership in regional light rail.

Response The following text addition has been made on page 189: “Energy Technology Collaborate with SLOCOG and public transportation providers in exploring alternative technologies, including vehicles not dependent on fossil fuels, “real time” arrival/departure information, flexible as well as fixed routing, etc.” Refer also to page 177.

24-5 Commenter suggests considering higher parking fees; permit restrictions.

Response Comment is noted and appreciated. Parking fees at Cal Poly are much lower than many comparable schools around the state. Cal Poly proposes a robust program of parking demand reduction, including restrictions on freshman parking and geographic controls. Please refer to the alternative transportation section.

24-6 Commenter suggests increasing public transit access.

Response See Alternative Transportation element. Text has been changed to place increased emphasis on public transit.

24-7 Commenter suggests considering light rail terminals at Cal Poly.

5 http://www2.ucsc.edu/taps/students.html#fresh
Response Refer to comment 24-4 above.

24-8 Commenter suggests considering traffic calming on east Perimeter.

Response See text addition, page 172, which reads “Explore “traffic calming” alternatives to reduce vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.” See also, page 168.

24-9 Commenter suggests moving parking structure #3 west of railroad.

Response Moving parking structure three west of the railroad would require the use of prime agricultural farmland, which is contrary to Master Plan policies.

24-10 Commenter suggests reviewing LOS discussion with respect to pedestrians.

Response Comment noted. The pedestrian movements at California Boulevard decrease the efficiency of the roadway. Prior to the development of Parking Structure II, a detailed plan of that segment of the road will be undertaken to improve both automobile and pedestrian flow.

24-11 Review LOS calculations with respect to increases in background traffic.

Response Text has been added to the EIR to clarify background traffic used in the analysis. An error occurred with regard to the Foothill segment near California. This has been corrected.
Comments on the Calpoly Master Plan and Draft EIR

Submitted by Glen C. Lawson
Calpoly Alumni
and
Local Resident

Submitted on

Glen C. Lawson
2425 Laurel Ave #A
Morro Bay, CA 93442
(805) 771-9541
glen.lawson@dot.ca.gov
The following comments deal primarily with circulation and parking elements of the Master Plan and the corresponding environmental impacts in the Draft EIR. The focus of the comments regards the Highland Drive corridor, parking on the Northern section of campus and the California Street extension.

The Circulation element of the Master Plan should be based on principals and goals, which the University wishes to accomplish. This version of the Master plan states those principals and goals in an appropriate clear way as seen here. “A fundamental objective of the Circulation element is to redesign campus circulation system to reduce automobile dependence by establishing a pedestrian-oriented campus core and reduce vehicular access to the core. Reducing conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists and autos by establishing a comprehensive circulation plan is a primary objective of this plan.” (Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft EIR, October 10, 2000; page 157) and “Primary entrances to the University need to provide direct access to parking lots or structures in order to reduce impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods and minimize vehicle pedestrian conflicts on campus.” (Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft EIR, October 10, 2000; page 158) Similar Statements can be found throughout the Master Plan and Circulation element. While these goals may have been met in certain areas of the campus, at the intersection of Via Carta and Highland the circulation element has completely failed to meet these goals. In fact with the increased parking density, new proposed student housing and sport facilities north of Brizzolara creek, vehicle and pedestrian conflicts can only increase at Highland and Via Carta.

The Problem

The only vehicular access across Brizzolara creek to the planned parking facilities on the north side of campus is by Via Carta. Via Carta is then used for all of the pedestrians that just left their vehicles in the parking lots to cross Brizzolara creek once again in order to access the campus core. Currently the intersection of Highland and Via Carta is directed by Campus safety officers during the peak traffic periods in order to manage the vehicular-pedestrian conflicts. It is currently barely manageable due to the high volumes of traffic and pedestrians. The current sports complex, future student housing and increased parking planned north of Brizzolara creek will only serve to worsen the already increasingly hazardous situation at this intersection.

The real problem is that the proposed parking structure 3 and other proposed developments are planned on the outside of the main access corridor to the campus, in relation to the Campus Core. This situation requires the paths of those entering campus and those trying to reach the campus core to conflict. Campus planning effectively eliminated this problem with the newly constructed parking structure 1 and the proposed parking structure 2 by placing them on the inside of the main access corridor, in relation to the campus core. It is understood that this option was eliminated for parking structure 3 in order to preserve valuable campus core development land, however the circulation requirements necessary to place it outside of the main access corridor have not been addressed by this Master Plan nor by the Draft EIR. Redesign of Via Carta as proposed in the Master Plan (page 172-173) won’t reduce the vehicular-pedestrian conflicts.
The truth of the matter is that the developers of the Master Plan already understand the problem. As stated in the Circulation element: "Traffic congestion and safety issues arise when circulation systems for motorized vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians cross or overlap. The master Plan should find ways to reduce these conflicts by designing separate routes and managing intersections." (page 59)

If the University truly intends to obtain the goals stated in the Master Plan of reducing vehicular-pedestrian conflicts, the circulation element must be reevaluated in this area of campus and appropriate measures to meet its goals.

The Solution

In order to reduce traffic congestion and increase safety at Highland and Via Carta, the two main circulation system flows (Vehicular and Pedestrian) should be separated. Pedestrians are always going to use the most direct route, which in this case is Via Carta to access the campus core. Therefore, Via Carta should be closed to vehicular traffic and remain as a pedestrian route only. It could still be used for event access during major events at the Sports Complex, but for normal day to day use it should be pedestrian and bicycle use only.

For vehicular access to the parking and other facilities north of Brizzolara creek, a new road should be constructed that is separated from the main flow of pedestrian traffic. For purposes of these comments, this new road will be named Glen View Drive. In order to separate vehicles and pedestrians, this new road should run behind the proposed parking structure 3 where a section of Pinnacles road presently is. This will provide easy access to the parking structure for vehicles, while preventing the necessity of pedestrians leaving the parking structure to cross the vehicular traffic trying to access it. Glen View Drive would also continue on across Via Carta to provide access to the proposed Brizzolara housing area. In addition, it would be the main access to the sports complex and the Ag Pavilion. A grade-separated pedestrian crossing could easily be constructed from the parking structure to the Sports Complex to reduce vehicular-pedestrian conflicts during events.

A new crossing of Brizzolara creek would be necessary for the new road. This crossing could be a few hundred feet east of the old Rodeo Rd crossing and intersect with Highland Drive. While this solution effectively separates motorized vehicles and pedestrian, it presents a challenge to design a functional intersection system on Highland. This solution would create three closely spaced 3-way “T” intersections on Highland. These intersections with Highland are Mount Bishop, the California extension, and the new road across Brizzolara creek. The intersection of Highland with Via Carta would be pedestrians only and would only conflict with cross campus traffic, which is considerably less than those, seeking access to parking from Highland.

To effectively manage traffic through these three closely spaced intersections, they must be designed to work together. The Master Plan proposes that key intersection designs should explore a range of solutions that provide the best response to the need. These
include roundabouts, signalization, stop signs, intersection geometry, lane configuration and other solutions. In addition, it states that they should reduce reliance on University Police staff to monitor and control traffic as a routine daily practice. (CalPoly Master Plan & Draft EIR, October 16, 2000; page 173)

Due to the multiple peak periods around class changes, stop signs at Mount Bishop and at Via Carta have proven ineffective in moving traffic to the parking areas on Highland. Traffic routinely backs all the way up to Santa Rosa Rd. Therefore stop signs are not recommended for these intersections. Traffic lights may be more effective in this situation, however, they may also produce excessive delays at the peak traffic periods. This could continue to require University Police Staff to control traffic during peak times. In addition, Traffic Signals on one of the Gateway entrances to campus will have a negative environmental effect due to visual features of signalization. This is something that the Draft EIR does not address with the Master Plan’s recommendations to have possible future signalization on campus. Currently the production of a detailed Highland Corridor Area Plan is in progress to enhance the visual attributes of this corridor. Signalization of these intersections would have a negative effect on these efforts. Also it will have an adverse effect on the “Pedestrian Oriented” feel of the campus that the Master Plan proposes to develop.

Calpoly can use innovative approaches to these intersections that will enhance traffic flow by reducing delay, improve visual characteristics and reduce conflicts. A combination of roundabouts and lane configuration or channelization would best serve these three closely spaced intersections. A three-leg roundabout at the intersection of Mount Bishop would provide a pleasing visual treatment between the border of the Agricultural lands and the campus core. It would also eliminate the long queues that back all the way to Santa Rosa Road during peak periods. Channelization at the intersection of the California extension would provide efficient cross campus traffic flow. Restricting left turns on Highland from California would resolve the limited sight distance problem produced by the Railroad bridge crossing of Highland. Another 3-leg roundabout at the intersection of the new road accessing the parking and facilities north of Brizzolara creek will effectively move traffic across the creek while minimizing conflicts with pedestrians and bicycles. Cross campus traffic will benefit from the reduced queues and confusion. It will also provide for those seeking to go left from California onto Highland by curving the roundabout and effectively making a u-turn.

Special attention will be required in the design of these intersections to effectively work together. The new road crossing the creek will be coming down from a grade atop the parking area where it will match with the now existing Pinnacles Road. This will have to be accounted for in the design of the roundabout at the intersection of Highland. The grade of the approach road does not eliminate a roundabout as an intersection design alternative. The Master Plan incorrectly states that due to grades at Via Carta that it is inappropriate for a roundabout. According to the guide book published by the FHWA: “Roundabouts: An Informational Guide” (Publication No. FHWA-RD-00-067) grades on approach roadways greater that 4% may make it more difficult for entering drivers to slow or stop for the approach. ( Pg 167) This is however less of a problem.
here due to the low speeds of the vehicles approaching the intersection. A roundabout at Via Carta may still be inappropriate, however not for the given reason. Any other intersection type will have the same problem and must be designed to address the situation.

These innovative approaches to traffic management will show all those that visit CalPoly that CalPoly is truly a Learn by Doing educational facility. Please see the attached rough sketch of the ideas proposed above.
Letter 25  
Mr. Glen Lawson  
December 4, 2000  

25-1 The commenter expresses concern about vehicle-pedestrian conflicts on Via Carta at and north of Highland Drive  

Response These comments are noted and have been forwarded to Facilities Planning. When Parking Structure III is designed, a detailed study will be undertaken to optimize the circulation in the vicinity of Via Carta, and to reduce conflicts with pedestrians.

25-2 The commenter proposes an additional road crossing Brizzolara Creek  

Response A crossing of Brizzolara Creek will be considered during the implementation of the Master Plan. Such a crossing will require permit authority from the California Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers.

25-3 The commenter suggests intersection redesign options.  

Response The DEIR suggested that a roundabout at Via Carta and Highland may not be feasible due to the steep grade on Via Carta. The intersection design will be studied for the most appropriate geometric configuration during implementation of the plan.
Ed. Here are some principles that should govern any management and/or enhancement activities. I would prefer that we identify the area as the stream system rather than riparian system. Stream system is broader and encompasses the riparian, and some wetland systems. You could use stream/wetland in stead of stream. That would cover everything - good luck, James.

Major Principles:
For management purposes identify stream segments by associated land uses land use, i.e. ag., urban, etc. For enhancement purposes identify stream zones within segments. Extent of the stream zones will be delineated by existing/potential vegetation that is dependent on soil moisture from the stream, i.e. wetlands, riparian, etc. Stream management/enhancement will be a function on maintaining the integrity of the stream and associated habitats.
Stream management/enhancement will be a function of maintaining the equilibrium of the stream hydrodynamics.

--- Original Message ---
From: James R. Vilkitis
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2000 9:34 AM
To: Edward F. Johnson / CFRI; James R. Vilkitis
Subject: Principles/james
Letter 26  
Dr. James Vilkitis  
Natural Resources Management Department  

December 6, 2000  

26-1 Commenter suggests a number of vocabulary modifications to the Master Plan, including identifying “stream” systems, rather than riparian systems.

Response The comment is noted and the text has been modified to reflect this suggestion (p. 85).
Aside from neighboring residents, possible issues w/ lights & noise, are there nocturnal animals or birds whose habitats will be disturbed by new housing & other buildings?
Letter 27
Anonymous

December, 2000

27-1 Commenter asks if lighting and noise will disturb neighboring residents and nocturnal animals.

Response New development, especially located on the edge of the campus instructional core, will have impacts on wildlife and neighboring residences. This issue is discussed in the sections of the Draft EIR on Noise and Aesthetics. Mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. The DEIR addressed these impacts.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following
Comments regarding the Cal Poly
Master Plan:

I hope you will take these into consideration
When revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

FROM: Jenny Wong
Name: 769 Rosecran Ave #16
Address: 5000

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Comment

Alternative transportation and less reliance on personal automobiles are definitely important. It is understandable that policies could be enforced to eliminate these problems, but a great importance is for the Master Plan to support these changes by making such a transition easier. Public Transportation at this time is not enough. There are reasons why people rely on personal transportation. There isn't enough public transportation.
Letter 28
Ms. Jenny Lang

December , 2000

28-1 Commenter reinforces the need for a strong alternative transportation system on campus and suggests the present system is inadequate.

Response These comments are noted and forwarded for the benefit of the decision makers. The Alternative Transportation section of the Master Plan details proposals for improvement of the alternative transportation system. See Alternative Transportation chapter.
MEMORANDUM
Animal Science Department
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

TO: Linda Dalton
   Vice Provost for Institutional
   Planning

DATE: December 8, 2000

VIA: Mark Shelton, Associate Dean
     College of Agriculture

FROM: Ken Scotto, Chair
      CAGR Land Use Committee

COPIES: Jen
        Lowe
        Wolf
        CAGRLUC

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO MASTER PLAN AND DRAFT EIR

The CAGR Land Use Committee (CAGRLUC) has studied the Master Plan and Draft
EIR, and offers its responses in the attached table. Some of the CAGRLUC's
comments and observations are editorial in nature, while others relate to procedural
(and, perhaps, philosophical) matters. It should be noted that the table is a compilation
of CAGRLUC responses (those considered in a formal meeting of the committee) and
individual committee member responses...time constraints did not allow the CAGRLUC
to reconvene for consideration of the entire response to the Master Plan Committee.
The CAGRLUC welcomes the opportunity to discuss any of the comments and
observations with appropriate members of the Master Plan Committee.

The "comments and observations" table presents responses in chronological order, so
no priority or importance is implied in the order of presentation. Items which deserve
special mention (and which appear in the chronological responses) include:

- Story Index method of soil classification, especially as it relates to
determination of areas classed a "prime agricultural land," differs from Land
Capability Classification method currently used by Soil Science Department
and CAGR here at Cal Poly
- Goldtree area -- CAGR and Master Plan Committee definitions of this area
differ
- NRM tree farm and logging sports area -- current use not identified in Master
Plan...area sited for remote parking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V    | Under "Master Plan Summary," last paragraph...add "insert "prime" to second sentence to read...
|      | "...protect natural environmental features and prime agricultural lands..."
| VI   | EXHIBIT 1 -- "AREAS SUITABLE FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES" on legend have not been proven or field tested:
|      | This shaded (in pink) area overarches the traditional CAGR definition of Goldtree...on previous maps of this area CAGR defined Goldtree as Fields C62, C63 and C64
|      | Encroaches into Cheda Ranch grazing fields and vineyard
|      | EXHIBIT 5.1 (page 70) should also be corrected to reflect CAGR definition of Goldtree

*REMOTE PARKING OPTIONS*  
The parking on Stenner and Mt. Bishop, based on actual site visit, is land capability Class II, or prime agricultural land (Brand Hallock)

|    | Designated areas encompass NRM tree farm/lab area, and irrigated pasture ground of Cheda Ranch

| x   | Ancillary Activities and Facilities -- remove reference to "designating a location" to consider options in San Luis Creek watershed ranches for "modest-sized applied research park" without reference to Cheda

| 14  | Section 9 (first bullet) -- use SLO Creek Watershed Ranches (SLO-CW-Ranches) which is after "main campus" but identified on page 43 as separate

| 33  | Under "Enrollment Growth by Discipline" -- first bullet on this page should also state that limits have been set on unique and smaller programs (Soil and Earth Sciences) that severely restrict growth

| 41  | On map under San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed... remove "includes Extended Campus and Instructional Core," as this is confusing in later parts of document, and they are managed entirely differently... Also defined differently on page 43

| 43  | There is no detailed map of the San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed Ranches

| 46  | Circulation and Parking -- "the Grand Avenue and Highland Drive entrances offer more direct access...without mention of ancillary parking which contradicts this section

| 47  | Soils:
|      | The use of Storrie Index is inappropriate; Cal Poly has used Land Capability Classification (LCC) as its tool to identify prime agricultural land, which would be LCC 1 and 2
|      | Storrie Index is not widely used or accepted since there is not a direct correlation to prime lands. CAGRLUC recommends changing this section and page 33 "Soils Map" Contact CAGRLUC and Brent Hallock for assistance.

| 50  | EXHIBIT 4.4 -- the intersection of Stenner Creek Rd. and Highway 1 is identified as "important," yet it is not part of circulation on page 46

| 51  | EXHIBIT 4.5
|      | There are 2 ag wastewater treatment ponds at the dairy...several other exhibits (EXHIBIT 4.10, 5.2, 5.6, and 5.10) should also be corrected to show 2 ponds
|      | Would one characterize lagoon at BCC as "WASTE WATER RETENTION POND," or as "AGRICULTURAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT POND?"

| 55  | Why is Building 52 "obsolete," when Building 10 from the same era is OK?

| 57  | Agricultural Soils -- regarding the conversion of prime agricultural land and its impact under CEQA... remove "generally" in requiring EIR and trustees acquiescence

| 58  | EXHIBIT 4.10 -- why are the "Ancillary Research and Parking" areas not covered in constraints if Master Plan Committee is considering them at the proposed sites?

| 59  | Opportunities -- Development Suitability
|      | Areas of development do not include Cheda Ranch, so how can Ancillary Research Facility be considered?
|      | Last word of first paragraph, "properties," by Master Plan definition (page 43) should read "ranches"

| 60  | Goldtree area identified does not have "good vehicular access" according to Master Plan earlier discussion

| 61  | EXHIBIT 4.11 -- Agricultural Facilities Enhancement is great for Stenner Creek-Mount Bishop Road area, but Master Plan also has this as "ancillary remote parking" which is not...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Introduction -- first paragraph, the word &quot;ranches&quot; was omitted after watermarked on line 8; document not consistent with page 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 69   | Ancillary Activities and Facilities  
- Such activities should not be well-defined or identified on this plan -- promotes leap frog development which contradicts Master Plan principles in any ways  
- Items such as parking or Goldtree have not been agreed upon or discussed in depth  
- It would improve these "wish" items if they were to be located on the San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed Ranches... since the items are generic, so should the location be broad |
| 71   | EXHIBIT 5.2  
- Farm Shop should be added to LEGEND in area of "FACILITIES SERVICES, FACILITIES PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION SERVICES and SUPPORT SHOPS  
- On map at "Future Corporation Yards" |
| 77   | Issues -- include "enforcement of campus onto prime agricultural land" as a major issue. |
| 79   | Third bullet on this page -- issue of "degradation of range by grazing practices."  
- Where? Who identified this as an issue?  
- Remove or reword as to "evaluate range practices to improve rangeland health."
| 80   | Plan Components -- should have Prime Agricultural protection as you do wildlife, plants and rocks.  
- Trails -- would it be a good idea to add something about placing sites where trails cross fences or locked gates? |
| 85   | BMP -- moving away from BMP's towards management measures (near Hallock)  
- First paragraph include "soil and earth sciences" as support operations and research |
| 90   | EXHIBIT 5.5 -- add second set of corral at Escuela Ranch (per Shelton)  
- Preservation and Enhancement... first bullet: remove the word "should" to "will" to agree with EQA, page 207. |
| 101  | Principles -- to avoid "unnecessary" conversion from agricultural lands is a concept that should also be high or even higher on SLO-CW Ranches,  
- Grading and Drainage -- should also include "erosion Control." In paragraph include SWPP  
- ATHLETIC FIELD HOUSE  
- Reference discussed here, but is not designated (labeled) as such on EXHIBIT III, page xii; diagram appears next to PS3  
- Does this mean that ARDFA is displaced/disappears? |
| 153  | See comments from page 69  
- Grey box of Environmental Consequences-paragraph 2.  
- Who identified that it is "infeasible" to return to prime agricultural land. This still is prime agricultural land.  
- This is not a "no impact." This is a concern that a document like this does not have the understanding of prime agricultural land but sought out the expertise to identify such lands. |
| 154  | The "ancillary parking" went to "Remote parking options" to new "new surface parking lots" as if a done deal. Legend does agree with map.  
- First paragraph does not mention SLO-CW Ranches as part of facility development. |
| 156  | Prime agricultural land should be identified as an "Environmental Sensitive Area".  
- Plan Components -- paragraph 2 states Gold tree as "potentially." According to whom?? Who "balanced" the principles and what weight was given? This is on the SLO-CW Ranch not in the "northwest portion of the main campus."
| 158  | This paragraph is good. It opens discussion without identifying the site. But why are the ancillary items, such as gold tree on the previous page, not specifically mentioned. Not consistent.  
- Back to "remote parking." Is this the decided place?? |
| 194  | Principles. Where is the CAGR-LUC input. There are no agricultural specialists identified that had input into this discussion. Plan components do not use "ranches as locations but only "main campus" and "western ranches." Be consistent and incorporate your own terms from pages 43-44. Otherwise using "main campus" for Cheda and Escuela Ranches is very misleading. |
| 195  | Goldtree is on the SLO-CW Ranch or Cheda Ranch and not the "northwest corner of the main campus.  
- Same comments as on page 194 that this is a misleading statement for proximity. Who
| 195 | GOLDTREE SITE  
|     | • Acreage of this site (as per aforementioned CAGR definition of Goldtree) is misstated at 200... should be about 51.9 acres  
|     | • Diagram of site should be redrawn to reflect inclusion of Fields C62 (21.7 acres), C63 (8.2 acres), and C64 (22 acres) as per previous (Buschman) maps  
|     | • This area has since been re-seeded—now a feed resource for sheep operation... resulted from loss of Serrano Ranch grazing to sheep  
| 267 | More on Goldtree...vegetation a mix of weedy and noxious species that are unpalatable to livestock. Who made this determination...feed resources currently being developed with sheep grazing  
| 261 | Under "SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS"  
|     | • The Master Plan specifically identifies prime agricultural soils on campus, and states that no further development of such lands will take place." Soil classification method in question.  
|     | • Are proposed "REMOTE PARKING OPTIONS" compatible with this statement/policy?  
| 262 | Under "CUMULATIVE IMPACTS"  
|     | • prime farmland will not be impacted...?  
| 326 | Interesting that the preparers and persons contacted does not include a single agricultural specialist. Yet much of this document involves technical input on agricultural land use. How does Master Plan Committee arrive at its conclusions and recommendations concerning agricultural lands and resources without direct input from ag specialist(s).  
| 3 | BOTANICAL SURVEY...again reference to Goldtree acreage...  
|     | • Reference to Goldtree as 180 acres...  
|     | • Again...CAGR definition of Goldtree would put that site at approximately 50 acres (Fields C52, C63 and C64) |
Letter 29
Dr. Ken Scotto

December 8, 2000

29-1 Comment requests that "prime" be added to the agricultural land designation.

Response The text has been modified to reflect this recommendation (refer to page viii).

29-2 Commenter raises concerns about the depiction of the Goldtree area.

Response The graphic depicting Goldtree has been amended to incorporate suggested changes and refine the location. The location will not impinge upon existing vineyards. Remote parking will not take place on prime agricultural lands nor will it displace current or future NRM facilities.

29-3 Commenter questions designation of applied research park site.

Response Text has been clarified; refer to pages xi, 64, and 206; Nevertheless, the University feels that it is important to continue to identify the Goldtree area of Chedaranch as a possible site for an applied research park.

29-4 Commenter suggests clarifying San Luis Obispo Creek watershed.

Response The following text has been added: “...Such designations will be used for all lands on the main campus, San Luis Obispo Creek Watershed ranches and Chorro Creek Watershed ranches in San Luis Obispo County.” (page 16).

29-5 Commenter notes limits on size of smaller, unique programs.

Response See text addition under discussion of Critical Mass (p. 37). The following text has been added: “In some instances the campus chooses to limit the size of unique programs despite demand, due to the specialized faculty, facilities and equipment or higher costs associated with such programs.”

29-6 Commenter suggests change in map legend.

Response The map on page 43 has been changed accordingly.

29-7 Commenter criticizes lack of detailed map of SLO Creek watershed ranches.

Response Maps of Cheda, Peterson and Serrano ranches have been added on page 45.

29-8 Commenter expresses concern about an apparent contradiction about access from Grand and Highland in Chapter 4.

Response Chapter 4 discusses Existing Conditions only. The commenter’s concern is focused on access to future uses, which are addressed later in the Master Plan. For example, see page 195 for a discussion of possible remote parking sites.

29-9 Commenter questions soil classification and analysis.
Response The soil study has been modified to use the Natural Resources Conservation Service soil capability class system, consistent with other jurisdictions.

29-10 Stenner Creek Road intersection (identified on p. 50) should be discussed on page 46.

Response This is discussed later in Circulation element. See page 165.

29-11 Commenter indicates that maps are missing some reservoirs and lagoons.

Response The base map has been changed to include additional reservoirs and lagoons.

29-12 Commenter has questions about dates and obsolescence for buildings 10 and 52.

Response Obsolescence is defined by several criteria, including functionality, not just age.

29-13 Commenter asks for clarification that an EIR would be required for conversion of prime agricultural lands.

Response Text has been clarified, refer to page 59.

29-14 Commenter asks why areas suggested for ancillary activities aren't covered on the constraints map?

Response The base map focuses on the Main Campus. The Constraints analysis has been modified, with the addition of another map and text about Cheda Ranch on page 64.

29-15 Commenter seeks clarification of reference to San Luis Obispo Creek watershed ranches.

Response The text has been clarified accordingly; refer to page 60.

29-16 Commenter is concerned with the suitability of Goldtree/Cheda Ranch area for development.

Response The Constraints analysis now contains a more detailed analysis of Cheda Ranch on page 64.

29-17 Commenter points out inconsistent designation of development suitability in area near Stenner Creek Road.

Response The remote parking sites are not expanded agricultural facilities. These were added after the constraints map was developed. There has been a clarification in the text to reflect this and changes in Exhibit 4.11. Please refer also to the discussion of potential remote parking sites on page 195.

29-18 Commenter suggests that the word “ranches” should be added to the second sentence at the beginning of the Land Use element.

Response This is a general paragraph not requiring the word change proposed.
29-19 Commenter calls for less specificity in designating ancillary activities.

Response The Master Plan team feels that a specific designation should remain, but with text clarification; refer to page 64.

29-20 Commenter seeks clarification of map legend to include reference to the Farm Shop.

Response The legend in Exhibit 5.2 has been changed to add this clarification. Exhibit iii has been modified as well.

29-21 Commenter is concerned that references to remote parking are not consistent throughout the Master Plan, and that the remote parking designation on the map does not match the legend on Exhibit 5.2.

Response The legend in Exhibit 5.2 has been changed to distinguish remote parking options from planned surface lots closer to the campus instructional core.

29-22 Commenter indicates that SLO Creek Watershed ranches are not included as part of facility development.

Response The SLO Creek Watershed ranches and Chorro Creek Watershed ranches are discussed in a separate section on page 77, which has been modified to indicate some potential for development on Cheda Ranch.

29-23 Commenter suggests identifying prime agricultural land as environmentally sensitive.

Response The Master Plan recognizes the environmental value of prime agricultural land in text, but designates it as Outdoor Teaching and Learning on land use maps. The Master Plan now explicitly refers to prime agricultural lands as meriting conservation and protection (see pp. 83 and 96).

29-24 Commenter questions Goldtree development potential as discussed in the Land Use element.

Response The Master Plan includes a general discussion in this section, so the text required only minor modification here. The development potential on Cheda Ranch is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, Existing Conditions (see p. 64).

29-25 Commenter prefers the general level of discussion about possible remote parking sites in contrast to the more detailed references to the Goldtree area.

Response Comment noted. Discussions of Cheda Ranch in general, the Goldtree area and remote parking options have been expanded in several sections of the Master Plan. See pp. 64, 195 and 206.

29-26 Commenter suggest adding “encroachment of campus onto prime agricultural land” as a major issue.
29-27 Commenter expresses concern about criticism of grazing practices.

Response: This issue was removed from the list. Grazing management is discussed elsewhere in the Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements (see pp. 88, 89 and 99).

29-28 Commenter calls for adding protection for prime agricultural lands in Natural Environment element.

Response: Protection for class I agricultural lands is now covered more explicitly in Principles in both Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements. (see revised text on pp. 83 and 96).

29-29 Commenter suggests adding to trails discussion regarding security.

Response: The following text has been added: “Trail standards need to be designed to address security as well as environmental issues – for example, stiles can provide access where appropriate over fences or near locked gates.” (See p. 88.)

29-30 Commenter suggests using "management measures" rather than "best management practices".

Response: The text has been clarified accordingly (see p. 89).

29-31 Comment asks that the discussion of the Campus Farm reflect research regarding soils and earth sciences.

Response: References to soils research have been added to the text (see p. 93).

29-32 Commenter indicates that Exhibit 5.5 should show a second set of corrals at Escuela Ranch.

Response: Exhibit 5.5 has been changed to show a set of corrals where the Walter’s Ranch western boundary intersects the Escuela Ranch.

29-33 Commenter asks for language change from "should" to "will" to strengthen protection of agricultural lands.

Response: Text now reads “Prime agricultural soils (class I) will be retained in agricultural use” (p. 99).

29-34 Comment calls for adding principles regarding avoidance of conversion of agricultural lands.

Response: This concern is addressed elsewhere in the Land Use, Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements (see pp. 69, 83 and 96).
Commenter asks that erosion control be included as part of Landscape Design guidelines.

Response This is already addressed as "minimizing erosion" under the Grading and Drainage section (p. 127).

Commenter suggests that the illustrative diagram designate the proposed field house with a letter and on legend, and asks if ARDFA will be displaced.

Response Exhibit iii has been changed to show the proposed athletic field house at some future date. When that occurs, ARDFA will be displaced and other arrangements will be made for the research activities that currently take place in that facility.

Commenter critiques the environmental analysis of the move of the Corporation Yards to Old Poultry Unit area asking for an explanation of why it would not be feasible to return this site to productive agriculture.

Response The environmental consequence discussion at page 161 has been rewritten to note that reconversion of this site to agriculture would be impractical, given the capital investment in buildings and site alterations. The notion that there are no impacts to agriculture refers to the additional development not exacerbating the previous conversion of prime soils.

Exhibit 5.12 generated additional questions regarding "remote parking" options.

Response Maps and legends have been made consistent throughout the Master Plan. Additional text on p. 195 explains that “If parking demand should require Cal Poly to consider using any of these locations, additional site analysis will be undertaken to determine the amount of land needed, the most appropriate site or sites, how access will be provided, the effect on circulation, how the parking area(s) would be secured, and how existing uses can be relocated.”

Commenter reminds us to be consistent in use of terms for Main Campus and ranches as we have defined them in the Existing Conditions chapter (4).

Response The text has been clarified in the Ancillary Activities and Facilities element (p. 205) as well as elsewhere in the document.

Commenter asks for further clarification of the description of the Goldtree area, particularly in the context of the potential for an applied research park.

Response Additional analysis has been added on p. 64 (discussed above), and this is reflected in wording changes in the Ancillary Activities and Facilities element (p. 208).

The Master Plan should recognize and discuss sheep operations in the Goldtree area.

Response Text has been added on p. 93, as follows: “The sheep unit and sheep operations occupy approximately 144 acres, or about one-third of Cheda Ranch, including some of the area known as Goldtree.”
29-42 Commenter criticized some of the terminology used in the environmental analysis of the Goldtree area.

Response The determination was made by V.L. Holland of the Biological Sciences Department who performed site botanical studies. Text has been amended to remove this characterization. (See p. 208).

29-43 Commenter raises questions regarding soil analysis and significance.

Response Remote parking options will not be located in areas currently used for prime agriculture or with prime agricultural soils. Prime agricultural soils were based on criteria used by the Natural Resources Conservation Service and local agencies such as the County of San Luis Obispo.

29-44 Commenter questions cumulative impact analysis.

Response It is the objective of the Master Plan not to further impact prime agricultural soils on campus lands.

29-45 Commenter critiques lack of involvement of agricultural specialists in analysis.

Response Comment noted. Determination of soils was based on accepted criteria of the NRCS. The Master Plan team consulted numerous times with the College of Agriculture Land Use Committee and other representatives of the College of Agriculture throughout the development of the Master Plan.

29-46 Commenter seeks clarification of description of Goldtree area in appendices to EIR.

Response Reference to Goldtree in this context is to the area surveyed by the biologists; refer also to page 64 for clarification.
Dear [Name],

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my concern regarding the ongoing issues with the new building. It is unfortunate that the situation continues to escalate, and I believe it is time for us to take action.

As you are aware, the new building is scheduled to be completed soon. However, there are several issues that need to be addressed immediately. First, the ventilation system is not functioning properly, causing discomfort for the occupants. Secondly, the lighting in certain areas is inadequate, making it difficult to work. Lastly, the space allocation for the various departments is not sufficient, leading to overcrowding and inefficiency.

I am concerned that these issues will continue to affect our operations and the reputation of our institution. I believe it is essential to address these concerns promptly to ensure a smooth transition to the new building.

Please let me know your thoughts on this matter and if there is anything I can do to facilitate a solution.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
Letter 30  
Dr. Ken Solomon  
Agriculture Engineering  

November 15, 2000  

30-I Commenter expresses concern about the proposed configuration of future BRAE building, and specifically the need to accommodate delivery of large goods.  

Response Following adoption of the Master Plan, Cal Poly will engage in a series of implementation studies (specified in Chapter 7). As projects are planned and built, they will be reviewed and monitored for compliance with the environmental mitigation requirements as well as with meeting plan expectations to reinforce the academic quality of the University. The Campus Planning Committee will review the Master Plan annually so as to advise the campus whether conditions have changed sufficiently to warrant a major update. New text in the Master Plan recognizes service delivery requirements, as follows: “Site design for new agricultural facilities will accommodate delivery of materials and equipment for student labs, including access by large trucks” (p. 117).
Bonnie Lowe /cpslo,employee1 11/16/2000 13:44

MESSAGE
Subject: Master Plan
Creator: Mark Shelton /cpslo,employee1

Item 1

TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee1
CC: Linda C. Dalton /cpslo,employee1
     Josee J. Jen /cpslo,employee1
     Gary B. Ketcham /cpslo,employee1
     Kenneth C. Scotto /cpslo,employee1

Item 2

Bonnie:

I have a few comments for you regarding the Oct. 10 Master Plan and BIR.

1. In 1996, the College built a second dairy lagoon, just east of the existing lagoon. This lagoon does not appear on maps in the master plan on pages 51, 71, and 105, and perhaps elsewhere.

2. On page 71, Ex. 5.2, the Farm Shop is not listed among the facilities in the Future Corporation Yards area.

3. On page 90, Ex. 5.5, there are a couple of mistakes. Red Rock Pit is indicated (no. 71) at the Chorro Creek Ranch where grazing (no. 5) should be indicated. Also, there is a second corral ("P") on the Escuela Ranch that should be shown just NW of the intersection of the NW boundary of Walters R. and Escuela R.

4. In the Botanical Survey discussion, the Goldtree Area is described as ca. 180 acres. I know that in all previous discussions between the master plan team and the CAGR Land Use Committee or myself, we have referred to Goldtree as fields C62, C61 and C64, which total about 52 acres. This was the area that the CAGR had in mind to open to non agriculture use. I realize from reading the draft that ca. 60 acres is being considered for use as a research park, etc. This is within the range we have previously discussed; however, 180 acres far exceeds this acreage, so an area much greater than the 50-60 acres should be discussed further with the CAGR, in my opinion.

Thanks,

Mark
Bonnie Lowe /cpslo,employee 11/16/2000 14:04

MESSAGE
Dated: 11/13/2000 at 13:10
Contents: 2

Subject: Goldtree site
Creator: Mark Shelton /cpslo,employee

Item 1

TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee

Item 2

Bonnie:

As per my previous email regarding the master plan's description of the Goldtree site as "approx. 160 acres", please note the error on page 195, where the site is listed as "approx. 200 acres". The actual Goldtree area is approx. 52 acres as I mentioned in my previous note to you.

Thanks,

Mark
Letter 31  
Dr. Mark Shelton  
Assistant Dean, College of Agriculture  
October 26, 2000

31-1 Commenter notes the omission of the second Dairy Lagoon.

Response Maps have been modified to show lagoon.

31-2 Commenter notes that the Farm Shop was not listed for the future Corporation Yards.

Response Exhibit 5.2 has been modified to list the Farm Shop.

31-3 Commenter notes errors on Exhibit 5.5 regarding red rock pit and corrals omitted.

Response Exhibit 5.5 has been modified accordingly.

31-4 Commenter notes a concern with the Master Plan’s description of the so-called Goldtree Area.

Response The northwest corner of Cheda Ranch includes an area known as Goldtree. Traditionally, this area has consisted of three fields (C62, C63, C64), totaling about 52 acres. In conducting feasibility studies for ancillary activities at a satellite location, the Master Plan team examined a slightly larger area (including fields C65 and part of C61, but excluding C64 as too steep) to determine which land might be more suitable, considering environmental, regulatory, cost and policy constraints. Based on soil type, slope, and current condition, the 60-acre area shown on the detailed map was identified as most suitable for potential development, and became known as the Goldtree project area or site. It is close to the Union Pacific Railroad and has access to water, sewage treatment and electricity. Access could be provided from Highway 1 (perhaps from an improved intersection near the site or at Stenner Creek Road) and/or internally from Mount Bishop Road (pp. 64-65). Reference to Goldtree in the Appendix to the EIR is to the area surveyed by the biologists, not the area proposed for development.
Bonnie Lowe /cpslo,employee 12/9/2000 13:26  Page 1

MESSAGE  Dated: 12/9/2000 at 12:55  Contents: 3
Subject: Master Plan concerns
Creator: Norm Pillsbury /cpslo,employee

Item 1
FROM: Norm Pillsbury /cpslo,employee
TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee
CC: Douglas D. Piirto /cpslo,employee
Mark D. Sheiton /cpslo,employee

Item 2

ARRA MESSAGE HEADER

Item 3

Bonnie, I've been made aware that the Master Plan calls for a remote parking lot in or in the near vicinity of our Christmas Tree Farm and Logging Sports Complex near Stearns Creek Road. This site is the ONLY site that the NRH Department has for field operations on campus, and as such, the value and integrity of this property is VERY HIGH.

We would like clarification of the exact location, size, etc. of the remote parking, but if it goes through as I understand it, it would have a significant impact on our field operations.

I would urge that the parking lot be moved to another location if possible. An alternative would be that our operations be moved to another location, however, the land that would be suitable for growing Christmas trees is already occupied by other programs and just being "moved" would be quite an undertaking: absolutely not easy.

Please advise us on the best course of action.
Norm Pillsbury
32-1 Commenter raises concern about the location of the remote parking lot relative to the Tree Farm and Logging Sports Complex near Stenner Creek Road. He further requests the exact location of the remote parking be described and moved away from NRM facilities.

Response The Master Plan Land Use map (Exhibit i) identified two general locations where a remote parking lot could be developed. The locations will be refined as discussed in new text on p. 195: “Planning for development of a remote parking site that would involve moving any Outdoor Teaching and Learning activities, such as the forestry demonstration area or sheep grazing, would follow the principle that a new site for their operations would need to be identified and developed first, so as to minimize disruption.” It is important to note that the development of remote parking is a contingency predicated on the inability to reduce parking demand through restrictions described in the Alternative Transportation element of the Master Plan.

32-2 Commenter suggests that the NRM Christmas Tree Farm be relocated to better soils.

Response NRM, at a meeting on January 3, identified land with the potential for relocating the tree farm. Consideration of remote parking locations will not impede this move.
MESSAGE
Subject: FW: campus sustainability
Sender: Linda Dalton /cpslo,employee

TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee

Bonnie,

Please include the note to Paul Zingg among Master Plan comments.

Linda

----Original Message-----
From: Paul J. Zingg
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2000 8:40 AM
To: Linda C. Dalton
CC: Bob Kitamura
Subject: campus sustainability

Linda -- could you take a stab at responding to this? I'm unlikely to get to it this week because of the San Diego trip. Thanks. Maybe Kit could provide some input, too. Paul

MESSAGE
Subject: campus sustainability
Creator: csac_cpslo@hotmail.com

FROM: csac_cpslo@hotmail.com
TO: Paul J. Zingg /cpslo,employee

Hello, my name is Obadiah Bartholomew and I am a fourth year mechanical engineering student. I am trying to start up a committee, or expand a current committee, that would discuss sustainability issues relating to Cal Poly. I have been working with two other students to interview and email any faculty, administrators, and students who might be interested in the environment, energy use, life cycle analysis, and planning. Basically, we have been trying to find out who is working on something related to the idea of sustainability at Cal Poly, and what could the university do as a whole to try to assist them in this area.

So far, after speaking with nearly thirty faculty, students, and administrators, we have come up with six major different areas related to sustainability at Cal Poly that either have projects going, or that need to be addressed. These are:

33-1 Energy and Resources: currently in the process of starting committee back up under Ed Johnson. Focus on overall energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, recycling improvements, and land assessment.

33-2 Buildings: Energy use analysis for different types of buildings, life cycle analysis before low bid for new contracts, which buildings are working well, which buildings are not?

33-3 Political: Interpretation of new legislation that has been passed, legislation or lobbying for further steps towards sustainability within state government, working with other C.S.U.'s as well as the California State Student's Association in these areas.

33-4 Education: How can we facilitate interdisciplinary classes which allow students to learn about all aspects of sustainability, not just through
Letter 33


their own department or college. How can we facilitate interdisciplinary senior projects in which an architect, a planner, an engineer and a business student can all interact on a project thus learning from each other's disciplines and learning how to see a larger picture.

Agriculture: What are we doing at Cal Poly to teach our students about sustainable agriculture and its benefits to our environment? How can we improve as a leader in agriculture, and how can we mesh sustainable agriculture with conventional agriculture so that they are not two completely separate, or even opposite, concepts?

Transportation: Are the solar bicycles and electric vehicle programs on campus successful? If so, how can we expand them, or improve them? Is it feasible to start a small biodiesel refinery on campus to alleviate some of our diesel costs?

Basically, I was wondering if you might have any input on such a committee, or if you think it might be better to try to expand the scope of another, such as the energy and resources committee. We are hoping that this committee could meet once a month for about two hours to discuss all of these issues between a group of 10 – 12 faculty, administrators and students. I would appreciate any interest or ideas you might have, thank you for your time, Qadish Bartholomy

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : http://explorer.msn.com
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Letter 33
Mr. Obadiah Bartholomy

December 4, 2000

33-1 Commenter notes that he is attempting to set up a campus committee on sustainability issues to promote projects dealing with areas such as energy and resource, buildings, political issues, education, agriculture, and transportation.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements (pp. 79 and 162-163).

33-2 Commenter expresses concern with energy and resource use.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element (pp. 162-163).

33-3 Commenter expresses concern with life cycle analysis for buildings.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements (pp. 162-163).

33-4 Commenter expresses interest in political and legislative support for sustainable practices.

Response Such support will contribute to Cal Poly's ability to address such issues in implementing the Master Plan as it raises public awareness and may provide resources as well.

33-5 Commenter expresses interest in interdisciplinary courses and student projects addressing environmental sustainability.

Response Introductory chapter enables and supports curricular attention to sustainability.

33-6 Commenter expresses interest in sustainable agriculture.

Response See Outdoor Teaching and Learning element.

33-7 Commenter suggests expanding bicycle use, including solar and electric energy.

Response Bicycle use will be made more convenient under the Master Plan. Cal Poly has already initiated several programs to deal with solar and electric powered vehicles. The first electric bicycles have already arrived on campus for a beta testing program under Ed Johnson of Facilities Planning.
Subject: Part One of My Comments: Master Plan/Draft EIR
Date: 12/8/00 2:27:51 PM Pacific Standard Time
From: rktamura@calpoly.edu
To: bastinson@rm-design.com, rjuestesan@rm-design.com, blowe@calpoly.edu, vmontgomery@rm-design.com
CC: cwelek@all.com, jkalton@calpoly.edu, nicole@cmcapplans.com, rwall@calpoly.edu

Subject: Part One of My Comments: Master Plan/Draft EIR
MIME-Version: 1.0
Sender: pasley@calpoly.edu
FROM: pasley@calpoly.edu
TO: rktamura@calpoly.edu
CC: biology@polymsl.calpoly.edu,
    jkalton@calpoly.edu,
    vhodland@calpoly.edu
Content-Type: multipart/Mixed; boundary="openmail-part-0928ab6-00000002"

--openmail-part-0928ab6-00000002
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: Inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

To: Mr. Robert Kitaruma
December 8, 2000
Director of Facilities Planning
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo CA 93407

From: Phil Ashley
Biology Technician
Biology Department
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo CA 93407


Dear Mr. Kitaruma:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Cal Poly Master Plan & Draft Environmental Impact Report (MP/DEIR). I also appreciate the Administration officially extending the public comment period on the MP/DEIR from the original deadline of Monday, 12/5/00, to the current deadline of Friday, 12/8/00.

I received my B.S. from the Cal Poly Biological Sciences Department in 1980 and my M.S. in Fisheries from Humboldt State University in 1973. I worked for the Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game in 1971 and for the J. S. Fish & Wildlife Service from 1973 to 1975. I have been a Biology Technician in the Cal Poly Biological Sciences Department for 26 years. During my work career at Cal Poly I have taken wildlife biology courses and also commented and testified on behalf of flora and fauna on many development projects at Cal Poly, local, State, and national levels. On June 12, 2000, I provided written comments on the May 1, 2000, Cal Poly Preliminary Draft Master Plan (PDMP).

So that my and many others' official written comment letters on the PDMP do not get basically eliminated and forgotten during the MP and its EIR process I request that you put these official comments in an Appendix to the Final EIR for the MP. This is important especially because, although the MP/DEIR have addressed some of our comments on the PDMP, many comments that we made on the PDMP have not been addressed or reflected in the current MP/DEIR.
Before I begin my specific comments on the MP/DEIR, I would like to urge the Cal Poly Administration to reduce the pace of the MP/DEIR process so full deliberations of the MP and its Final EIR can be made at the local level. This important recommendation includes holding a local Campus/local public hearing once the FEIR is finished so the Campus community can easily orally comment on the FEIR before it goes to the Chancellor's Office for final considerations.

This recommendation is important because it is very difficult for the Campus community to attend the Chancellor's hearing on the MP/FEIR in Long Beach. It is logistically too far away for almost all interested people to attend during the busy academic quarter or ever to attend during a short quarter break when faculty and staff use that time to prepare for the following quarter and to catch up on domestic things. And students use that same short quarter break to visit hometown family and friends.

So please slow the process enough to hold more local meetings on the MP next year and to hold a Campus/local public hearing on the MP and FEIR. The 20-year Master Plan is just too important a document and process to Cal Poly and the surrounding community for a long time to come not to take this final care with the process before sending it far away to the Chancellor for approval considerations. And please do not rush the process to meet any Cal Poly or CSU centennial celebration deadlines. A careful local Master Plan process for the long future ahead for Cal Poly transcends in importance any celebration deadline no matter how important the celebration.

Also I commend the University for the Master Plan and the process going with it. I think they make you all a leader in the areas of university planning and environmental protection. My list of positives about the MP are so long I can only list a few of them all as it would make my comments too long.

But as it collectively covers a lot of my positive thoughts about the MP, I especially like the overall MP Campus Core design. It has a nice balance of open ("green") space quads dispersed throughout the Campus Core for student outdoor study and relaxation between class periods. These Campus Core open space areas for students are very important for a university as Cal Poly. And none of my following strong recommendations against, and alternatives to, the MP proposal of placing student residences in and near the sensitive environs of the Mouth of Poly Canyon on the north side of Britzziari Creek should be construed as ever eliminating the nice Campus Core open space student quads shown in the MP.

I also thank the Administration for moving Student Residence Unit H-4 in the PDMP out of the south side Britzziari Creek flood plain for safety and environmental reasons. Now those 500 student residence beds are shown elsewhere in the current MP. This includes, as recommended in the Biological Sciences Department's comment letter of June 12, 2000, on the May 1, 2000, PDMP, 136 of them now shown in the MP between the existing Yosemite Hall student residences and the eucalyptus and olive tree lined intermittent Creek in the vacant grassland field adjacent to Slack Street.

However, in moving H-4 from the south side of Britzziari Creek, contrary to the Biological Sciences Department's 5/12/00 comments*, Student Residence units H-1, H-2, and H-3 not only were not eliminated from the north side of Britzziari Creek across it from the Campus Core in the sensitive environmental area in and too near the Mouth of Poly...
Canyon, but in the current MP, H-1, H-2, and H-3 combined have been increased from 1464 student beds to 1620 beds. This major environmental concern is addressed below in my comments. (*The Department's 8/1200 comment letter on page 3 recommended in paragraph "(1)" that H-3 be eliminated from the north side of the Creek and be built elsewhere as described, and in the first paragraph and paragraph "(a)" that H-1 & H-2 sites instead be used for grassland mitigation for unmitigated grassland loss resulting from recent Cal Poly development projects and that H-1 and H-2 "be held in long-term abeyance and...should only be considered for development if there is still on-campus student housing demand after all other student residences in our recommendations have been built.")

Now I will specifically comment on the MP/DEIR where I earnestly hope changes will be made to protect Campus environmental natural resources and the Cal Poly Biological Sciences Department's reliance on them for teaching.

Because of their significant relevance and also to help shorten my new comments on the MP/DEIR, I have included in their entirety as Attachment 1 to my comments here the 8/1200 comments of the Biological Sciences Department [hereafter referred to as the Department] on the PDMP. I also endorse and incorporate the Department's comments of 8/1200 into my comments here, except for my clarification in the next paragraph. Because my email account does not have enough space in it to include the Department's 8/1200 comment letter (Attachment 1) in this email, or the several other attachments referred to in my comments here, I have attached them to hard copy of my comment letter which I will personally bring over to the Cal Poly Facilities Services Building before tomorrow's 5pm MP/DEIR comment deadline.

In the last paragraph of page 3 of the Department's 8/1200 comments it is stated "Proposed housing sites H-1 and H-2 should only be considered for development if there is still on-campus student housing demand after all other student residences in our recommendations have been built."

However, for the many unmitigable, significant, adverse environmental impacts expressed in the Department's comments of 8/1200 that these student housing units would cause across from the Campus Coro on the north side of Brizzioli Creek and too near the ecologically sensitive mouth of Poly Canyon, I recommend that H-1 and H-2 should be PERMANENTLY eliminated from where the MP proposes them on the north side of the Creek.

The Department recommended various alternative sites for H-1, H-2, and H-3 that would have far less environmental impacts on Campus natural resources and the Department's teaching reliance on those natural resources. And in my comments here, I will provide more alternatives for H-1, H-2, and H-3 that will prevent urban sprawl across the Creek and will be significantly environmentally better than what the MP currently proposes.

Besides H-1 to H-3 destroying deep-soiled valley grasslands critical to the survival of many burrowing prey species and their many predator species, and being too close to the Creek and in and too near the Mouth of Poly Canyon and the Department's Ecology Reserve, these important biological natural resources would be irreversibly degraded for wildlife from the 1620 student residents living in them.

Although the Creek area will be planted with native vegetation, it is inaccurate to say the Creek will be restored for wildlife when 1620 students will cross the Creek and riparian zone many times a day to get back and forth to classes. The restored Creek environs will be a
Beautiful place for people and for plant study but it would be so
heavily used as a passageway and parkway by over 1500 students that it
will be significantly degraded for wildlife over what currently exists
wherever much more aesthetic it will look after vegetational
restoration.

As an example of how important the deep-soiled valley grasslands are to
wildlife where especially H-1 and H-2 are proposed by the MP, I wish to add
Cal Poly professors documented many wildlife and wildlife signs on this
area in a brief one-hour field trip on Sunday, November 26, 2000,
between 10am and 11am. During this short time on a sunny, moderately
windy day and while talking more than we were actually wildlife
observing, we saw, in, over, and immediately adjacent to the 6 grassland
fields (see Attachment 2) of the Bull Unit where H-1 to H-3 are proposed
the following: 2 red-tailed hawks, a northern harrier (Cali. Species of
Special Concern), an American kestrel, numerous species of small native
"songbirds" as goldfinch, Calif. towhee, white-crowned sparrow, mourning
dove, black phoebe, scrub jay, mockingbird, etc., numerous ground
squirrel and gopher burrows, numerous fox scats as well as coyote and
bobcat scat, many deer droppings and tracks, and small animal game
trails. Even in an hour, more serious wildlife observing than we three
wildlife disturbing walking, talking people did would have likely
revealed considerably more wildlife than we observed. Especially since
we did not have time to also observe wildlife in the H-3 site.

The primary reason student residences H-1 to H-3, and especially H-1 and
H-2, need to be located elsewhere is due to the loss of deep-soiled
valley grasslands. Various local scientific and environmental documents
(e.g., the SLO County's Dairy Creek [El Chorro] Golf Course Constraints
Analysis and Cal Poly's Sports Complex EIR including the MP DEIR (page
238) have correctly stated that valley grasslands whether comprised of
native or introduced grass species are important to many wildlife
species, especially when the many species of native and introduced broad
leaved forbes that also reside in valley grasslands are considered.

These wildlife species include prey species as ground squirrel, mico-
vals, and gopher burrowing rodents, mule deer, j Compatible, brush rabbit,
and the many avian and terrestrial predator species that rely on them
for forage as various hawk and falcon species, white-tailed kite,
several owl species, several egret and heron species, several snake
species, grey fox, coyote, bobcat, and badger. All of these species
except possibly the badger and white-tailed kite would be expected to be
found as residents or migrants on the H-1 to H-3 site every year if H-1
to H-3 are not built in the valley grasslands where proposed by the MP.

Also several insectivore bat, lizard, frog, and salamander species and
numerous insectivorous and herbivores native bird species are heavily
reliant on valley grasslands and many of these species would be found on
the H-1 to H-3 site every year.

Building H-1 to H-3 will not only eliminate nearly all of these species
from these sites, but when combined with the MP proposed Ancillary
Facilities for the Goldtree Ranch site and the new Bull Test Unit at
Chorro Ranch these species would be eliminated from about 100 acres of
Coastal Valley Grasslands according to the MP DEIR on page 290. I assume
that the MP DEIR takes into consideration in this 100 acre valley
grassland loss figure that the pastures of the new Bull Unit when built
will still have good wildlife value, as do the pastures of the existing
Bull Unit, even though overgrazing is occurring. If the MP DEIR has not
considered this, then the grassland loss figure would be slightly
smaller, but not much since the Ancillary Facilities and H-1 to H-3
sites would comprise the great majority of this 100 acre figure.
But a 100 acre or nearly a 100 acre loss of valley grassland is a significant environmental impact and not the "less than significant (Class III)" environmental impact indicated in the MP/DEIR (page 260). This is even more apparent when one considers that Cal Poly's two recent ARs on new student residences for about 600 students are the Sports Complex correctly concluded that the loss of about 12 acres of valley grassland for the former project and the loss of about 40 acres of valley grasslands for the latter project were both SIGNIFICANT impacts.

The MP/DEIR seems to base this conclusion that the previous 2 EIRs conclusions lesser losses of valley grasslands were significant impacts and about 100 acres of loss of valley grassland is not a significant impact with the Master Plan project because there is plenty of similar habitat for wildlife as "resident special-status birds, potentially including loggerhead shrike, golden eagle, and white-tailed kite." (page 268). This statement is specifically addressing the eastern portions of H-1 and H-2, but in reality it should include the entire approximately 100 acres of valley grasslands that the MP/DEIR project would eliminate. And it should also include other Calif. special status valley grassland foraging species as northern harrier, merlin, prairie falcon, Ferruginous hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, and Cooper's hawk, as they are losing their valley grassland foraging habitat nearly as fast as or faster than they are losing their mountainous, canyon, woodland, etc., breeding habitat as subsequent comments here help to indicate. Some of these special-status birds I have listed are resident birds and others are winter migrants. In either case their valley grassland foraging habitat is critical to their overall survival.

However, the MP/DEIR assumption is incorrect that there is plenty of valley grassland habitat for these special-status bird species and all wildlife reliant on deep-soiled valley grassland. In reference to these special-status species the MP/DEIR states on page 268 "The southern slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains provide many square miles of higher quality habitat associated with no or lesser intensity grazing." However the DEIR makes no analysis of how much of the southern slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains are suitable or even available to these special status species and other wildlife species reliant on deep-soiled valley grasslands.

Except for a very few grassland habitat areas specifically set aside for multiple use including wildlife use or near the Campus further north in the Chorro Valley and yet further north along the narrow coastal grassland prairies between the steep slopes of the southern slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains and the Pacific Ocean (as part of El Chorro County Park and part of the East-West ranch near Cambria just purchased for open space protection), almost all of this valley/prairie land along both sides of Highway 1 is under intense development pressure. It makes no more sense for the MP/DEIR to take the environmentally unacceptable position there is valley grassland habitat elsewhere so Cal Poly's Master Plan development would not create a significant impact to those grasslands and thus does not need mitigation or alternatives considerations, than it would for other developers along the narrow Santa Lucia Mountain valley/prairie grassland corridor to say concerning their potential projects, there's coastal valley grassland elsewhere so our project does not cause a significant valley grassland impact and needs no further CEQA assessment for mitigation or alternatives.

On the east side of Highway 1 where the southern slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains are, except for typically very narrow stream valley/canyon bottoms (Chorro, Dairy, Pennington, San Luisito, San Bernando, and a few other creeks along the Chorro Valley stretch, and
Monro, Toro, Old Santa Rita, Cayucos, Villa, Santa Rosa, San Simeon, Pico, Little Pico, and a few other creeks along the narrow coastal prairie stretch), many of which I've talked or drove up their short stream reachs over the years. This approximately 45 mile strip of mountainous southern slopes is so steep with such shallow soils underlain by bedrock, that it is unsuitable for burrowing prey species such as rodents and the predators that feed on them. For more on why these steep slopes are unsuitable for wildlife see my following comments on cumulative impacts on valley grasslands.

The bottom line is that the MP/DEIR should acknowledge as it correctly did in its two herein discussed recent EIRs for lesser losses of valley grasslands, that the loss of about 100 acres of valley grasslands that would result from the MP project is a significant adverse environmental impact and then assess mitigations and alternatives to avoid this significant impact.

Page 260 of the MP/DEIR also wrongly concludes that this is not a cumulatively significant loss of valley grasslands because "the County has witnessed the commitment of an average of 200 acres of grazing land per year since 1982, less than 0.03% of the County total." There are several major errors with this MP/DEIR conclusion.

First, there is no standard in CEQA that I am aware of that indicates that the annual development loss, year after year, of 0.03% of the total of a particular type of wildlife habitat in an entire County, is not a cumulatively significant impact. This to the contrary looks like a cumulatively significant loss of habitat. How would people like an EIR to conclude that the annual loss of 0.03% of all human inhabitable land was not a cumulatively significant impact?

Second, this DEIR analysis of the County wide loss of "grazing lands" fails to analyze what percentage of County grazing land has grassland soil that is deep enough for ground squirrels, mice, voles, and gophers to safely burrow into for their dens. These 4 groups of rodents make up much, and in many situations most or all, of the prey base for the survival needs of avian and terrestrial predators. Ground squirrels need soil several feet deep for their burrows. And almost all species in the latter 3 categories of rodents need soil at least 1 to 2 feet deep for their burrows. Much of the County's grazing lands are on steep hill and mountainsides with soils only a few inches deep underlain by solid bedrock entirely unsuitable by rodents! It is very likely that if the DEIR made the needed analysis on this issue, it would conclude that the percentage of County grazing land that can be used by burrowing rodents that is lost to development is much greater than 0.03% of the grazing land suitable for rodent inhabitation.

Third, and most importantly, the figure of an average of 200 acres of grazing land being lost each year in the County to development is grossly inaccurate. This 200 acre figure ignores the fact that in the past few years local newspaper articles have been reporting that conversion of land to Grapescape has been occurring at the rate of about 2000 acres per year with no foreseen future slowdown expected, and nearly all of this conversion has been valley ranchlands (Attachment 3 a, b, and c, 3 newspaper articles). When this approximately 2000 acres per year loss to Grapescape is added to the 200 acre loss figure from other types of County development indicated in the MP/DEIR, the total represents over 1000% greater annual loss of grazing grasslands in the County than the MP/DEIR admits too.

And it is generally recognized by most everyone but the Grapescrapers that these vast wine vineyard monoculture lands have little wildlife
value due to (1) nearly complete to complete closed vine canopies preventing hunting by avian predators, (2) barren filled surface soils instead of the heretofore rodent occupied grasslands, (3) generally much higher applications of pesticides than on the previous grazing lands, (4) avian nets covering entire vineyards preventing bird use, (5) noise cannons scaring away birds, (6) compared to previous dryland grazing vast groundwater use adversely impacting fish and wildlife wetlands, (5) almost complete lack of contour farming with vine rows often going down the slope perpendicular, or nearly so, to slope contours (e.g., Gallo's new vineyards on heretofore Cal Poly's public grazing lands) increasing land erosion (compounded by the common practice of barren surface soil tillage) and wetland sedimentation, (7) in preparation for vineyards deep plowing heretofore rangelands several feet down mining up rodents in their dens, etc.

And finally almost all of this currently 2000 acres plus per year loss of grazing lands to wine vineyards has been on deep-soiled valley grazing lands occupied by the many species of rodents that form the base of the predator food web. These valley grassland grazing lands converting rapidly to Grapescapes are most of the last valley ranchlands valuable to wildlife that are mildly sloping (defined here as 0 degrees to 30 degrees slope) lying between the flat mostly monoculture farmlands of generally low wildlife value and the steep hill and mountainsides that were too steep for conversion to irrigated row crops (until Grapescapes's arrival) and typically too thin-soiled for rodent use and the predators that forage on them.

For all these reasons it is erroneous for the MP/DEIR to conclude the loss of about 100 acres of valley grasslands is a Class III, less than significant impact. Cal Poly MP/DEIR officials testified at San Luis Obispo City's hearing on the MP/DEIR Tuesday night, 12/5/06, that sites such as Student Resident units H-1 and H-2 are "developed" Bull Unit pasture lands. But nearly all valley grasslands remaining were taken over long ago by humans for pasture lands and other livestock grazing lands. But even with overgrazing in many cases, as on the Bull Unit pastures, many prey and predator wildlife species still do very well surviving on such "developed" valley pasture and grazing lands. But they can no longer survive on those valley pasture/grazing lands if they are converted to other types of development as H-1 and H-2.

So I strongly recommend that just as Cal Poly acknowledged for lesser valley grassland losses in the EIRs for the Sports Complex and the soon-to-be-built approximately 800-bed student residences it likewise correctly acknowledge in the MP/DEIR that the loss of about 100 acres of mostly deep-soiled valley grasslands that would result from the MP project is both a significant and a cumulatively significant environmental impact. And then use alternatives or mitigations in the MP/DEIR to avoid or reduce these impacts to below significance.

The MP/DEIR also fails to address significant environmental impacts from the proposed MP project that would result from "Disruption of existing wildlife corridors" (page 26, test bullet). The only acknowledgement I found in the MP/DEIR of any type of ecological corridors existing were creek corridors. The MP/DEIR concluded on page 257 that regarding creeks in general Master Plan proposals would enhance creeks, so this is a Class IV beneficial environmental impact. And it concluded on pages 258 and 259 that impacts to Santee Creek and Brizzolara Creek (i.e., Brizzolara Creek spelling on the San Luis Obispo Quadrant USGS map) would be insignificant.

It is generally agreed on that creeks are wildlife corridors or at least parts of wildlife corridors. But the MP/DEIR conclusion that apparently
wildlife habitat must be a relatively narrow creak corridor. To be a wildlife corridor is unsupportable by wildlife corridor literature. I suggest that the preparers of the MP/DEIR read Conservation Corridors: Countering Habitat Fragmentation (Defenders of Wildlife, 1991. Pp. 81-135 in Landscape Linkages and Biodiversity, Wendy E. Hudson [ed.], Island Press, Wash., D.C.). Many types of wildlife corridors are described in this book including wide corridors that must provide all the survival needs of wildlife species in them. This would include not only wildlife’s relatively narrow trails but also their considerably more expansive foraging habitat and other survival needs areas.

The MP/DEIR indicates on page 258 under Open Space and Wildlife Corridors that native grasslands border the northeastern edge of where H-1 and H-2 are proposed and that these native grasslands will not be built on. But the MP/DEIR fails to acknowledge that (1) not only do wildlife trails exist where H-1 and H-2 would be built, but (2) also the wildlife valley grassland foraging habitat of many prey and avian and terrestrial predator species exists in the wildlife corridor at the base of the Santa Lucia foothills and will be disrupted and even eliminated where H-1 and H-2 would be built. In fact the valley grassland foraging habitat part of the wildlife corridor at the base of the Santa Lucia foothills is being disrupted and fragmented by many types of development and not just the MP proposed one, so this is also a cumulative significant impact to the wildlife corridor.

Paul Cal Poly construction as the Yosemite, Brick, and North Mountain dorms, O.H. Unit, and Swena Unit, have disrupted this wildlife trail and valley grassland foraging corridor habitat. And approved construction of the new dorms for about 800 students across from the North Mountain Dorms will further disrupt this wildlife corridor. And proposed construction of H-1, H-2, and the Ancillary Facilities far back on the Goldtree Ranch site on the base of the Santa Lucia Mountain foothills will further disrupt this wildlife trail and foraging corridor. Finally much of the Chorro Valley north west of the Main Campus is interspersed with development that has disrupted this wildlife corridor. These Chorro Valley developments disrupting this wildlife corridor include the California Men’s Colony, Camp San Luis East, heavily used parts of El Chorro County Park including Dairy Creek Golf Course, County Schools Offices, Camp El Chorro, the gun range, etc.

To demonstrate how wide some corridors need to be for wildlife survival and to prevent habitat fragmentation, I have attached (Attachment 4) the Klamath Corridors Proposal map from the above cited book on wildlife corridors showing that wildlife corridors in some areas need to be many miles wide. I am not suggesting here that the wildlife trail and foraging corridor providing for wildlife’s movement and feeding needs at the foothill base of the Santa Lucia Mountains needs to be of such expanse. But it does need to be wide enough to prevent further fragmentation of this wildlife movement foraging corridor. And that width clearly includes the valley grasslands in the H-1 and H-2 sites.

The MP proposed H-1 and H-2 Student Residence units on the valley grasslands in and too near the mouth of Poly Canyon and MP proposed Ancillary Facilities far back on the valley grasslands in the Goldtree Ranch site (1) would eliminate many acres of the wildlife foraging habitat in this wildlife corridor at the base of the Santa Lucia Mountain foothills, and (2) would disrupt or eliminate some of the wildlife trails in this corridor. This is a significant disruption of this important wildlife corridor.

So it is incorrect for the MP/DEIR to fail to consider, assess, mitigate or provide alternatives for both the significant and cumulative
significant environmental impacts that H-1 and H-2, as well as the Ancillary Facilities far back on the Goldtree Ranch site, would have on this important wildlife corridor.

I will conclude my comments on the importance of Cal Poly finding alternative sites for H-1 to H-3 by briefly listing here the alternatives the Department and others have recommended for these sites to avoid building student residences 350 yards back into the environmentally sensitive Mouth of Poly Canyon (see Attachment 5). Most of these alternatives are:

1. Provide parking under the dorms the MP proposes to build on the Campus Core side of Brizzolari Creek.
2. Where the MP proposes single level parking lots, provide multilevel parking lots.
3. Where the MP proposes single level parking lots, build dorms over the parking lots.
4. Build dorms proposed by the MP on the Campus Core side of Brizzolari Creek slightly higher than proposed. This may marginally block some more holistic views, but that is much more preferable than eliminating important wildlife habitat on the north side of the Creek that also has long term teaching value to the University and citizens of the State.
5. On the north side of Brizzolari Creek along both sides of Via Carta Drive where the MP shows large, single level parking lots, build dorms over some of these. This area across Brizzolari Creek is already greatly disturbed by development from buildings, parking lots, the Sports Complex, and heavy vehicle and foot traffic along Via Carta and Highland Drive and even with more Creek restoration this area is so heavily developed that it will be of high aesthetic and park value, but will remain very low wildlife value.
6. With at least some upper division student housing in the State/Cal Poly land off Campus along Highway 1 adjacent to Campus where the MP currently proposes only faculty/staff/married student housing. These two areas are at the outer edge of the City and would be little to no disturbance to City neighborhoods and are conveniently situated adjacent to Campus for students reducing City traffic problems.
7. As is now being looked at by Cal Poly and Cuesta College officials, build some student residences on Camp San Luis by replacing old buildings as barracks with student residences, thus not causing the loss of any Chorro Valley wildlife habitat.
8. And the final one I will list here that the City should consider, but apparently has not to date, is to provide at least some new places for student housing in those massive areas it is proposing to annex to the City in the Airport/Margarita-Rivera development areas adjacent to the south end of town. Being good neighbors works both ways and our students should mean far more to the City as Cal Poly prepares to celebrate its centennial than just economic benefit. I make this comment in the most respectful manner to the City and with pride for Cal Poly students, as I was one for 4 years and have directly served many thousands of them as a 25-year Cal Poly employee.

This ends Part One of my comments on the MP/DEIR as I do not have enough space left in my email account to finish my comments in this email. So I will now finish my comments on the MP/DEIR in a second email titled in the email Subject line “Part Two of My Comments: Master Plan/Draft EIR.”
In Part Two I will provide some final comments on (1) presenting the
Goodtree Ranch site where Ancillary Facilities are proposed by the MP,
(2) presenting most of the vacant field adjacent to Black Street, and
(3) summarizing my overall comments. And I will get both Part One and
Part Two electronic emails in to you by deadline today, as well as hard
copy of both with the hard copy attachments (Attachments 1 through 5).

Continued on email Part Two, Phil Ashley
Subject: Part Two of My Comments: Master Plan/Draft EIR
Date: 12/8/00 2:30:56 PM Pacific Standard Time
From: rkitamura@calpoly.edu
To: pashley@calpoly.edu
CC: baadison@rm-design.com, biology@poly-mail.cpvmuc.calpoly.edu, cwclam@aol.com, mltong@calpoly.edu,
    parkeystein@rm-design.com, wholand@calpoly.edu, rkitamura@calpoly.edu, hblowe@calpoly.edu, nicole@cmcapplans.com,
     rmontgomery@rm-design.com, nwolf@calpoly.edu

Phil - Thank you for your comments and I appreciate the time you spent on reviewing the plan and EIR. - Bob

To: Mr. Robert Kitamura  December 8, 2000
   Director of Facilities Planning
   Cal Poly
   San Luis Obispo CA 93407

From: Phil Ashley
   Biological Sciences Department
   Cal Poly
   San Luis Obispo CA 93407

Subject: Same as for Part One of this email.

Dear Mr. Kitamura:

The following is a continuation from email Part One of my comments on the MP/DEIR:

In some of my previous comments on the adverse impacts that would occur:

- to valley grasslands and reliant wildlife from the MP proposed
  - development of Student Residence H-1 to H-3, I also included comments on
  - the same types of adverse impacts that would occur to the valley
  - grasslands and reliant wildlife from the MP proposed development of
    Ancillary Facilities far back on the Goldtree Ranch site. I will add a
    few additional comments here with mitigations and alternatives that I
    recommend be incorporated in the MP and reflected in the MP/DEIR:

- There is a large body of literature available on wildlife habitat
  - fragmentation. And nearly the entire book that I cited earlier in these
    comments is just one example of this body of literature. And siting the
    MP proposed Ancillary Facilities far back in the middle area of the
    Goldtree Ranch valley grassland area is a major example of habitat
    - fragmentation.

- The Department in its 6/12/00 comment letter on the PDMP provided 3
  recommendations regarding the MP proposed development on the Goldtree
  Ranch area and I re-emphasize my endorsement of those 3
  recommendations:

  (Attachment 1, page 5) in my comments here, If the the Department's
  recommendations "(1)" and "(2)" cannot be compiled with (and I hope they
  can be) regarding not building the Ancillary Facilities in leap-frog
  development fashion far out from the main Campus Core, then I want to
  add the following mitigations/alternatives to the Department's
  recommendation "(3):

- A. Further reduce the size of the Ancillary Facilities as much as
> possible from what is shown in the MP/DEIR (page 70) and give the final acreage of the area proposed for the Ancillary Facilities.
> 4. In following the Department's third recommendation to move the Ancillary Facilities closer to the the human disturbance corridor already created by Highway 1, (1) place the parking lots for the Ancillary Facilities adjacent to Highway 1 and buffer them from Highway 1 with nice tree and shrub plantings to protect the scenic view corridor. (2) place the Ancillary Facilities immediately behind the parking lots and use more nice tree and shrub plantings to further buffer them from the Highway 1 scenic corridor.
> 5. If the Ancillary Facilities absolutely must be built at on the Goldtree Ranch site, these additional recommendations in A. and B. above would greatly help prevent habitat fragmentation of the valuable-to-wildlife valley grassland foraging habitat of the Goldtree Ranch area.
> A. Finally, I support the testimony of Cal Poly MP/DEIR officials at San Luis Obispo City's hearing on the MP/DEIR Tuesday night, 12/5/00, to protect from future development the part of the vacant field between Slack Street and the tree-lined creek dividing the field. As I understood Cal Poly's testimony at the hearing, the approximately 40% part of this field that is between the tree-lined creek and Yosemite Dorms would be used for Student Residences as shown in the MP/DEIR; the MP proposed Visitors' Center would be moved to this proposed development.
> B. side of the Creek between Grand Avenue and the MP proposed Student Residences, and the approximately 60% part of the field between Slack Street and the tree-lined creek will be preserved as open space. This is what I endorse and recommend in my comments here.
> C. I do want to make an additional point regarding the Slack Street vacant field. Although this is an aesthetically beautiful grassy field, it is a very low quality wildlife habitat apparently due to long being a fragmented habitat island due to intensive development on 3 sides (Slack Street neighborhood on the south side, Grand Avenue and parking lots on the west side and Yosemite Dorms on the north side).
> D. I have spent about 3.5 hours on this site the past 2 weekends, and unlike the many wildlife and signs of wildlife 1 and 2 faculty members saw 2 weekends ago in 1 hour in the area of the Bull Unit pastures, where the MP/DEIR inappropriately proposes siting Student Residences H-1 to H-3. And during this 3.5 hour period on the Slack Street grassy field site, which was all during mild and sunny weather, I saw no ground squirrel holes or ground squirrels, no mice or vole holes or other signs of rodents except a few gopher holes towards the back (east side) of the field, as opposed to many such rodent signs on the MP proposed H-1 to H-3 site. I only saw 2 fox scats and a few areas of deer droppings as opposed to many such wildlife signs at the MP proposed H-1 to H-3 site.
adequate tree and shrub plantings to buffer the Highway view corridor,
and 3) preserve the Slack Street field as permanent open space as
herein described.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the M/DEIR. And I
will continue to provide constructive input to this very important
Master Plan process, which the Administration and Campus community can take
special pride in leading the way for university long-term development.
planning balanced with long-term environmental and natural resource
protection!

Thank you and Sincerely, Phil Ashley

-----
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June 12, 2000

Ms. Deby Anderson
Project Information Coordinator
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Ms. Anderson:

The Biological Sciences Department appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Draft Master Plan (PMP). There are many good features to the PMP, and it is a wonderful step for campus planning. It demonstrates Cal Poly's rapidly evolving leadership and vision in campus planning and environmental analysis and protection. We will limit our comments to areas of concern in the PMP that would cause adverse impacts to Biological Sciences Department's (hereafter Department) teaching resources and to specific sensitive biological resources on campus.

Our Department has asked that I let you know of two major concerns with the PMP which are (1) location of housing in the B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4 all of which are located near the mouth of Poly Canyon and along the Brissiolas (Brissolara) Creek floodplain; (2) ancillary activities and facilities on the Goldner Ranch area of Cheda Ranch.

Proposed Housing Sites

Regarding our first and primary major concern the PMP proposes to establish student housing residence B-4 for 540 students on the south side of the Brissiolas (Brissolara) Creek in its sensitive riparian zone, immediate flood plain, and contiguous upland which blends in with the sensitive coast live oak woodland along Poly Canyon. Similarly it proposes to establish student housing residence B-3 for 256 students across the creek (north side) next to the sensitive riparian zone and immediate flood plain of the creek. Finally it proposes to establish student housing residences B-1 and B-2 for 1208 students on the north side of the creek near the Ecological Reserve, stands of California Native Grassland, and serpentine soils that support endangered plant
The already approved housing project (8-A) will remove a significant amount of grassland which includes many stands of native grassland and
at least one rare plant, Calystegia subaequula ssp. episopelia (Cambria morning-glory) which will be discussed in our biological survey of the site. Cal Poly should provide mitigation for the loss of this habitat and a good place for restoration of these habitats should be the grassland forming the north slope entry to Poly Canyon where residences H-1 and H-2 are proposed by the DMP. This would appear to provide an excellent mitigation and restoration site for approximately 10 acres of native and valley grassland and habitats for the Cambria morning-glory. Many predator and prey species use these grasslands for foraging and housing. The SRA for the current student housing project discussed mitigating the loss of this mixed native and introduced grassland habitat, but no mitigation was provided.

As a result of the uniqueness and sensitivity of habitats where the B-1 to B-4 housing is proposed, we recommend the following changes in the DMP.

1. Residences B-3 and B-4 being proposed in the creek ecosystem area be eliminated from the DMP. The lost housing units can be accommodated by adding housing units to other proposed housing sites and also a site near the Grand Avenue and Slack Street entrance.

2. The proposed housing site located behind the Brick Dorms and their parking lots (B-3), the North Mountain Dorm (B-6), and the housing site near California Blvd. (B-7) should be built first in whatever sequence deemed desirable. After these sites are fully developed, the housing needs on the campus should be re-evaluated to determine what additional housing may be needed.

3. The open field east of the Grand Avenue entrance to the campus should be used for additional future student housing. This area is immediately adjacent to existing housing, and there is a natural drainage divide in this field with tall eucalyptus and dense mature olive trees that form a buffer from the Slack Street neighborhood. Student housing should be planned in the open field between the tree-lined divide and the existing adjacent Yosemite Bell Dorms (B-D, page 117). This would leave an existing open space buffer (about 65% of the field) between the Slack Street neighborhood and the new student housing.

4. The campus is currently evaluating the need for married student, faculty, and staff housing. The off-campus housing proposed for the west side of Highway 1 north of Highland Drive (B-8 and B-9, page 117) is designated for this purpose. It might be possible to use one of the sites or part of the sites for additional student housing if needed.

5. After all of the student housing sites discussed above is built, we believe there is a good chance the student housing demand on campus will be met. The current percentage of students living on campus is about 19% as indicated. It is very possible many of the upper division students included in the DMP's 3,000 additional beds may not wish to reside on campus. Therefore, we recommend that housing sites H-1 and H-2 across the creek at the entrance to and in Poly Canyon be held in long-term abeyance and be the last built. Proposed housing sites H-1 and H-2 should only be considered for development if there is still on-campus student housing demand after all other student residences in our recommendations have been built. If this site must be used, the site should have a thorough biological analysis and evaluation of
environmental impacts. Reasonable alternatives may exist at this time as well.

Goldtree Ranch area of Cheda Ranch

The DNP proposes ancillary activities and facilities on the Goldtree Ranch area of the Cheda Ranch (pages vi, 60, and 178-180) have not been clearly defined. Since the DNP gives few examples of these ancillary facilities in partnership with non-Cal Poly entities (page 178), we cannot here discuss specifics of potential projects. However, we recommend a careful survey of the biological resources at this site prior to any final decisions on its land use. This is especially important if a very large construction project is proposed for this fairly pristine valley grassland area of campus.

A significant portion of the grassland areas close to the campus core has been removed for construction of the Sports Complex and next for the approved new housing on the south slope entrance to Poly Canyon. This makes examining remaining grasslands on campus very important prior to development. The Goldtree Ranch area may have been disturbed by past railroad construction, and it may have marginal agriculture soils; however, the site may still offer unique and valuable wildlife habitats and be important in our instructional program on campus. The site may be very valuable for several field-oriented courses and for student research. It is easily reached in a 3-hour lab period allowing adequate time for field instruction.

The mostly flat to mildly sloping Goldtree Ranch area has fairly deep valley soils. These deep soils provide critical habitat for burrowing animals such as rodents which are prey species for a host of free roaming predators such as snakes, hawks, falcons, eagles, kitas, owls, eaglets, herons, skunks, foxes, coyotes, badgers, bobcats, weasels, ringtails, etc. Many of these predators breed, nest and hide in the steep surrounding hills, mountains and canyons, but depend on the grasslands for foraging and prey species. As the food web becomes more and more devoid of prey species, the predators will diminish or disappear. These impacts are not only to the biodiversity of our campus ecosystems but will also impact the value of our campus as an outdoor laboratory.

The Goldtree Ranch area has not been evaluated carefully enough for proper land-use designation in the DNP. Apparently, the maps do not show three campus wetlands: the Nelson and Middlecamp reservoirs and Frog Pond, all of which are near the Goldtree site. These three wetlands are important biological and campus resources especially considering the proximity of the Sports Complex to some other campus wetlands. Some species of winter migratory waterfowl that our Department has documented on Shepard and Drume Reservoirs may shift to more remote wetlands near the Goldtree site. The DNP also does not show the streams of these reservoirs and ponds or any other drainages in the Goldtree area.

The DNP (page 180) states approximately 35 acres of the Goldtree area are potentially suitable for ancillary development. However the map exhibits on pages vi and 60 show the potential “Areas Suitable for Ancillary Activities and Facilities” to be much larger. Careful
evaluation of the site needs to proceed prior to siting any facilities or determining the size of these facilities.

The DMP recognizes that "some of the area is visible from Highway 1 and so care should be taken in facility siting to minimize impacts to visual resources." This is often the guiding planning principle stated for development proposed for wild and rural areas along fast-traveled roads. However, often the best areas for wildlife habitats are also sanctuaries away from and not visible from the highways.

Based we have the following recommendations and suggestions.

1) The Goldtree Ranch site should be carefully evaluated not only biologically but also in total prior to any land-use designation. The value of the site to the campus may be greater if it is undeveloped.

2) Alternate sites that may not be as unique and valuable as the Goldtree Ranch site be explored for Ancillary Activities and Facilities nearer the Campus Core, rather than leapfrogging out 2 miles to a place that has diverse natural resources important to the teaching and research mission of the university.

3) If the Goldtree Ranch site must be used for Ancillary Activities and Facilities, the campus should consolidate the facilities as much as possible and site them in disturbed sites perhaps closer the disturbance corridor created by Highway 1. This will reduce the habitat fragmentation that would occur on the site.

In summary, overall the Draft Master Plan is a huge planning and environmental step toward a vision for the university in which our natural resources are restored and protected for future generations of students as well as the community. We commend you for doing an excellent job but hope you will incorporate our recommendations into the Final Master Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Biological Sciences Department

Copies:
Dr. Linda C. Dalton, Vice Provost Institute. Planning, Cal Poly
Mr. Robert E. Kitamura, Director Facilities Planning, Cal Poly
ATTACHMENT 2
THE 6 BULL UNIT PASTURES
WINE from Page One

Some wine growers, association, think the best level is closer to 50 percent. Most of the exported grapes go to large wineries in Napa and Sonoma counties.

"Certainly, the fruit is here for many varieties," she said.

The exact numbers of plants are impossible to come by because farmers are not required to report when they convert their rangeland or dry land crops to wine grapes. The numbers are recorded by the county when the first crop is harvested three or four years after planting.

The estimates are strictly pie in the sky — there's no way of knowing," said Herman Schwartz, owner of Continental Vintners near Paso Robles.

But the number that do exist indicate a booming wine grape industry in the county. A number of factors are pushing this boom.

First, the 1990s can be called the decade of the grape in San Luis Obispo County and that trend shows no sign of slackening off. The cool nights and warm days along the Central Coast are perfect for growing wine grapes.

San Luis Obispo has emerged in the 1990s as one of California's most vibrant and rapidly expanding grape growing and wine-producing regions," concluded a report commissioned by county vintners published in August.

Second, the premium types of wine grapes grown in San Luis Obispo County are in the greatest demand. Wine consumption overall has remained flat but consumption of premium wines is on the increase, Ackerman said.

"People are drinking less but better," she said. "That's a sign of the economy, plus the American public in general is developing a little more sophisticated palate."

Third, San Luis Obispo County has laid out the welcome mat for the wine industry. Getting approval for a winery takes months rather than years. Paragon proposed its winery in mid-December and expects to take its first grape shipment in August.

This county is a dream compared to Santa Barbara and Sonoma counties," Neyer said.

"The county's burgeoning grape-growing and wine-making trend shows some indication of slowing," Richard Greek, county agriculture commissioner, said, speaking at his Paso Robles office report that that on the average person a day comes into the office asking about possible permits and other permits to plant grapes.

"Grape growers in the county need to keep the land prices in San Luis Obispo County will continue to fall at the same rates. More than 40,000 vineyard acres will be planted in the county by the turn of the century, experts predict."

END OF SUPPLEMENTARY FRIDAY, Open 10

WE'LL PULL NEWSPAPER ON FRIDAY 5% OFF
to Grapeshcape
COMES LOSING OUT

Question arise about the inputs of timing chart leads this viewpoint

APRIL 18, 1999
ATTACHMENT 3C

Letter 34
must remain because of it. Absolutely not, unless we have some realistic options that the Klamath Nation has not thought of. How strictly we have to rely on the model.

A MODEL

The Klamath applies the biodiversity. Will say: with assu- ult and in real that larger is support from federal court advocating: a management plan. There are also ways to Klamath Mo. for landscape corridor between the e.

Within the options for natural habitat gone. If we a Reed Noss, that academia, we landscape and Klamath Co. efforts.
Letter 34  
Mr. Phil Ashley  
Department of Biology  

December 8, 2000  

34-1 Commenter suggests putting comments and responses in appendix to Final EIR.  

Response Comments have been placed in the body of the Final EIR. The Master Plan and FEIR will include all comments on the October 10 publication, plus a matrix showing changes from both the May 1 and October 10 publications.  

34-2 Commenter has suggested reducing the pace of the review of the Master Plan.  

Response Comment noted. Review periods for the Master Plan and EIR were extended beyond required timeframes to allow for more comment, and the Preliminary draft and its preparation involved the input of the public and many campus advisory groups.  

34-3 Commenter expresses appreciation for components of the Master Plan such as design of the campus core.  

Response Comments are noted.  

34-4 Commenter expresses appreciation for the moving of the H-4 unit since the Preliminary draft.  

Response Comments are noted.  

34-5 Commenter expresses concerns with current location of H-1, H-2 and H-3 housing units.  

Response Concerns are noted. The Master Plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the H-1 and H-2 housing units at a suitable distance from the creek corridor that resulted in the creation of the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project and the re-adsorption of units initially proposed for location along the creek (namely H-3). The additional beds were the result of partial absorption of the H-4 housing unit that could not be relocated in its entirety elsewhere on campus.  

34-6 Commenter suggests that H-1 and H-2 be permanently eliminated from the Master Plan for several reasons, the first being the loss of deep-soiled valley grasslands, and the second the degradation of the creek corridor due to traffic.  

Response Grasslands. The grasslands the commenter refers to are currently used for grazing and foraging of animal species. Valley grasslands consisting of species typical of pasture vegetation are not considered a sensitive plant community at the state or federal level, nor are they considered sensitive by CNPS. Therefore, the loss of this vegetative community is not considered a significant impact. In order to consider the loss of foraging habitat a significant impact under CEQA, the consultant would have to find that the proposed development would “have a substantial adverse effect [through habitat modification]” on sensitive species as defined in the EIR. The consultant maintains that there is adequate foraging habitat on surrounding Cal
Poly lands for sensitive bird species, and that development of the site would not result in loss of nesting or other habitat for such species.

*Creek Degradation.* The Master Plan and EIR make a priority of the enhancement of the Brizzolara Creek corridor through the designation of a special project. Mitigation for the H-1 and 3 housing units specifically states (pg. 206) that “Plans for the H-1 and H-2 housing units will include pedestrian systems which are sensitive to the Brizzolara Creek corridor.” The commenter is reminded that the design shown in the Plan is conceptual; mitigation in the EIR requires that the creek be protected from pedestrian traffic. Implementation of this mitigation will be part of the long-range implementation of the Master Plan; the project will be further reviewed at such time it is planned to be built.

34-7 Commenter suggests Draft EIR and Master Plan fail to address the disruption of existing wildlife corridors.

**Response** The consultant believes that the site provides marginal “corridor” values due to existing development on three sides, and maintains that the major wildlife corridor in the area consists mainly of Brizzolara Creek. As mentioned above, the project provides a hard edge to the campus and provides protection for wildlife corridors along the hillsides and through Poly Canyon.

34-8 Commenter suggests several alternative locations and approaches to the housing development at H-1, H-2, and H-3.

**Response** The commenter is referred to the housing alternatives analysis prepared in the EIR which directs housing siting and design. The goals of the Master Plan are to locate housing within proximity to the campus instructional core and create a community for student living without compromising the function.

34-9 Commenter suggests Master Plan will result in wildlife habitat fragmentation.

**Response** Comment noted. Development has been concentrated near existing campus development so that fragmentation of wildlife habitat is minimized. The commenter’s specific reference to ancillary facilities at Goldtree is noted. These facilities are located where other site constraints (slopes, wetlands) will not be adversely affected. See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.

34-10 Commenter suggests location of H-1 and H-2 at the Grand Avenue and Slack Street location.

**Response** The University faces significant constraints in this area associated with the surrounding residential neighborhoods (specifically light and noise) that make development of this site with significant housing units difficult. The Environmental Suitability and Sustainability principle in the Land Use element (p. 65) calls for "limiting future development to those areas least affected by regulatory and/or high cost environmental constraints.”
Cal Poly Master Plan  
ASUU Review and Response  
December 2000 (Received 12/4/00)

ASUU staff and students have reviewed the draft Campus Master Plan (dated October 10, 2000) and offer the following for consideration.

The programs and services provided by the ASUU will be impacted by expanded enrollment, an increase in the on campus residential population, and physical changes to the campus environment. Comments and recommendations regarding the Campus Master Plan draft are made with consideration of these issues.

Areas for revision, enhancement and/or inclusion of the ASUUU can be summarized into four categories:

1. University Union Programs & Services
2. Clubs & Organizations
3. Child Care
4. Campus Recreation

1. University Union Programs & Services
   - Incorporate elements from the University Union Master Plan, which recognize the student desire to continue growth in specific program areas such as Events, Films, Live Music, Recreation, Meeting Facilities, Informal Gathering Areas, Services, etc.  
   - Provide for physical expansion opportunity both at current location, and at possible satellites near new population centers and residential areas.  
   - Provide consideration of Crandall Gym facility as potential site for Union/Recreation satellite opportunity.  
   - Acknowledge ASUU need for facility expansion/development for student entertainment venue.  

2. Clubs & Organizations
   - Consider creation of formal and passive locations for student clubs and organizations to gather.  
   - Provide opportunity for large multi-purpose rooms for increased student club participation.

Child Care
   - Acknowledge opportunity for ASI childcare services to expand on site, and at alternative locations as faculty/staff/student housing is developed.

4. Campus Recreation
   - Allow for physical expansion opportunity both at current location, and at possible satellites near new population centers and residential areas.
• Provide consideration of Crandall Gym facility as potential site for Union/Recreation satellite opportunity.
• Provide specific language consistent with Sports Complex Operating Agreement delineating recreational field replacement as Athletic facilities are centralized at Sports Complex.
• Identify ASI role in development of new recreational sites to maximize economy of scale, staffing, and program delivery.
• Allow for support facilities in specific proximity to new site development.
Letter 35
Dr. Rick Johnson
Cal Poly ASI/UU

December 6, 2000

35-1 Commenter asks that the Master Plan incorporate UU program areas for expansion.

Response Text has been added to the Campus Instructional Core element on p. 111: “The UU planning process identified the need for expanded facilities and programs, both in the current location and elsewhere on campus.” In addition, the list of area studies in Chapter 7 refers to the “University Union and Student Services Plan.”

35-2 Commenter asks for flexibility for UU expansion at present and possible satellite locations.

Response Language added to Campus Instructional Core (above) reflects this request. In addition, Integration and Social Environment principles in this element recognize the need for dispersed activities (refer to p. 109).

35-3 Commenter asks for consideration of potential reuse of Crandall Gym for Union and/or Recreation activities.

Response A plan component has been added to the discussion of the Southwest area of the campus: “Renovation of Crandall Gym for possible additional instructional space and/or recreation and support activities.” See p. 122.

35-4 Commenter seeks acknowledgement of student entertainment facility needs.

Response These are addressed in the list of uses for primary campus activity center. (Refer to p. 111.)

35-5 Commenter reminds us that clubs and organizations need formal and informal space.

Response Text regarding this need now reads “space in student residential communities can accommodate formal and informal functions of student organizations closer to where students live” (p. 202).

35-6 Commenter also reminds us that clubs and organizations need multipurpose rooms.

Response Text under the principle of Flexibility for Support Activities and Services has been added to read: “This should include multi purpose rooms for student clubs and organizations” (p. 200).

35-7 Commenter asks that the Master Plan acknowledge the need to expand childcare and provide alternative child care locations.

Response Discussion of childcare in the Support Activities and Services element has been modified to read: “The revised diagrammatic illustration shows a site for expanding the Child Care Center at its present location. ASI may also explore additional child care facilities on
Commenter suggests that the Master Plan allow for expansion of recreation at its current location and near new residential areas.

Response The Recreation element addresses this need as part of the Proximity principle (p. 147) and in discussions of the potential reuse of Mott Gym (p. 152).

Commenter asks for consideration of potential reuse of Crandall Gym for Union and/or Recreation activities. (repeated comment).

Response Text has been added on p. 122 as noted above.

Commenter reminds us that the Sports Complex Operating Agreement calls for replacement of recreation fields with any consolidation of athletic facilities at the Sports Complex.

Response This issue is addressed by the Continuity principle (refer to p. 147).

Commenter encourages an explicit ASI role in the development and management of recreation sites to ensure that the planning process addresses operational considerations.

Response Text has been added, as follows: “As the organization responsible for managing student recreation programs, ASI should be involved in the design of new outdoor and indoor recreation facilities” (p. 153).

Commenter suggests that the Master Plan allow for expansion of recreation at its current location and near new residential areas (repeat comment).

Response As noted above, the Recreation element addresses this need as part of the Proximity principle (p. 147).
Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comments regarding impacts on Cheda Ranch

My review of the plan and DEIR focused primarily on the proposed modifications of the Cheda Ranch, a property that is the sole location of the Cal Poly Sheep Operations and Field Laboratory. Because of the recent reduction in acres available for maintaining the sheep operations from 450 down to 150, and because of increased enrollment in the Animal Science major, any further reductions in available laboratory space will have significant negative impacts on our ability to deliver the education that we promise our students. The two proposed actions that impact this ranch are the development of a research park on the northern side of the ranch, and the development of remote parking on acres adjacent to Stoner Creek Road. I believe that the planners have ignored the guidelines of the campus as well as CEQA when arriving at these proposals. It also becomes apparent that the drafters of this plan based their assumptions on outdated and inaccurate information. For lack of a better approach, I have noted comments regarding statements in the order they appear in the document. In my opinion, there is significant negative impact to both of these actions and mitigation would be more costly than alternative plans. Many of the comments below, drawn from the document, reinforce the mission of the University. I would submit that the actions proposed violate this mission.

Executive Summary - Consider the impacts of a research park and parking lots in light of the following

Page III - Lands provide hands-on opportunities for students.

Page IV - Plan is designed to meet educational needs particularly in science and technical fields.

Page V - Plan is designed to protect natural environment and ag lands that form the character of the campus.

Page VI - The map on this page indicates the areas suitable for ancillary activities and facilities (not education) - this includes a significant portion of the grazing lands of Cheda as well as the vineyard. The "remote parking options" are located on prime ag land. The rest of the ranch designated as "outdoor teaching and learning" includes a large number of acres, which is extremely steep and rocky and is used occasionally to pasture rodeo stock.

Page VIII - Outdoor teaching and learning are central to Cal Poly's mission and must remain integrated.
Page X - Describes "modest-sized" research park. What's modest - in relation to the site it is located?

Introduction - Consider the impacts of a research park and parking lots

Page two - University recognizes relationship between physical space and student learning/life - spirit of learning.

Page five - Prime ag lands were identified so that no development would be proposed.

Chapter 2

Pages 11 & 12 - Continued reference to learn by doing - hands on - importance of undergraduate learning.

Chapter 3

Page 35 - Some facilities will not require expansion with enrollment growth - example - college farm - How was this determination made?

There is no reference made in this or any other chapter about the impact of must higher fuel prices (which are certainly coming) on numbers of vehicles that need to be parked on campus.

Chapter 4

Page 41 - Although most of the Cheda Ranch is in the San Luis Creek watershed - the northern side is in the Chorro creek watershed.

Page 44 - Cheda ranch is listed at 447.8 acres. Of that, the portion that is fenced for sheep operations is 144. Approximately 20 acres is used by the Smith family for grazing. The majority of the acreage of Cheda is used to house Rodeo stock - it is extremely steep and unproductive. The report seems to suggest that because the sheep are at Cheda - that sheep operations control nearly 450 acres, so therefore, to lose 50 or 60 acres would not be significant.

Page 47 - Doesn't account for Nelson or Middlecamp reservoirs (or Frog Pond).

Page 51 - Doesn't show second Dairy Lagoon, Lagoon at BSEC, Nelson/Middlecamp reservoirs.
Page 52 - Clearly shows Stenner Creek Pastures (site for parking) as <5% slope.

Page 54 - All ag field lines are inaccurate - entire ranch has been re-fenced and re-planned since this map was drawn (mid 70's?).

Page 57 - Slope > 20% have greatly increased development costs. The area designated on the Goldtree side has slopes in excess of 20%.

Page 60 - Goldtree is suitable for development -- - Access?? Slope?? Ag land?

Chapter 5

Page 65 - Reference to "prime ag soils" and that plan retains all currently available prime ag soils for ag use (parking?).

Page 65-66 - Reference 10-minute walk to classes/labs - many ag labs - including Cheda currently exceed this.

Page 71 - Doesn't show approved access road from Stenner Creek road to the parking lot at Cheda.

Page 72 - Future land use at Cheda, Peterson, etc. will continue to be rural, focusing on outdoor teaching and learning.

Page 89 - Would suggest that all of Cheda is sheep unit - actually less than 1/2 is used by sheep.

Page 94 - Re-emphasis on maintaining ag lands.

Page 194 - Suggests competition for land between ancillary and teaching uses.

Page 195 - Describes 200 acres as being Goldtree - actual size of Goldtree pastures is <45 acres. Impression is created that the area is not currently being used in the educational program. This grazing area is used as much or more than any grazing area on campus for undergraduate education. Within the last year, ASCI - Range Management - Hellock, FNR (D. Piirto's class), Crop Science (Steinmaus, Patterson, Fountain), and BioSci have all used portions of the indicated Goldtree area to teach various facets of their classes. The site has been used for independent studies for both Senior Project and Masters Thesis. Of course, it is used on a daily basis as part of the resource management associated with sheep classes. Access at Stenner Creek would be highly improbable - both from HWY 1 as well as through the ranch itself.
Access at HWY 1 would require significant modifications to the highway and potential mitigation with the Men's Colony. 50-60 acres for research park and parking would reduce the sheep unit size by over 40%. The flock is already below critical mass to meeting teaching/research requirements. Further reductions will SIGNIFICANTLY impact education.

Chapter 6

Page 206 - Discusses introducing human impacts into open space - they suggest impacts less than significant. This plan places a research park in a field laboratory used by multiple departments - I consider that significant impact.

Cumulative grassland loss is less than significant - I consider the loss of over 1/3 of the grassland at Cheda significant. The increase of students at Cal Poly is insignificant when compared to the population of California - however, it is very significant when compared to the population at Cal Poly.

Ag Resources section - Prime ag land is referenced once again - with no impact (parking lots?)

Page 208 - There is no mention of traffic/circulation impacts at Cheda. No mention of impacts of development on Goldtree on wildlife (fox, coyote, deer, hawks, etc. etc.).

Page 221 - The County Ag and Open Space Element "avoid locating new public facilities outside urban and village reserve lines unless they serve a rural function or there is no feasible alternative" (research park on ag land?).

Page 280 - States that grassland loss will only be 1.5% of Cal Poly's - but this will be more than 35% of the grassland at Cheda - the only property set up to accommodate and manage sheep. Most of the grassland at Cal Poly is not readily accessible to most of the students for purpose of education.

Page 261 - Existing conditions "none of the projects proposed in the plan will result in development of prime farmland" (parking lots?)

State CEQA Guidelines consider impacts to ag resources significant if the project will: a)...b)...c) result in indirect conversion of ag land (converting rangeland into research park).
The traffic/parking impacts in this chapter never mention the traffic/parking impacts at Chacra and along Highway 1 in this area.

Page 313 - Section 15126(b) of CEQA - Significant irreversible environmental Changes include the conversion of ag land to non-ag land use.

It is my opinion that all of the above references point to the fact that the proposed plan would violate CEQA, the University’s Mission Statement, and previous agreements between CAGR and the University regarding ag land use. Furthermore, it would serve as a poor example for society, in that it promotes the idea of converting valuable and productive lands into a landscape that produces pollution, excessive runoff, and destroys habitat. No matter how extensive the plan, if it is based on outdated and inaccurate information, such as this plan is it can not be considered a viable document and should be rewritten.
Letter 36
Dr. Robert Rutherford
College of Agriculture, Animal Science

December, 2000

36-1 Commenter raises concern about suitability of Cheda Ranch area for ancillary activities and/or remote parking.

Response The commenter has raised several concerns regarding the appropriateness of developing ancillary activities in the Cheda Ranch area. As the head of the Sheep Unit, Dr. Rutherford is expressly concerned about the viability of the sheep operations. The Sheep Unit has been impacted by a number of changes on campus. The most significant was the recent moving of the entire unit from the location now occupied by the Sports Complex to the Cheda Ranch buildings, the former location of the Dairy Unit. In addition, sheep grazing pasture area has been reduced by the Sports Complex and expansion of the Horse Unit grazing requirements.

36-2 Commenter asks what does "modest-sized" research park mean?

Response Analysis for the DEIR considered a possible development of about 400,000 square feet of building plus parking. The comparison would be to like facilities developed at universities elsewhere.

36-3 Commenter asks how was the determination made that campus farm would not require expansion to serve more enrollment?

Response The College of Agriculture leadership has indicated that the college has facility capacity.

36-4 Commenter notes lack of reference to impact of fuel prices on number of automobiles.

Response See text addition regarding dependence on fossil fuels as a principle related to Alternative Transportation: “Less reliance on vehicles using internal combustion engines can also contribute to improving air quality and diminishing the use of fossil fuels” (p. 167). A new section on Sustainable Campus Planning and Design also notes “Alternative, renewable energy sources should be used to the greatest extent possible to offset growth in demand” (p. 163).

36-5 Commenter notes that Cheda Ranch is partially in Chorro Creek watershed.

Response See text change, p. 45. The clarification is appreciated.

36-6 Commenter notes misleading data on use of Cheda Ranch for sheep and rodeo stock.

Response The text has been modified to reflect the actual use by the Sheep unit, as follows: “The sheep unit and sheep operations occupy approximately 144 acres, or about one-third of Cheda Ranch, including some of the area known as Goldtree.” See text change, p. 93.

36-7 The commenter notes that reservoirs (Nelson and Middlecamp) are missing from the discussion.
Response  The text in the Existing Conditions chapter has been made more general, referring to “multiple reservoirs and ponds” (p. 49). Elsewhere, the base map has been changed to add missing reservoirs and ponds.

36-8  Commenter notes certain reservoirs and ponds missing from map

Response  The base map for Exhibit 4.5 and others has been modified to show additional water bodies.

36-9  Commenter notes on slope in areas shown for potential remote parking is less than 5%.

Response  Comment is noted.

36-10  Commenter notes that new fencing patterns have rendered Exhibit 4.8 out of date.

Response  It is recognized that the description of these facilities is in need of updating.

36-11  Commenter questions suitability of Goldtree area for development.

Response  Text to clarify the analysis of the Goldtree area has been added to the discussion of constraints and opportunities (pp. 64-65). “The northwest corner of Cheda Ranch includes an area known as Goldtree. Traditionally, this area has consisted of three fields (C62, C63, C64), totaling about 52 acres. In conducting feasibility studies for ancillary activities at a satellite location, the Master Plan team examined a slightly larger area (including fields C65 and part of C61, but excluding C64 as too steep) to determine which land might be more suitable, considering environmental, regulatory, cost and policy constraints. Based on soil type, slope, and current condition, the approximately 60-acre area shown on the detailed map was identified as most suitable for potential development, and became known as the Goldtree project area or site. It is close to the Union Pacific Railroad and has access to water, sewage treatment and electricity. Access could be provided from Highway 1 (perhaps from an improved intersection near the site or at Stenner Creek Road) and/or internally from Mount Bishop Road.”

36-12  Commenter suggests showing access from Stenner Creek Road to Cheda Ranch.

Response  Area is outside the base mapping. Detailed mapping needs to be extended to the rest of the campus area.

36-13  Commenter suggests clarifying future use of Cheda Ranch, in view of Goldtree discussions.

Response  The following text has been added to the discussion of Ancillary Activities and Facilities (p. 206). “The City and County of San Luis Obispo have supported a research partnership with Cal Poly through the California Central Coast Research Park (C3RP) task force. While a number of sites both on and off campus have been suggested over the years, the Master Plan explores the potential of an applied research park on campus. One possible site is in the Goldtree area. It is important to note that an applied research park on Cal Poly lands would focus on applied research and advanced development activity in support of the University’s academic mission, including applied research partnerships, “in technology, and business development. It is likely to be heavily involved in and dependent on technology – information technology, telecommunications, biotechnology, geographic information systems, visual imaging, etc. An applied research park would provide opportunities
for faculty professional development, internships for students, and employment for partners and spouses of faculty and staff. It could include business services (e.g., photocopying equipment, meeting rooms, and food service). However, it would not include activities often associated with business or industrial parks, such as professional offices or manufacturing (assembly) except as incidental to applied research and development.”

36-14 Commenter requests that the plan clarify use of Cheda Ranch by sheep operations.

**Response** As noted above, additional text has been provided in the Outdoor Teaching and Learning element (p. 93).

36-15 Commenter notes competition between ancillary activities and teaching.

**Response** Comment noted.

36-16 Commenter questions the suitability of Goldtree area for development given the extent of its current use.

**Response** As noted above, the text in Chapter 4, under the discussion of Constraints and Opportunities, has been added to analyze development potential at Cheda Ranch including the Goldtree area (p. 64).

36-17 Commenter questions determination of less than significant impact, regarding human use, loss of grassland, and prime agricultural land.

**Response** Valley grasslands consisting of species typical of pasture vegetation are not considered a sensitive plant community at the state or federal level, nor are they considered sensitive by CNPS. Therefore, the loss of this vegetative community is not considered a significant impact. This grassland is not supported by prime agricultural soils or other important farmland soils and its loss therefore does not constitute a significant impact under the significance thresholds given. However, the University can make a determination, outside of the realm of CEQA, as to the best use of these lands. Discussions are ongoing with CAGRLUC regarding this area.

36-18 Commenter requests that the plan add traffic and wildlife analysis for Cheda/Goldtree.

**Response** The eventual type of development at Goldtree and feasible access routes are not yet well understood. This information will be required to determine traffic impacts. Future environmental review and consultation with agencies such as CalTrans will determine impact significance.

Significant impacts to wildlife are limited to sensitive species; the loss of this grassland is not considered to pose a significant threat to the fecundity of sensitive species in the area; similar foraging habitat exists elsewhere on Cal Poly property and in surrounding areas.

36-19 Commenter questions the research park location, analysis.

**Response** Important in the policy cited is the condition “unless…there is no feasible alternative.” Goldtree has been chosen because of the importance of having campus facilities near the core, and the lack of available, unconstrained space, including areas that do not overlie
prime soils. A facility of that type is not essential to the function of the University and is too large to locate on campus.

36-20 Commenter expresses concern about grassland loss.

Response The College of Agriculture is currently pursuing opportunities to expand grazing in areas off-campus. The Master Plan’s commitment is to not develop new facilities without adequately replacing any that may be displaced. See the principle of Continuity in the Outdoor Teaching and Learning element (p. 97).

36-21 Commenter expresses concern about conversion of agricultural lands

Response Parking lots will not be located on prime agricultural land. Further, additional text on p. 195 explains that “If parking demand should require Cal Poly to consider using any of these locations, additional site analysis will be undertaken to determine the amount of land needed, the most appropriate site or sites, how access will be provided, the effect on circulation, how the parking area(s) would be secured, and how existing uses can be relocated.”

36-22 Commenter expresses concern about conversion of agricultural lands

Response The Master Plan policy is to not convert any Prime agricultural lands. There are some designated fields used by the College of Agriculture, which have been identified for development of housing, parking and other ancillary activities. None of these fields contain prime soils.
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BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following section outlines the resources present on Cal Poly land holdings and analyses potential impacts to these resources due to implementation of the Master Plan.

Existing Conditions

Cal Poly is surrounded by unique geologic and associated biological resources which enhance not only the setting but educational opportunities for students and researchers as well. Past biological investigations have been limited to classroom fieldwork and site-specific analysis completed as part of environmental review. The Biological Sciences department at Cal Poly is currently attempting to inventory the biological resources of Cal Poly lands. This effort will identify sensitive plants and animals and provide a larger picture of resources present. Some of this information is already available, and is contained in the following section. Other forthcoming information will be incorporated into future environmental review, where applicable, and will be part of the implementation of specific policies in the Master Plan.

Biological resources of Cal Poly were inventoried based on review of past investigations, searches of the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (Skipper and Pollock, 1994). Vegetation and habitat types were classified using California Vegetation (Hollands and Kolb, 1995). Sensitive plant and animal species are addressed separately in sections following the general vegetative and animal descriptions.

This subsection provides descriptions of each major vegetative community type present on campus. The common and characteristic plant species are provided for each.

Riverine and Open Water. The riverine/open water habitat of the main campus consists primarily of the cooling flow channel of Stennet Creek and Briones Creek, and adjacent drainages. Just south of the Chorro Creek Ranch, Chorro Creek provides open water habitats. Stream channels and all associated meadows, floodplains, drainages and riparian areas, are specifically addressed by the CDFG Code Section 1600-1603 (Streambed Alteration Agreements) and are considered Waters of the U.S. Waters of the U.S., including stream channels and wetlands, fall under the jurisdiction of the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Valley and Streamside Riparian Communities. The density of vegetation within riparian communities varies from open to nearly closed (Hollands, 1986). These habitats are typically located within seasonally flooded and saturated areas, or areas that are located close to ground water (Gwyer and Kerle-Wold, 1995). Dominant species within riparian communities require moist, bare mineral soil for germination and establishment (Hollands, 1986). Riparian communities are considered sensitive by CDFG and frequently qualify as wetland based on the USFWS wetland classification system (Cowan, 1979). In the campus area, dominant trees in riparian areas include willow (Salix spp.) and willow (Salix spp.)

Seasonal Freshwater Marsh/Seep. Freshwater seep communities are considered sensitive by CDFG, and are classified as palustrine persistent emergent and temporarily to intermittently flooded (USFWS wetland classification system). Vegetation and flora of wet meadow/freshwater seep communities is dominated primarily by a variety of low-growing hydrophytic (water-loving) species including rushes.

Habitat includes animals, etc., as well as plants. Where are the wild habitat west...
Freshwater Marsh. Freshwater marsh communities occur in slow moving, shallow freshwater streams, along the periphery of ponds and lakes, and in isolated areas where the water table is at or near the ground surface (Holland, 1962). In the campus area, these communities occur around the perimeters of the two reservoirs located in the northern portion of campus, and in scattered locations along the stream channel of Steiner and Breezocks Creeks. Vegetation of these communities consists primarily of bulrush (Scirpus spp.) with some occurrences of cattail (Typha spp.). Freshwater marsh habitats are considered sensitive habitats by CEQA and are classified as wetland according to the USFWS wetland classification system.

Valley Grassland. The major portion of grassland throughout California is dominated by native grasses that were introduced from the Mediterranean region during the Spanish Colonial period. Typical naturalized grass species occurring within Valley Grassland include wild oat (Avena fatua), slender wild oat (Avena barbata), soft grass (Bromus hordeaceus), tall grass (Bromus diandrus), forest blue (Hordeum marinum), and annual ryegrass (Lolium multiflorum). Other dominant species may include red-stemmed rye (Elymus canescens) and cattail sedge (Vulpia myuros). Native species present in these areas, generally at low density, include Hymenostachis nudaeflora, blue daisy (Dichelostemma capitatum), and clover (Trifolium repens).

California Native Beach Grassland. Typical dominant bunch grasses in this community are purple needlegrass (Nassella pulchra) and nodding needlegrass (Nassella cernua). Other dominant species may include slender needlegrass (Nassella linearis), stiff needlegrass (Anchusa aristata), rye (Secale cereale), and clover (Trifolium repens and three-awn (Aristida spp.).

Coastal Scrub. Occurring in more xeric areas, coastal scrub communities occupy sandstone, diatomite, and serpentine, relatively infertile parent material. The most dominant species in the coastal shrub understory are coyote bush (Baccharis pilularis), lemonade berry (Rhamnus ilicifolia), coffeeberry (Rhamnus californica), and poison oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum). Other dominant species include sugar sumac (Rhus ovata), laurel sumac (Oxydendrum laurifolium), California sagebrush (Artemisia californica) and bush clover (Lespedeza herbacea).

Coast Live Oak Woodland. One of the most xeric communities dominated by coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) is the coast live oak woodland community. These areas are dense and are often mixed evergreen forest. Other species found intermingled with coast live oak are California bay laurel (Umbellularia californica), big-leaf maple (Acer macrophyllum) and madrone (Arbutus menziesii). The understory of coast live oak woodland communities varies between grassland species and shrubs.

Eucalyptus Woodland. Eucalyptus woodland is typically represented by moderately dense stands of gum trees (Eucalyptus spp.). Plants in this genus, imported primarily from Australia, were originally planted in groves throughout many areas of coastal California as potential sources of lumber, for their use as windbreaks, and for their horticultural novelty. In areas where eucalyptus forms dense stands, growth of native plants within their immediate vicinity is usually completely inhibited.

Pastoral. Pastoral habitats have been disturbed by grazing. Vegetation generally consists of a mix of native and non-native woody species, similar to those mentioned for grasslands.

Ornamental Landscaping. Parking lots, building areas and other interior portions of campus are vegetated with a mix of native and ornamental plant species, including several species of Eucalyptus, Monterey pine, western sycamore, Japanese maple, wisteria, Persian pepper tree, and Brazilian pepper tree.

Ruderal Habitats. Ruderal habitats are those that have been significantly disturbed by construction, passenger or other landscape activities. In the campus area, ruderal habitats primarily occur along roadways and other surfaces. Characteristic plant species of ruderal habitats include milk thistle (Silybum marianum), tree tobacco (Nicotiana plumiflora), wild mustard (Brassica napus), sweet fennel (Pimpinella anisum), and wild radish (Raphanus raphanistrum).
Accuracy and completeness is insufficient.

The creeks support all three.

Vegetation fauna consists of shrimp, crabs, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and small fish. Ingested vegetation taxa are known to occur on or frequent aquatic lands and adjacent areas on a seasonal basis.

Riverine and Open Water. The streams of Sonoma and Suisun Creeks are expected to support important habitat for various aquatic and semiaquatic species of wildlife due to their sensitivity and substantial nursery value. Species common to peking and abundant within riparian vegetation. Species expected to occur in association with Sonoma and Suisun Creeks include various aquatic fish species such as three-spined stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus) and prickly sculpin (Cottus asper), and a variety of amphibians including Pacific chorus frog (Pseudacris regilla), western toad (Bufo boreas), and bullfrog (Rana catesbeiana). The creeks are expected to provide suitable habitat for the following semiaquatic species: eel (Anguilla rostrata (Cottus asper)), California red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytoni), and southwestern pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata plattii).

Vegetation and Foothill Riparian Communities. Riparian communities within the project area are expected to provide suitable habitat for a diverse assemblage of semiaquatic and terrestrial wildlife species. A variety of amphibians and reptile species, such as those identified as having potential to occur in association with Suisun Creek, would be expected to frequent riparian habitats such as those found within the project area. Other anuran species that would be expected to occur in, or frequent, riparian forest and scrub habitats of the project area include Pacific chorus frog (Pseudacris regilla), western toad (Bufo boreas), and bullfrog (Rana catesbeiana). Vegetation associated with riparian habitats of the project area is also expected to provide important nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat for a variety of migratory bird species.

Seasonal Freshwater Marsh/Seep. Wildlife inhabiting wet meadow/freshwater seep habitat is most likely limited to various amphibians such as Pacific chorus frog, Western toad, whiptail, and California slender salamander. Species of wildlife that would be expected to frequent wet meadow/freshwater seep habitats for foraging purposes include meadow voles (Microtus pennsylvanicus), gopher snake (Pituophis melanoleucus), and long-nosed rattlesnake (Crotalus atrox), as well as a variety of songbirds, including red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus) and song sparrow (Melospiza melodia).

Freshwater marsh. Freshwater marsh habitats provide escape, nesting, and roosting cover for a variety of mammals, birds, amphibians, and invertebrates (Oyler and Lauderdale, 1988). In addition, numerous birds and mammals commonly use these habitats for a source of water and food. Birds expected to occur in association with freshwater marsh habitats include American coot (Fulica americana), great blue heron (Ardea herodias), black-crowned night heron (Nycticorax nycticorax), great blue heron (Ardea herodias), and several gulls, as well as numerous other migratory bird species. In addition, a variety of warm water fishes, amphibians, and reptiles, such as the native southwestern pond turtle may occur within these habitats.

Valley Grassland. About 3,000 acres of valley grassland provide important habitat for a variety of wildlife species. Habitat is subject to sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata), white-milked (Atriplex confertifolia), and bluegrama (Bouteloua gracilis). Species commonly found in open grassland areas include Western meadowlark (Sturnella neglecta), sage thrasher (Zonotrichia leucophrys), and Black-tailed prairie chicken (Tympanuchus s. cupido). Rarely, white-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus townsendii), and pronghorn antelope (Antilocapra americana) may occur occasionally in open grassland habitats.

Native bunchgrass species found in this habitat area similar to those listed above for Annual Grassland.
Coastal Scrub.  Island coastal scrub supports a diversity of species similar to that for annual grasslands.  Island coastal scrub also provides nesting habitat for small birds and rodents.

Coast Live Oak Woodland.  Species found in this habitat are similar to those listed above for annual grassland.

Eucalyptus Woodland.  Eucalyptus woodland may provide suitable nesting sites for various birds or prey including the barred owl (Strix varia), barn owl (Tyto alba), and red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis).  In addition, areas such as these often provide roosting and hunting perches for a variety of reptiles.  Portion of coastal Live Oak Woodland may also be used for roosting, nesting, or as cover by monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus).

Recreational and Natural Habitats provide foraging areas similar to that found in grassland areas, above.

Ornamental Landscaping.  Wildlife present in landscaped areas is limited; rodents and songbirds may use denser areas for foraging.

Rural Habitats.  Rural communities typically provide little habitat value for wildlife.  However, some reptiles, such as western fence lizards, as well as a variety of songbirds frequent rural habitats for foraging purposes.

Sensitive Species and Habitats

Special-status species are plants and animals that are listed as either endangered or threatened under the Federal or California Endangered Species Act, or are covered under the California Native Plant Protection Act.  They may also be considered rare or not normally listed by resource agencies, professional organizations (e.g., Audubon Society, CDFG, The Wildlife Society), and the scientific community.  For the purposes of this project, special-status species are defined as shown in Table 6-4.

The CDFG uses the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) to document occurrences of special-status species.  The CNDDB also includes information on a number of plant species prepared by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS).  To determine which special-status species are likely to occur on campus, CMC conducted a literature survey and database search of the CNDDB.  Based on information obtained through the CNDDB search and review of existing literature, a preliminary list was compiled of sensitive plant and animal taxa that are known or have potential to occur on campus.  The common and scientific names, legal status, and preferred habitats of all special-status plant and animal taxa with potential to occur on University-owned lands are presented below in Table 6-4 for special-status plant species and Table 6-5 for special-status wildlife species.  The distribution, preferred habitats, and known occurrences of special-status species that were determined to potentially occur within or fragment the project site, based on the presence of suitable habitat, are discussed in the following sections.

Table 6-4: Definitions of Special-Status Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special-Status Plant Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17.12 for listed plants and various codes in the Federal Register for proposed species).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants that are Category 1 candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (55 CFR 6194, February 21, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants that meet the definitions of rare or endangered species under the CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants considered by the CNPS to be &quot;rare&quot; threatened,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special-Status Animal Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17.11 for listed animals and various notices in the Federal Register for proposed species).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals that are Category 1 candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (54 CFR 554).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals that meet the definitions of rare or endangered species under the CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal’s listed or proposed for listing by the State of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6. Special Status Plant Species and Communities with Potential to Occur on Cal Poly Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Federal/State/CNPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoovers honeysuckle</td>
<td>Aquilegia hooveri</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dielder's Mariposa Lily</td>
<td>Calochortus dielderi var. dielderi</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis mariposa lily</td>
<td>Calochortus obliquus</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambria Morning Glory</td>
<td>Calochortus suberosus var. epicarpus</td>
<td>C1/C1/B</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo Sage</td>
<td>Carrisia oblongata</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer's pinewax</td>
<td>Chorizema breweri</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chusar Creek dual daisy</td>
<td>Chrysothamnus var. oblongata</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis serpentine duffle</td>
<td>Dufouria abramsii var. serpentina</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis duffle</td>
<td>Dufouria abramsii var. marina</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockman's duffle</td>
<td>Dufouria blockmanii var. blockmanii</td>
<td>C1/C1/B</td>
<td>C1/C1/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito Strawberry</td>
<td>Fragaria viridis</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad's thistle</td>
<td>Hymenopappus conradii</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Lake</td>
<td>Liatris paniculata</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Leaved Limantia</td>
<td>Lomatium parvifolium</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privet's Yarrow</td>
<td>Pediadis paniculata</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Pinole</td>
<td>Sanicula maritima</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Glass checkerspot</td>
<td>Salvia checkerspot var. maritima</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattlesnake weed</td>
<td>Senecio sphagnus</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
<td>-/-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitive Habitats/Communities

1. Serpentine Bunchgrass
2. Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh
3. Wet Meadow/ Freshwater Seep

Sensitive Habitats/Communities

Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh. Freshwater marsh is discussed above under "Vegetation."
Wet Meadow/ Freshwater Sphagnum moss is discussed above under "Vegetation" as wetland.

Serpentine Bunchgrass: Areas of serpentine bunchgrass are located east of the main and extended campus. Vegetation is similar to that discussed under "Vegetation" on native bunch grassland. Locally, serpentine soils may also support a range of sensitive plant species including Dudleya and San Luis Obispo sedge. Species found on these soils are adapted to low nutrient content and high levels of usually harsh parent materials.

Sensitive Plant Species

Hesperis filifolia: Hesperis filifolia is a perennial grass occurring within dry sandy substrates of chaparral, chionoideae woodland, and valley foothill grassland (Skinner and Pavlik, 1994). Hesperis filifolia was not documented by the NDBR as occurring on campus.

Club-Mossed Mariposa Lily is a bulb-forming lily that produces one or two strap-shaped green leaves in early spring. These begin to wither by the time the plant flowers in May or June. The flowers are cup-shaped with three narrow, yellow-green sepals and three oblong, yellow petals marked by jagged, transverse purple-brown bands across the inner face. Each petal bears a rounded, depressed nectary toward the base surrounded by club-shaped yellow hairs. The stamens are large and purple. After the flowers wither the ovary develops into a slender, banded capsule with many dark seeds. The plant is generally completely dry by late summer. The dry remains can be identified by the shape of the capsule. Only the bulbs and seeds remain alive until the next growing season.

This species is restricted to San Luis Obispo County and Santa Barbara County in the western portion of the Coast Ranges, mostly on soils derived from serpentine parent material. In San Luis Obispo County, it is known from several locations in the Santa Lucia and San Luis Ranges. Four other rare subspecies occur to the north and south of subspecies filifolia. It is known from several sites in the area.

San Luis Mariposa Lily: San Luis mariposa lily generally occurs within chaparral habitats of San Luis Obispo County, but may also be found in coastal rangeland and valley foothill grassland habitats within San Luis Obispo County (Hickman, 1993; Skinner and Pavlik, 1994). Within these habitats, this species primarily occurs in dry, serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993). San Luis mariposa lily has been documented north of the Cal Poly campus on hillsides located adjacent to Sycamore Creek (NDBR, 1996).

Calyxine morning glory is a perennial herb with trailing or sometimes woody climbing stems. It has alternate, broadly triangular leaves that are minutely hairy. The cream-colored, funnel-shaped flowers are produced from April to July. After the flowers wither, the plant develops small, dry capsules with dark seeds. By late summer, the aboveground parts of the plant are completely dry and only seeds and an underground rosette persist through the dry season. The plant is difficult to identify in the dry season because the dry parts change.

Calyssana subaqua is a species that is present known only from San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara County, in San Luis Obispo County ranges from the Hearst Ranch in the northeastern corner of the county south to the vicinity of San Luis Obispo where it usually occurs in coastal cliffs with clayey soils often in association with serpentine parent material.

San Luis Obispo Sedge: San Luis Obispo sedge is a perennial herb that occurs in coastal scrub, coastal sage, and coastal sage chaparral. It is a critically endangered forest community. San Luis Obispo sedge is threatened by grazing. San Luis Obispo sedge primarily occurs in dry, serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993).

Brewer’s Spindletop: Brewer’s spindletop is an annual herb known from twenty occurrences in San Luis Obispo. This species occurs in coastal scrub, clumped grasslands, coastal sage, and coastal sage chaparral. Brewer’s spindletop primarily occurs in dry, serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993).

Chorro Creek bog thistle: Chorro Creek bog thistle is a perennial herb that grows in San Luis Obispo. This species is known in fewer than ten occurrences and primarily in serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993). Chorro Creek bog thistle
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Thistle occurs in chaparral and coastal woodland communities and is threatened by grazing, development and proposed water diversions.

San Luis serpentine dudleya. San Luis serpentine dudleya is a perennial herb located in chaparral, valley and foothill grasslands and coastal scrub communities. This species is known in fewer than ten occurrences and grows primarily in serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993).

San Luis Obispo Dudleya. Dudleya is a succulent perennial herb with a thick, fleshy rosette. It produces a dense cluster of narrow, fleshy, leaves with a dull, greenish coloration. In late spring clusters of greenish-colored, bell-shaped flowers are produced on stalks arising from the rosettes. The ovaries of these flowers mature to clusters of tiny, dry seeds that split open and release many dry seeds. These plants are very difficult to recognize during the dry season.

Dudleya abramsii ssp. marina is endemic to San Luis Obispo County and it is apparently limited to many serpentine soils and serpentine rock outcrops. Its range is limited to the hills bordering the San Luis Valley in the foothills of the Santa Lucia Mountains from Chorro Creek to Coon de Piedra Creek and in the San Luis Range from upper Pfeiffer Canyon to the Round Rock Ranch and the hills south of Broad Street.

Blackman's Dudleya. Blackman's dudleya is a perennial herb located in Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties. This species is known from fewer than twenty occurrences in California and thrives in coastal bluff scrub, valley and foothill grassland and coastal scrub communities with rocky, clay or serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993).

San Benito fritillary. San Benito fritillary is a perennial herb located in San Luis Obispo. This species lives in chaparral communities and serpentine soils (Hickman, 1993). Vehicles and expansion of mining threaten the San Benito fritillary.

Coulter's Zephyr. Coulter's zephyr is an annual herb that occurs primarily in seasonally wet grassland communities consisting of saline soils. (Hickman, 1993). This subspecies is documented by the NDDB as occurring in grassland communities located within the Chorro and Los Osos Valley, and near Laguna Lake. Due to the absence of suitable habitats within the project area, it is unlikely that this species occurs within the project area.

Jona Jepria. Jona Jepria is an annual herb that is found in chaparral and grassland communities. Within these communities, this species occurs primarily on open serpentine or clay slopes. (Hickman, 1993) Based on review of the NDDB, the closest documented occurrence of this species to the project area are along the bases of Carun Mountain and Bishop's Peak, approximately four and two miles away, respectively (NDDB, 1990).

Small-Leafed Yarrow is a spring-flowering perennial herb with a slender, woody rootstock. Leaves are produced through beginning in March or April and flowering generally begins in April and may continue into June. The smooth green leaves have expanded, toothed bases and blades divided into many segments. The small yellow flowers are borne in flat-topped clusters up to 5 inches across. The flattened, dry fruits are often tinged with purple and have membranous wings. The mature fruit clusters shatter during the summer at the leaves' centers. By mid-summer the above-ground parts of the plants are completely dry. The old fruiting stems may persist in identifiable condition during the drought season.

Lomatium pumilum occurs from San Mateo County to Santa Barbara County in the western portion of the Coast Range, mostly on soils derived from serpentinite parent material. It is known from several sites in the San Luis Obispo area.

Adobe Yarrow is a perennial herb that arises from a deeply buried tuber. In the spring, one or two basal leaves are produced from the tuber. The basal leaves often wither before the flower stalks are produced. Stiff, erect flowering stems rise to late spring or early summer. The few leaves become progressively smaller and less divided up the stem. The small white flowers are borne in a flat-topped cluster that is elevated above the leaves. After the
paks have fallen, the ovary develops into small, 2-seeded dry fruits that shatter when the plants dry up in summer. Old dry fruit clusters may occasionally be recognized through the dry season.

Psoralea pandurata is known to occur in coastal locations from Monterey to Los Angeles counties and in the interior from Nevada to Kern counties. In San Luis Obispo County it has been documented from a few widely scattered locations—serpentine soils in the vicinity of San Luis Obispo, from dry hills east of Creston, and the summit of the Caliente Range.

Adobe Walltie. Adobe walltie is a perennial herb that occurs within a variety of communities including, chaparral, coastal sage, wet meadows, and valley foothill grassland. Within these communities, the adobe walltie occur primarily on serpentine-derived soils or soils with a high clay content (Skinner and Pechol, 1994). This species is also often found along the margins of salt marshes. Within the San Luis Obispo Quadrangle, the adobe walltie is documented by the NODB as occurring on slopes associated with Cerro Romualdo, approximately 4 miles away (NODB, 1996).

Cuesta Pass checkerboard, Cuesta Pass checkerboard is a perennial herb known from only three occurrences on the Cuesta Ridge in Los Padres National Forest. This species lives in closed-cone conifer forest and serpentine soils (Hickman, 1992).

Raysless Tansy, Senecio inmphicus occurs in ventral damp openings in low elevation coastal scrub on the mainland from Sonoma County south to northern Baja California, and on Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz, and Santa Catalina Islands. In San Luis Obispo County, it is known from the vicinity of San Luis Obispo where it occurs mostly on serpentine-derived soils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status Federal/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datura decipiens</td>
<td>FT/SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaura aurantiaca</td>
<td>FT/SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clematis mascouia</td>
<td>FT/SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenothera evansii</td>
<td>FT/SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco columbarius</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butor aera</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter cooperi</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter gentilis</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus cyaneus</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaus corynus</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquila cupreata</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularis</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter velox</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astralus gracilis</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene tristis</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Status Wildlife Species

Based on review of NODB documentation, other pertinent literature, and results of the field surveys, the following special-status animals were determined to potentially occupy or frequent the campus and creeks. The species present are listed in Table 66. The habitats and known distributions of the special-status wildlife species identified as occurring on Cal Poly property are described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status Federal/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Kestrel</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Harrier</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-crowned Kite</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Squirrel</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrowed Owl</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggerhead Skunk</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend's Western Dungaree</td>
<td>SCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many more bird species occur here than

White is yellow now.
Monarch Butterfly. Overwintering habitat for the Monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus) is considered sensitive by the CDFG. Monarch butterflies typically use dense Eucalyptus stands for this purpose.

California Red-legged Frog. The California red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytoni) prefers aquatic habitats with little or no flow, the presence of surface water to at least early June, surface water depth of at least 2.5 feet, and the presence of fairly steady underwater supports such as cattails (Federal Register 59(23): 46881). The largest densities of this subspecies are typically associated with dense stands of overhanging vegetation and/or overgrown fringe of emergent vegetation (Federal Register 59(23): 46881).

Southwestern Pond Turtle. The southwestern pond turtle (Clemmysmarmorata pulchra) prefers quiet waters of ponds, small lakes, streams, and marshes. It is found to inhabit the largest and deepest pools along streams with large amounts of basking sites, including fallen trees and boulders. Pond turtles also congregate in areas of streams with abundant underwater cover or piles of coveys beneath the water surface such as undercut banks, piles of rocks, and submerged logs (Hanse, 1994).

Western Pond Turtle. Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) are known as the anadromous form of rainbow trout. Steelhead have been documented as occurring in Stoner and Bristlehead Creeks (CDFG, 1973). Optimal habitat for steelhead can be generally characterized by clear, cool, water with abundant benthos and riparian cover and relatively stable stream flow (Ralph et al, 1994).

Merlin. The merlin (Falco columbarius) is a winter migrant throughout the western portion of the state in grassland to woodland habitats, but does not breed in California. Audubon Society, 1994). The Merlin may occasionally occur on campus in Annual Grassland and riparian scrub habitats during the winter months.

Ferruginous Hawk. Wintering habitat for the ferruginous hawk (Buteo regalis) is considered sensitive by CDFG. The ferruginous hawk is an uncommon winter resident and migrant along the Coast Ranges and in San Luis Obispo County (Audubon Society, 1994). This species does breed in California. Foraging habitat for the Ferruginous Hawk includes open, dry terrain such as grasslands and scrub. This hawk may occasionally use Annual Grassland habitats on campus for foraging during the winter months.

Cooper's Hawk. The nesting lifstage of the Cooper's hawk (Accipiter cooperii) is considered sensitive by CDFG. This species is an uncommon resident and winter visitor through most of San Luis Obispo County. Suitable foraging habitat occurs within Annual Grassland habitats on campus.

Sharp-shinned Hawk. The nesting lifstage of the sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus) is considered sensitive by CDFG. This species is an uncommon resident and winter visitor within San Luis Obispo County (Audubon Society, 1994). Winter foraging habitat for sharp-shinned hawk may occur within Annual Grassland.

Northern Harrier. The nesting lifstage of the northern harrier (Circus cyaneus) is considered sensitive by CDFG. This species is a common resident and winter winter within much of San Luis Obispo County (Audubon Society, 1994). The northern harrier nests on the ground near freshwater and salt marshes. Open areas, such as grasslands and coastal shrub, provide foraging habitat for this species. Potential nesting habitats for the northern harrier occur adjacent to the two reservoirs and suitable foraging habitat occurs in grassland communities.

White-tailed Kite. The nesting lifstage of the White-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus) is considered sensitive by CDFG. This species is an uncommon resident and winter visitor throughout California. Nests are typically constructed in trees or shrubs with dense foliage. This species is considered an uncommon resident of most of San Luis Obispo County. Suitable nesting habitat occurs within Annual Grassland, while suitable foraging habitat may occur within large open fields and other tall grasslands.

Golden Eagle. The nesting lifstage and wintering habitat for the golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos) is considered sensitive by CDFG. This species is an uncommon, permanent resident and migrant throughout California and...
San Luis Obispo County. Habitats include oak woodlands, coastal scrub communities, and open grassland. Nests are constructed on cliffs and in large trees in open areas. Suitable foraging habitat for the golden eagle occurs throughout Annual Grassland.

Willow Flycatcher. The nesting strategy of the willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii) is considered sensitive by COFG. Within San Luis Obispo County, the species is documented as a rare but regular spring transient and an uncommon fall migrant (Audubon, 1994). Appropriate habitat for willow flycatcher breeding, in the form of dense willow-dominated riparian vegetation.

Burying Beetle. The burying owl (Nebria brevicollis) is documented as an uncommon-to-common permanent resident of the interior valleys and plains of San Luis Obispo County, and an uncommon winter visitor to the coastal regions of the county (Audubon Society, 1994; Moreau Group, 1994). This species is primarily associated with extensive grassland habitats and agricultural areas, and is typically dependent on existing burrows of other mammals.

Loggerhead Shrike. The loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus) occurs in lowlands and foothills throughout most of California. This species is considered a common resident of most of San Luis Obispo County (Audubon Society, 1994). Preferred habitats for loggerhead shrike include woodland, chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and grassland with perches such as fences, posts, and scattered trees. This species has been observed foraging on campus.

Tricolored Blackbird. The tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor) occurs in flocks within grasslands and freshwater marsh habitats containing canals and pools (Robbins et al., 1983). This species is considered an uncommon resident of San Luis Obispo County (Audubon Society, 1994). Tricolored blackbirds have been observed near Shepard and Smith Reservoirs.

Townsend’s Western Bighorn Sheep and Bald Eagle. The Townsend’s western bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis newberryi) and bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) live in a variety of communities throughout California, including coastal conifer and broadleaf forests, oak and conifer woodlands, and grasslands. Both Townsend’s Western Bighorn Sheep and Bald Eagles typically roost in caves and structures, and forage in grassland habitats. Suitable foraging habitat for these species occurs within grassland habitats.

Regulations and agencies governing biological resources in the campus area are described below.

Draft Environmental Impact Report 256
Dr. Roger Gambs  
Biology Department  

December, 2000  

37-1 Dr. Gambs was requested to comment on the wildlife portion of the administrative draft of the EIR. He identified several important omissions and errors in this early version of the document.  

Response Corrections were made to the EIR to incorporate many if not all of Dr. Gambs comments. These were included in the public review Draft EIR and therefore need not be elaborated here.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:

I hope you will take these into consideration when revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

FROM: Sarah Brown
Name: Sarah Brown
Address: 411 Foothill #45
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Comment

In dealing w/ such a confined space to build the new dorms it seems rather silly to build "student apartments" that do not use space efficiently. In an attempt to use as little extra land as possible, it seems more environmentally "smart" to create dorms that pack students in an high rise style of buildings.

This same line of thought should be followed by additional buildings on campus... don't build any more one story buildings. Build up instead of out!
Letter 38

Ms. Sarah Brown

December 4, 2000

38-1 Commenter suggests development on campus should go “up and not out” utilizing taller buildings instead of greater land area.

Response The Master Plan has been designed to maintain a compact instructional core to reduce the need to “sprawl” into undeveloped areas of campus, or into Outdoor Teaching and Learning areas. See specific policies and discussion in the Outdoor Teaching and Learning chapter. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis.
Public Comment on 11/5/00 by:

Scott Cooke, resident and homeowner
3490 Sequoia St
SLO, CA 93401

RE: Water Supply

As a 40-year resident of SLO, I have seen an adequate water supply for the City of SLO become so crucial during several drought seasons that consumption had to be controlled by the city. The City Council is currently struggling with how to address the fact that demand will exceed supply again during these unpredictable periods. Currently there is no construction project underway to increase the supply.

Since Cal Poly is under these same constraints, the Environmental Impact Report must, in my personal opinion, carefully address in a detailed, documented manner the adequacy of supplies to cover the student, faculty, staff, and auxiliary impacts to our local water supply. This high priority issue for the City of SLO should be re-visited by Cal Poly before approving this Master Plan (Plan). The Plan should document the campus actual steps to addressing a major drought.

The Plan indicates the most recent usage figure of 1,288 AF/Y (1997-1998). With the plan’s usage estimate for the Sports Complex at 129 AF/Y, a total of 1,357 AF/Y would have been reached back then which essentially equals the campus allotment of 1,384 AF/Y from Whale Rock Dam. These figures would suggest the limit is already being approached.

I fully support the need for Cal Poly to increase its student enrollment, but I do not have a background in water supply management to allow me to adequately address this topic. I, therefore, ask that you work closely with the City’s staff on this specific issue. Also, ensure that the Plan includes a timeline for bringing on board additional water supplies (e.g., wastewater for Sports Complex) before the enrollment increases occur, or Cal Poly will most assuredly suffer an image of not being a good neighbor when water supply problems arise.

Thanks for your interest in the feedback.
Letter 39  
Scott Cooke  

November 30, 2000  

39-1 Commenter describes in detail concerns regarding Cal Poly’s water supply especially during drought and vis-à-vis the City’s water supply.

Response  Cal Poly derives its water from groundwater sources and through surface water entitlements. For domestic (non-agricultural) use, the University owns entitlement to 33% of the water in Whale Rock Reservoir or approximately 13,707 acre-feet. This amount is not available for continuous consumption because a certain level of water must be maintained in the reservoir to avoid a deficit.

The City of San Luis Obispo, which shares the reservoir with Cal Poly, has developed a computer model that assigns allowable yearly withdrawals based on worst-case weather cycle conditions. The model shows that during the 27-year cycle from 1942-1969, approximately 1,384 acre-feet per year (AF/Y) would have been available to the University, and would have drained Cal Poly’s allocation during that 27-year period. This allocation does not account for losses due to sedimentation of the reservoir over time; however, this loss of capacity is relatively minor (estimated 2 AF/Y) and has not been documented. This remains a very conservative lower limit on consumption. The City of San Luis Obispo’s water use from Whale Rock regularly exceeds their worst-case allocation.

Water from Whale Rock reservoir is treated at the Stenner Canyon water treatment facility owned and operated by the City of San Luis Obispo. A portion of the entitlement is diverted prior to treatment for use in landscape and turf irrigation. Peak treatment capacity has been recently expanded to 16 million gallons per day (mgd). Since water is conveyed to the University through the City’s treatment plant and distribution system, the actual source of drinking water arriving at the campus may be either Whale Rock Reservoir or Salinas Reservoir. No matter the source, Cal Poly’s allotment is still based upon its Whale Rock share.

Agricultural operations on campus derive their water from a number of sources, depending on location. Untreated Whale Rock water is supplied to the Sports Complex, and all agricultural operations east of Mount Bishop Road, via the reservoir system on campus. Agricultural operations west of Mount Bishop Road are supplied by groundwater, namely two shallow wells fed by Stenner Creek. Agricultural operations on the Chorro Creek watershed ranches are supplied by three groundwater wells. The University’s understanding and documentation of their water supply is limited to their allocation from Whale Rock; none of the groundwater supplies have been documented.

The Sports Complex EIR placed total agricultural allocations at 900 AF/Y because it assumed 449 AF/Y of Whale Rock water was allocated specifically for irrigation and 450 AF/Y was available from other sources. Cal Poly does not currently allocate Whale Rock water in this fashion. Therefore, domestic and agricultural water users compete equally for Whale Rock water. Other sources, as mentioned above, have not been documented, although the well have never run dry or hampered agricultural operations. For the purposes of this EIR, analysis is limited to impacts on the Whale Rock supply, as it is the only known quantity. It is strongly suggested that Cal Poly study their total agricultural water supply prior to expansion or intensification of irrigated agricultural operations.
In recent years, use of Whale Rock water has been split almost equally between agricultural and domestic users. The following table illustrates this division.

**Table 24. Use of Water From Whale Rock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total AF</th>
<th>Percentage/AF Domestic</th>
<th>Percentage/AF Agricultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>52%/587</td>
<td>48%/544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>57%/525</td>
<td>43%/393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>63%/552</td>
<td>37%/272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ed Johnson, Cal Poly Facilities Planning

Current (2000) domestic water use by the University (for non-agricultural purposes) is 587 AF/Y, and agricultural use is currently 544 AF/Y, including the sports complex. The housing project will add 56 AF/Y, for a total of 1,187 AF/Y. Water demand varies considerably; records have shown total consumption as high as 1,130 AF/Y (1999-2000), and as low as 792 AF/Y (1992-1993). The year 1999-2000 is considered the worst-case scenario for the purposes of this analysis.

Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo are currently working on a project to recycle wastewater for irrigation of the Sports Complex. The development of this system would reduce demands on the domestic system, which is currently irrigating the Complex at a rate of approximately 73 AF/Y.

The Master Plan is expected to result in an additional 3,000 student residents and 465 additional faculty and staff. The Plan will also result in approximately eleven acres of additional recreational fields, and approximately nine acres of green space (non-athletic turf). Water demand factors from apartment-style housing facilities at the University of California Santa Barbara campus were used to project water demand in the residence halls. City and County water demand factors were used to calculate staff (office) demand. Water demand for landscape irrigation was based on current per acre usage at the University. Total projected demand, compared with existing use and the University’s total domestic Whale Rock water allocation is summarized in Table 6.25 below.

---

6 These last two figures were adjusted to include the anticipated 129 A F/Y from the Sports Complex, which was under construction at the time of this analysis, and the Student Housing Project, which was being permitted.
### Table 6.25: Master Plan (Current + Future) Estimated Whale Rock Water Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Water Factor</th>
<th>Demand (AF/Y)</th>
<th>Total Water Usage (AF/Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Usage (Agricultural, Domestic, and Sports Complex)</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Project</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Usage under the Master Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Resident Students (Apartments, Landscaping + Laundry)</td>
<td>3,000 persons</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Staff/Faculty</td>
<td>465 persons</td>
<td>20 gpd</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Recreation Fields</td>
<td>11 acres</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Greenspace (Lawns)</td>
<td>9 acres</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Facilities (Off campus – estimate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Master Plan Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,557</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Worst-case) Supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,384</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Water Entitlement (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(173)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ed Johnson, Utilities Coordinator, Cal Poly, 2000 and City of San Luis Obispo

City of San Luis water supply models show that during worst-case weather cycle conditions, Cal Poly demand would exceed supply. During normal rain years, it is likely that considerably more water would be available to Cal Poly.
Bonnie Lowe /cpslo,employee 11/22/2000 7:27

MESSAGE
Subject: Cal Poly Master Plan comments
Sender: Scott Steinmaus /cpslo,employee

Item 1
TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo,employee
FROM: Scott J. Steinmaus /cpslo,employee

Item 2
AKPA MESSAGE HEADER

Item 3

Linda Dalton presented the latest version of the Master Plan at our advisory council meeting Fri Nov. 17.

I applaud all the consideration to alternative transportation. Cal Poly is so close to obtaining that "college community feel" that existed at UC Davis (where I obtained my BS and PhD). The automobile (and truck) has really taken away from our campus environment. Cal Poly is currently a commuter campus, and it does NOT have to be that way. Students (and faculty) living within a couple of miles of campus could really boost the quality of their lives by joining the community on bike or bus.

A couple of additional comments:

1. One hinderance for riding bicycles: too frightening on San Luis Obispo city streets and Cal Poly campus roadways. Too many folks driving way too fast for the safety of those around them.

   One solution: provide bike thoroughfares through campus that are isolated from traffic.

   Another solution: reduce traffic on main campus

   Yet another: facilitate a bike path that follows the railroad corridor from Orcutt road to the Cal Poly campus.

   And another: provide incentives for alternative transportation by providing a 25 day free car parking pass for faculty who find alternatives per quarter and the same pass for students but on a per year basis.

2. We need to preserve the neighborhoods around campus in an attempt to keep them from becoming the "student ghetto" that Hathaway/California, sections along Grand, and the streets off Highland have become. These neighborhoods are an absolute disgrace and reflect directly on this campus.

   Solution: push heavily to develop new student housing in the proposed locations, and do it quickly. The additional housing needs to accommodate more than the projected studentbody increases. Students are CURRENTLY having serious problems finding housing. Multistory housing near campus so nobody needs to drive is clearly the solution.

3. Solving the parking issues on campus will likely involve developing remote parking with shuttles. Crop Science has labs that require us to be in the fields (Field 23, 24, vineyard at Baker's Acres) every week. Remote parking would make it difficult to get out to the fields.

   Solution: if a shuttle system has already been developed for remote parking, then we could use same shuttles to help us get from main campus to the fields. This would be a fantastic solution because we already have problems with too many students driving by themselves out to the field. A shuttle system (enough to carry 50 people) running to the fields at 8am, noon, and 3PM and running back to campus at 10:45AM, 2:45, and 5:45PM would meet our needs perfectly.

You might think that I am an old crotchety prof. that loves complaining about how things are not as they used to be. Yes, I am a prof. and I'm
crouchily but I am in my 30's. I have seen how college campuses have done away with a reliance on the automobile and how they have addressed their housing needs, and Cal Poly is not one of them...BUT IT CAN BE. I simply want to improve the quality of life for everybody on the Cal Poly campus.

Dr. Scott J. Steinmaus
Crop Science Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
(805) 756-5142 office
sstevens@calpoly.edu e-mail
Commenter raises concerns for the ability to commute via bicycle to campus. He notes specifically that city streets and campus ways are unsafe for bicycles. He suggests bike thoroughfares on campus, reducing traffic on campus, a bike path along the railroad corridor, and alternative transportation incentives.

Response Detailed bicycle planning will be included in the implementation programs of the Master Plan.

Commenter suggests the need to prevent “student ghettos” near campus and offers that additional housing on campus is the solution.

Response Cal Poly is currently developing 800 new beds on campus for current demand. Cal Poly will develop an additional 3,000 beds on campus to house all new enrollment. Cal Poly is in planning for the development of approximately 200-250 faculty and staff housing units to be located on Highway 1 just off campus.

Commenter suggests the utility of campus shuttles extending to aid Crop Science students accessing relatively remote labs.

Response A shuttle program has been recognized by the College of Agriculture as a positive step towards improving the efficiency and convenience of their course offerings.
Bonnie Lowe /cpslo, employee1  11/22/2000 11:38  Page 1

MESSAGE  Dated: 11/22/2000 at 11:31
Subject: Campus Master Plan Pedestrian Friendly.
Sender: Samuel Aborne /cpslo, student2

Item 1

To: Bonnie J. Lowe /cpslo, employee1

Item 2

Bonnie,

This is from an e-mail I received from Simon Robertshaw.

1. Closing one of the roads that connects perimeter road and highland.
   I am inclined to argue that the road by campus market would be the best
to shut down. I realize that those temporary parking spots would
have to be relocated, and a stop sign could be removed.... Also, it
could be quite nice to
   spruce up the closed road and make it pedestrian friendly, for instance
   have the
   OH club turn it into a garden, or hold a campus farmer's market there on
   tuesdays from 11 to noon. I see a lot of potential for this road, should it be closed to thru traffic. I think
   that this road closure would also be consistent with what I know of the
   master plan. this whole notion of pedestrian friendly is rather
   intriguing...
Letter 41

Simon Robertshaw

November 22, 2000

41-1 Commenter suggests that Via Carta from Highland to North Perimeter should be closed to all but pedestrians. He further suggests that the area be made into a garden and hold a Farmer’s Market. Commenter is intrigued by the notion of “pedestrian friendly.”

Response The Master Plan (see Campus Pedestrian System in the Circulation section of chapter five) recommends just such a treatment of Via Carta from the Rec Center to Highland Drive. The specifics of the design of this pedestrian promenade will be part of the implementation phase of the Master Plan. See text addition on p. 182.
MESSAGE
Subject: FW: Comments on Master Plan
Creator: Linda Dalton /epsio,employee

Item 1

TO: Bonnie J. Lowe /epsio,employee

Item 2

-----Original Message-----
From: Stephen Kaminaka
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2000 1:15 PM
To: Linda C. Dalton; rkitamura
Subject: Comments on Master Plan

Bob, Linda:
These are a couple of thoughts that I had about the Master Plan:

A. Regarding vehicle access to the Instructional Core

(1) vehicle access to the instructional core (esp. Chumash Auditorium)
 is frequently needed by outside vendors, employers, and campus people
 for setup for special events, conferences, workshops, career days, etc.
 When you have 50 or a hundred employers trying to unload booths,
 brochures, etc. at the UU, it's a real zoo. The UU needs to be
 redesigned to allow easier vehicular access (in and out) to the
 interior auditorium areas and to avoid conflicts with pedestrian
 traffic along Inner and Outer Perimeter Road.

(2) specific mention should be made about the needs of the DRAE dept.,
 Arch. Engineering, and the College of Engineering for access to their
 labs by large Tractor/trailer vehicles. These vehicles require much
 more maneuvering room than your usual service and emergency vehicles.

The above comments relate to the following sections: SERVICE,
 EMPLOYEY, AND ADA ACCESS (page 174), and to the section on CIRCULATION
 (pages 156-159).

B. COST ESTIMATES FOR THE MASTER PLAN

(1) It seems like Chancellor Reed would like some cost estimates to go
 along with the Master Plan. Some others I have spoken to also seem to
 think that it would be a good idea.

Would some order-of-magnitude type estimates for some of the better
 defined early phases of the Master Plan be a reasonable item to include
 as part of the Master Plan? (I don't know what you might have already
 worked up in this regard.)

Thanks, Steve Kaminaka
BioResource & Agricultural Engineering Dept.
Cal Poly

Phone 756-2658

----------
Letter 42
Dr. Stephen Kaminaka
Biological Resources/Agriculture Engineering

December, 2000

42-1 Commenter suggests the need for improved vehicle access to the campus core for the purpose of deliveries and special events, especially at the University Union.

Response While the Master Plan proposes the closing of Perimeter to standard automobile traffic, all interior ways will be designed to facilitate delivery and safety vehicles.

42-2 Commenter notes the need for special access consideration for BRAE, Architecture and Engineering for large vehicle.

Response An addition to the text has been made to clarify these access considerations. The design of the access will occur during the implementation phase (p. 117).

43-3 Commenter suggests the need for cost estimates to be included in the Master Plan for its recommended components.

Response Cost estimates are normally developed as part of the campus capital improvement program. This is considered an aspect of Master Plan implementation.
Responses to Master Plan and Draft EIR. November 19 2000—Steven Marx

I believe the Master Plan is an excellent document overall, but I think there is still much in it that needs to be disseminated, discussed and decided upon.

I. Deadline

   A. I believe that December 5 is too tight a deadline for closing off community input on a document that lays out a comprehensive blueprint that’s expected to work for 20 years. As the author of the introduction eloquently states, this planning process is the University’s own opportunity to learn by doing (p.1). It’s too early to close that off.

II. Updating and revising

   A. Further along these lines, where is a section outlining how the plan will be updated and revised on a regular basis?

III. The Plan of the Plan

   A. I think the document needs modifications to rationalize its structure and make "way-finding" easier.

      1. What is the special function of Chapter 2? It appears that material there belongs in chapter 1 or Chapter 5

      2. Chapter 5

         a) Title—"Physical Plan Elements"—doesn’t tell me what this chapter is about, though subtitle does.

            (1) “Physical” doesn’t include the services and support element
b) Not till I get here do I discover that the first four chapters of the Master Plan are really a prelude to chapter 5, which is the actual plan presented with its own subdivisions or "elements." Perhaps there should be three sections: Introduction, Plan, EIR

c) Use of terms "element" and "plan component" on p. 63 are confusing

d) "University Land Uses" seems to be a new introduction rather than one of several elements, and it has its own introduction

e) "Existing conditions" was title of chapter 4—now it appears as a heading in all the elements

f) The heading, "Issues," in all the elements of Chapter 5 seems to signify challenges or problems rather than a pro-con question.

g) How do "Principles" here relate to Principles on p. 47

IV. Specifies

A. p. 3 Why is the summary called "Executive" Summary? Are non-executives not supposed to read it?

B. p. 4 on Principles

1. "The following statements..." What follow are not statements but attributes

2. I'd like to add a principle: "Build nothing ugly." Thermal tower for instance. Let's act like one of the best colleges in the country.

C. p. 4 Wording on principle 5—Substitute "A socially responsible university that meets the needs of the public," for parallelism and distinction from environmentally responsible in principle 6

D. p. 4 principle 6 "...high regard for biodiversity, energy conservation and SUSTAINABLE development"

1. Quote Executive Order of Governor D-16-00

   a) Whereas a building's energy water and waste disposal costs are computed over a twenty five year period, or for the life of the building, and far exceed the first cost of design and construction; and
b) Whereas an opportunity exists for the State of California to foster continued economic growth and provide environmental leadership by incorporating sustainable practices into the state capital outlay and building management processes; and

c) Whereas, sustainable building practices utilize energy, water and materials efficiently throughout the building life cycle; enhance indoor air quality; improve employee health, comfort and productivity; incorporate environmentally preferable products; and thereby substantially reduce the costs and environmental impacts associated with long-term building operations, without compromising building performance or the needs of future generations; and

d) Whereas the widespread adoption of sustainable building principles would result in significant long-term benefits to the California environment, including reductions in smog generation, runoff of water pollutants to surface and groundwater sources, the demand for energy and water, and sewage treatment services and the fiscal and environmental impacts resulting from the expansion of these infrastructures; and

e) Whereas it is critical that my administration provide leadership to both the private and public sectors in the sustainable building arena...

f) I establish a state sustainable building goal...

g) ...to site, design, deconstruct, construct, renovate, operate, and maintain state buildings that are models of energy, water and materials efficiency, while providing healthy, productive and comfortable indoor environments...

h) ...such an approach treats the entire building as one system and recognizes that individual building features, such as lighting, windows, heating and cooling systems, or control systems are not stand-alone systems.

E. p. 12 Correct website address for task force reports on:
   http://www.facilities.calpoly.edu/Facilities_Planning/FPDB/mp/task_forces.htm

F. p. 58 Exhibit 4.10—why is Dairy and Poultry unit area left white?

G. p. 63 Why no mention of Valencia property in Santa Cruz—this is relevant to stewardship as well as a teaching and learning resource.
1. What are other lands managed by Foundation?

H. p. 65 Heading “Balance” doesn’t elaborate the idea of balance, but states primary use is instructional

I. p. 86 Outdoor Teaching and Learning

1. Provide more specification of the teaching and learning and research functions using these facilities—biology classes, NRM classes, ROTC classes, English class—new for 2001—Ecolit: Reading and Writing the Landscape, Art Classes, and interdisciplinary course new for 2002, Cal Poly Land

J. p. 127 Affordable quality of Residential communities

1. What about cost? Will the rents follow SLO market? Will scholarship programs provide adequate help for low income students? Will rent pricing be high enough to finance subsidies?

2. Danger of not filling upper division residences. Make beer and wine available for 21 years olds, take on the burden of checking ID and of instituting alcohol abuse and awareness programs on campus—as at Stanford or Cal. You couldn’t have a worse alcohol situation than on this “dry” campus

K. p. 142 Recreation

1. Heery plan referenced throughout, but not described. Why hide the ball? Heery plan is and is not superseded. Master Plan, Heery plan, Sports complex plan are confused.

2. Who decides that additional 8000 seat gym is needed in addition to Mott Gym and Rec Center?

3. Survey students, faculty and community to see how many want a new football stadium and how many want more maintained trails. Do cost and benefit analysis of passive recreation using natural facilities vs. yet more sports palaces

L. p. 150 Public Facilities and Utilities

1. What does this mean? “the campus is diverting UP TO 50% of its waste from the landfill by recycling, except for waste from construction projects. The campus is presently being required to divert 50% of its waste from the landfills.”
a) South of Poly Canyon road—close the quarry and check erosion there. Test the former dump area directly below it for alleged toxic waste runoff. Check toxic wastes coming from the dump on north side of Brizzolari creek below bull test area

M. p. 154 Thermoelectric Storage Tank should not be hidden as an eyesore but designed as a landmark Centennial Clock Tower, highlighting the university's commitment to sustainable technology and architectural distinction. Design should be chosen from a competition. Sandra Lakeman, professor of Architecture, expert on towers and mother and collaborator of prize-winning tower designer for the University of Utah should be consultant for this project.

N. p. 181 Parking

1. What does this mean: "While Cal Poly has the most successful program for reducing single occupancy vehicles, there is still a large demand for parking on campus." P. 181

O. p. 193 Ancillary activities

1. Introduction—the whole thing sounds vague and defensive. The second sentence doesn't make sense.

2. Good not to site any on Western Ranches

P. p. 194 "Principles for locating specific ancillary facilities should be the same as for land use in general—that is relationship to University's academic mission, environmental suitability, compatibility between adjacent uses..."

1. Goldtree plan violates principles of Natural Environment element

a) Stewardship—restore and protect
b) Understand—inventory and study
c) Conservation and Sustainability
d) Biodiversity
e) Viability—size of habitats
f) Enhancement—stewardship and education
g) Aesthetics
2. This area contains three well developed stockpools and riparian areas and an oak woodland riparian area not shown on the map. It's probably a wildlife corridor between the Morros and Cuesta Ridge. I saw a herd of deer there one day and nine raptors on another.

3. A letter from the Biology Department in June 2000 signed by VL Holland specifies many reasons why not to develop this land for non-teaching-learning functions.

4. It's leapfrog development.

Q. p. 195 "Access could be provided from Highway 1 perhaps from an improved intersection near the site or at Stenner Creek Road) and/or internally from Mt. Bishop Road."

R. p. 195 "the area is not used heavily by the College of Agriculture"

1. Very bad to increase traffic internally through agricultural and Stenner creek areas

1. It's been newly fenced by Professor Rutherford as part of his sheep and range management program which was recently displaced from the site of the sports complex.
More responses to Master Plan and Draft EIR November 26 2000—Steven Marx

This is additional to my comments dated November 19 2000.

I believe that the Master Plan document and procedures signal great improvements in campus planning. But I'd like to reiterate that the deadline for comment on this Master Plan and EIR is too tight.

The plan is so comprehensive and raises so many issues that it is not reasonable to expect interested members of the community to digest and consider them all within the six-week period allotted, especially since that period is in the middle of the Fall Quarter, the busiest time of the year for faculty. The first public student discussion of the plan takes place on November 28, a week before the deadline, and the plan will be presented to the San Luis City Council on December 4, the announced closing date itself. Such a tight deadline does not confirm the stated principle of welcoming and being responsible to community input.

Ample time was allowed for initial reports from various Task Forces, including the Natural Environment Task Force, which I chaired. The same people who contributed ideas and suggestions in the preliminary stage need more time to study, evaluate and provide alternatives to what the Plan consultants and senior administrators made of those reports. The Task Force recommendations rejected by the drafters of the Plan should also be listed, and reasons should be provided for those rejections. Also the comments received by the planning committee and responses to them should be included as an appendix to the plan/EIR.

We are told that the Master Plan is a living, changing document whose projections are open to further input and modification. If this is the case, the Plan should include procedures for future revisions that guarantee such flexibility and responsiveness.

One example of the need for further study is the locations of student residences. As a result of feedback to the planning team's original idea of placing 540 units in the Brizzolara Creek floodplain, this provision was modified to the Creek restoration plan and the relocation of those units elsewhere, a crucial improvement. The present version of the plan needs further modification to protect the outdoor teaching and learning laboratories and the environmental assets of Brizzolara Creek which are still unnecessarily threatened.

Units H-2 and H-3 (p. 130) are sited too close to the north bank of the creek and to the mouth of Poly Canyon. Building residences here extends the central campus into what was previously an agricultural and biological study area. Lack of adequate buffers in these locations will adversely affect wildlife using the creek corridor, especially in its future enhanced condition. Major impacts will be produced by fire lights, noise and the 900 residents whose primary pedestrian access will be across the creek to the core
c campus. In addition, the primary drainage of the slopes on the site of these units goes directly into the creek.

I support the alternative of siting the 900 beds of H-2 and H-3 residences in buildings located on the large surface parking lot areas that still remain in the plan, despite its stated principle of eliminating one-level surface parking. Parking garages can be built under the dorms at as many levels as are deemed necessary. These surface parking areas are not labelled in the plan, so I will describe their location on the map on p. xiii.

1. South of Drumm reservoir
2. East of Via Carta and south of the Ag Pavilion
3. West of Via Carta, adjoining sports complex
4. West of PS3
5. East of Q
6. West of K
7. Southwest of Grand Ave, across from Yosemite Hall

By sight on the map, the square footage of these surface parking lots exceeds the square footage of the H2 and H-3 residence complexes. It’s not good planning to sacrifice environmentally sensitive areas for more parking lots.

Only after all possibilities of new residential development in less sensitive areas of the central campus are exhausted should the H-1 complex be developed. Its capacity could be somewhat enlarged with less impact on the creek. The H-1 area drains less steeply and down toward Drum Reservoir and it is adequately buffered from the creek. Pedestrian access to the central campus from the H-1 area can be directed down toward Via Carta, already heavy with traffic.

These infill modifications are preferable to sprawl into environmentally sensitive areas which are used as teaching and learning facilities. They will render the Master Plan more consistent with its own stated principles.
Letter 43  
Dr. Steven Marx  

November 19 and November 26, 2000  

43-1 Commenter requests more time for deliberation on the Master Plan.  

Response Cal Poly’s Master Plan team has been preparing the Master Plan for the past three years. After public meetings during the Fall and Winter quarters of the 1998-1999 academic year, over one hundred members of the campus and community participated in task forces during Spring 1999 to develop the guiding principles for the plan. The plan was first presented in draft form to the public in the Spring of 2000. Numerous press releases and public meetings accompanied the release of this early version of the plan. The formal plan and Draft EIR were presented to the community in the Fall of 2000. The March date for the Board of Trustees presentation has been presented to the public for over three years. For further information, please see discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.  

43-2 Commenter suggests need for a section on how plan will be updated.  

Response A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7 explaining the role of the Campus Planning Committee and California State University system (p. 351).  

43-3 Commenter raises questions and suggestions about organization and chapter titles.  

Response Organization retained, but text clarified. Key changes include the following: Addition of a section in Chapter 1 explaining the organization of the document; also within each element, the section labeled "Existing Conditions" and Issues has been relabeled as "Background and Issues" to avoid confusion with Chapter 4, Existing Conditions.  

43-4 Commenter suggests editing of principles in the Introduction.  

Response Text changes - statements now identified as Values to distinguish master plan principles in subsequent chapters.  

43-5 Commenter indicates need to correct website address.  

Response Text correction has been made (p. 14).  

43-6 Commenter seeks explanation of white space around Dairy and Poultry units on Exhibit 4.10.  

Response Map has been relabeled as “Selected Constraints Summary.” Many white areas are simply not constrained by the environmental features shown on this exhibit.  

43-7 Commenter asks for reference to Valencia Creek property in Santa Cruz County.  

Response As the Valencia Creek properties are not used for direct support of instruction, they are noted in the footnote at the beginning of the University Land Uses element (p. 67).
Commenter requests clarification of use of the term "Balance."

Response: The text has been clarified as follows: “This principle recognizes that all uses of Cal Poly’s lands must be balanced in support of the University’s academic mission.”

Commenter seeks elaboration on outdoor teaching and learning activities.

Response: Additional text provides broad language defining outdoor teaching and learning in the introduction to this element: “Specific courses in these and other colleges, including Liberal Arts, are frequently designed to focus on different aspects of campus lands” (p. 90). As the course numbers and titles for specific course applications change over time, a list at that level of detail would not be appropriate in the Master Plan.

Commenter expresses concerns about the affordability and marketability of student residences.

Response: See new discussion of Market Analysis added to Residential Communities element. “Cal Poly will review and revise these market studies to inform each phase of Master Plan housing development and enrollment growth” (p. 136).

Commenter asks Cal poly to clarify references to Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan.

Response: A new note at the beginning of the Recreation element explains: “The Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan was prepared in 1996 as the basis for the development of the Sports Complex north of Brizzolara Creek. The Heery Plan included a range of recommendations. Cal Poly did not adopt the entire plan, but rather used it as the basis for the Sports Complex. The campus Master Plan also referred to the Heery analysis but supercedes the Heery Plan” (p. 145).

Commenter questions need for additional sports facilities; calls for more analysis.

Response: New text has been added explaining that, “As the Master Plan is implemented, the campus, and ASI in particular, will review and refine the kinds of recreational facilities needed to serve students, faculty and staff” (p. 150).

Commenter seeks clarification of discussion of recycling

Response: Confusing language has been deleted (p. 158).

Commenter calls for a discussion of environmental condition of quarry area.

Response: The red rock quarry is not proposed to be modified under the Master Plan. Nevertheless, the campus will continue to work with the Regional Water Quality Control Board on this and other sites on campus.

Commenter suggests making TES a landmark.

Response: Addition to Invisibility principle in Public Facilities and Utilities element allows for “environmental aesthetic that balances beauty and function” (p. 161).

Commenter asks for clarification of statement about vehicle trip reduction.
Response Cal Poly does have the most successful vehicle reduction program among CSU campuses; however, demand for parking continues. Text has been clarified to this effect (p. 191).

43-17 Commenter finds discussion of Ancillary Activities “vague and defensive.”

Response The introduction to this element has been simplified. Then, the Plan Components section contains an amplified discussion of likely ancillary facilities (pp. 204-206).

43-18 Commenter claims that proposed facilities near Goldtree violate environmental suitability location principles.

Response The Environmental Suitability and Sustainability principle in the Land Use element (p. 69) calls for "limiting future development to those areas least affected by regulatory and/or high cost environmental constraints." Compared with other areas on the Main Campus and ranches in the San Luis Obispo Creek and Chorro Creek watersheds, the Goldtree area is relatively well-suited as a satellite location. (See the discussion in Chapter 4 regarding Constraints and Opportunities as well.)

43-19 Commenter expresses concerns about access to Goldtree area.

Response At such a time as detailed proposals are developed, site planning and feasibility analysis will provide more detailed evaluation of access options.

43-20 Commenter indicates use of Goldtree area by sheep operations.

Response See text addition in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element (p. 93).

43-21 Commenter suggests that comments on Preliminary Draft and responses be appended.

Response The Master Plan and FEIR will include all comments on the October 10 publication, plus a matrix showing changes from both the May 1 and October 10 publications.

43-22 Commenter expresses continuing concerns about student housing north of Brizzolara Creek

Response The DEIR addresses impacts. Housing units are conceptual, but in general are located 150 feet or more from the channel, a greater distance than existing feedlots. Drainage mitigation is required; pedestrian and light control is required; refer to the text for additional mitigation and analysis.

43-23 Commenter asks for consideration of more intense student housing, including use of existing parking lots (specific sites listed).

Response See responses to Ashley (letter 34). The commenter is referred to the housing alternatives analysis prepared in the EIR that directs housing siting and design. The goals of the Master Plan are to locate housing within proximity to the campus instructional core and create a community for student living without compromising the function.
Dear Mr. Lowe,

My name is Tyson Carroll and currently a student here at Cal Poly in the Landscape Architecture Dept. During the course of the quarter we have had a site analysis class, of which our site was the area located by the reservoir. During this process of analysis we have continued to ask ourselves what is our site eventually going to be used as and we keep coming back to dorms or classroom expansion. But when we received a copy of the Cal Poly Master Plan we were shocked to see the dorms being placed right at the mouth of Poly Canyon. When we researched it even further we found that there has not been any environmental impact report to state out the dorms and future parking will have on the creek? Why have they encouraged more parking instead of pushing for more mass transit? Why is it that we are building out instead of up? Instead of increasing enrollment why not limit it encouraging transfers? These are questions and concerns that I have which have not been razed or been even mentioned to the students or the public.

Sincerely,
Tyson Carroll
Polyp's plan for housing

By Linda C. Jabben

Even if you have not read Cal Poly's proposed campus Master Plan — in print, on CD or on the Web — I am sure you have at least heard about it. In short, it is an effort to present the University's vision for itself during the next 20 years. It addresses a wide variety of issues, one of which concerns growth and housing.

I mention growth and housing because these are the two issues that the San Luis Obispo community is most concerned with — and for good reason. Let's face it: there is a shortage of suitable housing in our community and it seems to be getting worse. We hear stories about students engaged in living with four persons in an available apartment, students crowded into off-campus homes and apartments, and companies looking to San Luis Obispo as a possible location owing to concern about the lack of affordable housing in our area.

While Cal Poly's student population makes a very real impact on San Luis Obispo County, it is not the only factor in the housing shortage equation. Cal Poly's enrollment today is about 21,000 students. In fall 1996, when it reached 17,750 students, the university was able to accommodate this growth as state funding was reduced. Since then, our enrollment has been slowly building back, but our growth rate has been slower than that of the City of San Luis Obispo. In 1996, the California State University system set a projected enrollment cap at 25,000 students, equivalent to about 11,000 students. In the next decade the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo system expects enrollment to increase by 57 percent, and it has asked Cal Poly to consider an equivalent level of growth. However, the analysis at Cal Poly suggests that a more modest growth rate in order to maintain academic quality, restore economic change, and address impacts both on and off campus. Thus, the Master Plan calls for adding another 3,000 students before the end of the next 20 years. With the enrollment growth we project for the future, Cal Poly will not grow as rapidly as the population in San Luis Obispo County.

The Master Plan, which is currently under public review and discussion, takes the housing situation into account and proposes measures that will help alleviate a portion of it. The Master Plan calls for adding student housing to accommodate all new enrollment growth. The campus will be housing growth in phases: 2,300 to hold approximately 1,000 students. This facility is scheduled to be available in the fall of 2002. The next phase will house 3,750 additional students by 2005 to 2008. In total, Cal Poly will add 1,750 to 2,000 student beds in the next five years, but only about 1,350 additional students during that same time period.

Recognizing the critical importance of student housing to the university and the community, Cal Poly will make an additional commitment in the Master Plan. Beyond 2000, we will continue to provide student housing for all new enrollments. This will increase the proportion of students who live on campus from about 17 percent today to about 56 percent in the future.

Further, we will monitor the local market closely, and if continuing students are not able to find suitable housing, we will develop a strategy to house a larger proportion of our students in the future. In addition to student housing, it is important to know that the university has conducted several studies regarding faculty and staff housing and is now moving forward with plans to help faculty and staff finance housing to create new housing. These residences, which will be located on property currently owned by Cal Poly on the west side of Highway 1, will be in two complexes consisting of approximately 250 new units in total. In short, Cal Poly's Master Plan follows an integrated and collaborative approach to academic planning, enrollment growth and physical development that seeks to make sense — for everyone. With its spring 2001 submission of the Master Plan to the California State University Board of Trustees, Cal Poly will take the critical step toward meeting its obligations to both the State of California and our local community, namely, to grow in a measured, responsible way.

Linda C. Jabben, Ph.D., 2001, is vice president for institutional planning at Cal Poly.
Letter 44  
Tyson Carroll  

December, 2000  

44-1 Commenter is concerned about placement of housing at the “mouth” of Poly Canyon.  

**Response** The housing proposed near Poly Canyon has been situated to avoid the sensitive resources in that area. The Ecological Study Area and Botanical Preserve will be protected. Housing will be designed to encourage students to move towards campus, rather than up the canyon. Numerous measures will be instituted to protect the sensitive resources of the canyon.  

DEIR addresses impacts  

44-2 Commenter states there is no analysis of impacts to the creeks from housing in the EIR.  

**Response** The EIR identifies numerous policies, design elements, and mitigation measures – including the University’s Water Quality Management Plan – that will reduce impacts to the Brizzolara Creek and other natural resources on campus.  

44-3 Commenter asks why the Master Plan encourages more parking instead of promoting mass transit.  

**Response** The Master Plan is promoting many measures to reduce the demand for parking and increase alternative transportation. Specifically, the plan calls for a reduction in demand of 2,000 parking spaces. This is to be achieved through many measures identified in the Alternative Transportation section of the Master Plan. See Alternative Transportation element and plans for reduction in parking demand.  

44-4 Commenter asks why the Master Plan encourages building “out instead of up.”  

**Response** The Master Plan has been designed to maximize the land use of the campus instructional core, rather than spreading into the Natural Environment or Outdoor Teaching and Learning areas. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis  

44-5 Commenter suggests the Master Plan should encourage transfer students instead of increasing enrollment.  

**Response** The reader is referred to Chapter 3 of the Master Plan entitled “Long-Range Enrollment Scenarios” for a detailed explanation of Cal Poly’s approach to growth and its response to California’s need for higher education. See Chapter 3.
Hi all,

Attached are the revised documents regarding the Creek Enhancement Plan. Please look them over one more time. If you have any final changes let me know so we can forward the final to the Master Plan committee.

Thanks.

V. L. Holland
Professor and Chair
Plant and Restoration Ecology
Biological Sciences Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
(805) 756-2798 office
(805) 544-4568 home
(805) 756-1419 fax

--- Original Message ----
From: V-L Holland
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2000 5:33 PM
To: V-L Holland; Edward P. Johnson; Dirk R. Walters; David J. Keil;
James R. Vilkitis; Roger D. Gambs
CC: Linda C. Dalton; Dale A. Sutliff; Leslie S. Bowker
Subject: No subject was specified.

Hi all,

Attached are the revised documents regarding the Creek Enhancement Plan. Please look them over one more time. If you have any final changes let me know so we can forward the final to the Master Plan committee.

Thanks.

V. L. Holland
Professor and Chair
Plant and Restoration Ecology
Biological Sciences Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
(805) 756-2798 office
(805) 544-4568 home
(805) 756-1419 fax
GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR THE CAL POLY CREEK MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN

INTRODUCTION

There are a number of significant creeks and tributaries that traverse Cal Poly lands and support biologically diverse aquatic and semi-aquatic habitats comprised of communities of hydrophilic trees, shrubs, herbs and the associated diversity of animal life. This report provides some guiding principles and goals that should be implemented in a Creek Management and Enhancement Plan for the Cal Poly campus.

CREEK HABITATS - AN OVERVIEW

Riparian and creek ecosystems support a diversity of plant and wildlife species. These ecosystems are complex habitats that provide water and moist areas in otherwise arid areas of the campus. The variety of vertical habitats created by the trees, shrubs and herbs provide nesting and foraging sites for a diversity of animal species. These habitats are critical for many wildlife species because they provide a rather permanent source of water and moist microhabitats in otherwise dry environments.

Many riparian and wetland plants and animals are restricted to the creek channel, banks, and/or flood plains of waterways; others integrate with the riparian community from adjacent upland areas. Sometimes the riparian trees are tall and dense forming a forest-like community, and at other times the trees form more open woodland. The lateral extent of the riparian vegetation depends on the size and nature of the creek banks and flood plain of the creek, the amount of water carried by the creek and on the depth and lateral extent of subterranean aquifers. Additionally historical patterns of land use and human impacts often determine the actual extent of the existing riparian and stream corridor, an important consideration on Cal Poly lands. The extent of the riparian and wetland communities vary depending on the interaction of the above factors, as well as others not listed.

There are several creeks and drainages on the Cal Poly campus that support various forms of riparian and wetland vegetation ranging from broad corridors of dense riparian forests to small corridors of mostly aquatic and semi-aquatic shrubs and herbs. Freshwater marsh habitats are found along creeks where permanent, slow moving pools of standing water occur. In these areas, the riparian woodland and freshwater marsh communities overlap and form a mosaic along the creek. Small freshwater marsh areas occur in scattered locations along the creeks on the Cal Poly campus.
Riparian communities have a significant effect on the environment along creeks or streams. There is seasonal fluctuation in light available to riparian understories because most of the dominant trees are deciduous. When the trees are in their winter-dormant leafless condition, direct sunlight can reach the ground or the river. Some herbaceous species and shrubs actively grow and flower while the trees are leafless. When deciduous trees are in full leaf, they can cast dense shade reducing the light energy that reaches the ground or water and moderates of temperature fluctuation. Daytime temperatures beneath the tree canopy are often several degrees lower than temperatures in full sunlight. The tree cover also decreases wind velocity and relative humidity is increased. The moisture evaporated from the soil and river through evapotranspiration can significantly raise the humidity in a riparian corridor. The evaporation also tends to decrease the temperature. Overall, the environment within a riparian woodland or forest is more mesic than that in adjacent areas. The presence of more mesic conditions along streams permits some plants from adjacent communities to grow as riparian species in areas that are otherwise outside their limits of drought tolerance. For example, *Quercus agrifolia* (coast live oak) and *Umbellularia californica* (California bay-laurel), which occur in upland woodlands, are common in many riparian areas on Cal Poly lands.

Unlike the plants of many other communities of California, riparian dominants are summer-active and winter-dormant. Many of the understory plants are similarly summer growing species. The availability of either surface water or shallow subsurface water in a riparian corridor allows the plants to remain metabolically active at times of the year when moisture stress is extreme in adjacent upland areas. Most of the riparian dominants, however, lose their leaves during the winter when active growth is taking place among the members of many lowland communities. Consequently the riparian plants often seem out of phase with the surrounding vegetation.

Riparian areas are very important as wildlife habitats. The multilayered canopy provided by the assorted trees, shrubs and herbs provides a diversity of nesting and feeding sites for birds and mammals. Riparian areas are productive habitats, especially at times when plants of other communities are dormant. The moisture of the stream is an important summer water source in the dry California landscape. The nutrients added to the stream and the alternating shaded and sunny zones of the patchy vegetation are important in stream ecology. The vegetation is an important component of the habitat for fish and other aquatic animals as well as terrestrial species.

Riparian woodland vegetation influences fish habitats by moderating the temperature and providing cover and food. Loss of riparian trees and shrubs and undercut banks can decrease the amount of suitable habitat reducing creek productivity and decreasing fish populations. Riparian vegetation is also an important source of fish food and nutrients. Small fish use slower water along margins of larger rivers and depend on terrestrial organisms such as insects that live in the riparian vegetation for food because most aquatic other organisms escape them.

River flow velocity, water depth, and riparian cover are important factors that affect fish populations. In general, vegetation cover slows the water velocity providing resting areas
for fish and increases habitat complexity, which can lead to greater species diversity. Riparian vegetation provides hiding places for both adult fish and fry to escape predation and may also provide increased substrate for fish food and for egg attachment.

Riparian vegetation decreases erosion from stream banks and adjacent uplands, which is very important in maintaining stream purity and decreased sedimentation. This is very important because streams that are inundated by heavy silt loads become useless as fish and invertebrate habitat.

**RIPARIAN AND FRESHWATER MARSHES ARE SENSITIVE HABITATS**

Over half of the wetland and riparian vegetation in the contiguous 48 States and over 90% of the wetlands in California have been destroyed and few remaining riparian and wetland areas have not been adversely impacted. Because of their location in floodplains, destruction of riparian ecosystems is largely associated with human's activities, especially clearing for agriculture, building structures and paving in flood plains, stream-channel modifications, water impoundments, mining, and urbanization. Even recreational development can destroy natural plant diversity and structure, lead to soil compaction and erosion, and disturb wildlife.

Wise management of remaining riparian ecosystems and restoration of disturbed riparian areas is extremely important because of their high value as fish and wildlife habitat as well as important values to humans and human existence. Riparian ecosystems generally compose a minor proportion of surrounding areas, but typically are more structurally diverse and more productive in plant and animal biomass than adjacent upland areas. Riparian areas supply food, cover, and water (especially important in arid regions) for a large diversity of animals, and serve as migration routes and forest connectors between habitats for a variety of wildlife.

The area occupied by riparian communities in California has decreased over 90 percent in the past 100 years. There has been a similar decrease in area occupied by freshwater marshes. With the loss of these wetland communities has come a comparable decrease in the habitat available for various types of wildlife, particularly resident and migratory birds. Today riparian communities occupy less than one percent of California, but in pre-colonial times these communities occupied considerably larger areas.

Much of the decrease in riparian and freshwater wetlands has been incremental — a little bit here, a little bit there. Individually these changes are minor. Collectively they represent a serious loss of wetland habitats. Freshwater marshes, riparian and other wetland areas are important wildlife habitats. They are particularly important to migratory birds of the Pacific Flyway. The piecemeal draining of marsh areas and removal of riparian woodlands throughout California along with the massive draining of marshlands in some areas of California such as the Central Valley have reduced the overall area covered by marshes by over 90 percent. Still, other areas of marshland are threatened by pollution. Loss of these
wetlands in California makes the protection and management of those on Cal Poly lands even more significant.

The original riparian forests in California covered several million acres. Today they are measured in thousands and many of the remaining riparian ecosystems have been degraded as a result of human activities. Prior to 1960 few people showed any concern for the demise of California's Riparian Woodlands and very little biological data was collected. Today many scientists and governmental agencies are expressing concern that has led to several symposia and workshops dealing with the ecology and conservation of riparian communities in California. California Department of Fish and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service considers Riparian and freshwater marsh communities sensitive. The sensitivity of riparian woodlands and marshlands make it extremely important that Cal Poly take a leadership role in addressing the proper management, enhancement, and protection of these habitats on the Cal Poly lands.

CAL POLY STREAMS AND HABITATS

Several of the largest tributaries in the San Luis Obispo Creek and Chorro Creek watersheds traverse significant sections of Cal Poly lands. The survival and sustainability of the diversity of riparian, aquatic, and semi-aquatic biota found along these creeks depend upon Cal Poly's proper management, protection, and enhancement of the stream and streamside habitats. Protection of these sensitive wetland habitats, including the special status species they support, must involve creating and maintaining high quality water in the creeks, sufficient water to support the aquatic and semi-aquatic plant and animal life, and high quality riparian habitats along these creeks large enough to protect the creeks and provide essential wildlife habitats. This will require developing a comprehensive Creek Management and Enhancement Plan based on wise, science-based land and water use decisions by Cal Poly. This plan should develop acceptable management and enhancement goals and guidelines for the creek systems that are found on Cal Poly lands.

As a leading institution of higher education, Cal Poly must be able to acknowledge and address the regional impacts the campus may have on the creek systems that traverse our lands. We must acknowledge and address how activities on our campus effect aquatic habitats downstream in the both the City and the County of San Luis Obispo and in the Morro Bay. The potential impacts to the Morro Bay estuary from Chorro Creek and the marine environment near Avila Beach from San Luis Creek must be evaluated. Thus, the sensitive riparian and aquatic habitats found on Cal Poly lands must be addressed not only as sensitive creek habitats that support rare, threatened, and endangered species but also because they provide a diversity of educational opportunities for our students, staff, faculty, and the community.

GOALS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CAL POLY CREEK MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT PLAN
The comprehensive Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan should include the following management and enhancement goals and guidelines for the creek systems that are found on Cal Poly land. These provide the guiding principles and philosophy for more specific recommendations for the creeks as they might affect all present and future projects undertaken by Cal Poly near the creek ecosystems.

1. Identify all structures, concrete, pavement, etc. that affect the stream and riparian ecosystems. Obstacles to proper management and/or enhancement shall be removed from designated creek corridors.

2. Protect the streams, stream channels, and adjacent banks, flood plains, and riparian habitats on campus and be consistent with sound, long-term hydrology principles.

3. Maintain and/or create stream and riparian corridors that provide adequate buffer zones that protect habitats for the riparian and aquatic plant and animal species.

4. Essential habitat features within the stream and riparian ecosystem shall be maintained and/or created including the hydrology, water quality, water flow, water temperature, and complex vertical and horizontal plant cover.

5. Reestablish natural flood plain areas for flood control purposes while protecting the Instructional Campus Core.

6. Provide habitat for the special status species known to occur or likely to occur in the stream and riparian ecosystem.

7. Provide access areas for the public as well as designated wildlife areas with limited human access.

8. Passive recreation shall be restricted to designated trails.

9. Reduce point and nonpoint sources of pollution to ensure that only high quality water enters the stream and riparian ecosystem in accordance with best management practices developed in the Cal Poly Water Quality Management Plan.

10. Identify and control stream bank and upland area soil erosion that may contaminate or add sediments to the stream and riparian system.

11. Provide student access to and from the housing units on designated paths, which are designed to reduce the impact on the stream and riparian ecosystem.

12. Maximize the use of the stream and riparian ecosystem as a living laboratory and educational resource.

13. Develop a maintenance program as part of the Cal Poly Creek Enhancement and Management Plan.
14. Control exotic invasive species with stream and riparian ecosystem.

SUMMARY

A Cal Poly Creek Enhancement and Management Plan shall be prepared that addresses methods to protect, restore, manage, and enhance the biodiversity and stability to the creek and riparian corridor on the campus. Protection of existing riparian and creek ecosystems from impact by creating adequate riparian and buffer zones should be of utmost importance.

All disturbed sections of the creeks shall be restored and enhanced as directed by the plan. One of the main problems when restoring disturbed creek and riparian ecosystems to their pre-disturbance condition is that the historical conditions of creeks is not well known. Investigations of relatively undisturbed sections of the creek near the restoration and enhancement areas may be useful in gaining some knowledge of predisturbance conditions of the creeks.

The plan shall address methods to restore riparian habitat diversity and stability to the creek corridors as shall provide methods and procedures to manage, restore, and enhance valuable biological habitats that will support a diversity of plant and animal species, including sensitive species. The plan shall also create public trails and lookouts in appropriate but restricted areas that will provide resource-based recreation for the campus residents and visitors to the site, such as bird watching and hiking. The plan, once implemented will be monitored and the area managed to make sure the goals of the plan are achieved. Success of the plan will be evaluated regularly.

Restoration involves returning the ecosystem to as near predisturbance conditions as possible and involves revegetation and removing exotic, invasive vegetation. Enhancement of riparian ecosystems consists of improving existing conditions to increase habitat values. This is usually accomplished by increasing plant community diversity for plants, wildlife, fish, and other animal life. Managing riparian and creek ecosystems typically involves enhancement techniques as well as proper management and monitoring. However, in some areas creation and restoration projects may involve use of techniques considered more management-oriented (e.g., land shaping and fencing until planted vegetation of the created or restored wetland is established).
Comments on specific Master Plan pages (from V.L. Holland - Received 12/6/00)

Page 78 - Principles

The intro paragraph should state that the principles are action statements and should direct the principles towards the implementation.

Page 78 - Stewardship

Note the word "restore" has been used.
Use more consistent verbiage principles and actions vs. practices.
Discuss the impact of Stemmer and Brizzolara Creek on SLO Creek and the marine environment.

Page 78 - Understanding

No changes

Page 79 - Conservation and Sustainability

Change Cal Poly can to Cal Poly will or should
Discuss air, water, energy and the impact of these resources on the global environment.
Conserving natural resources on campus
Mention conservation and/or sustainability
Reconsider the wording in general

Page 79 - Biodiversity

Biodiversity should not be hyphenated
Change plant to native biotic communities.
This feature is recognized and addressed in this document
Sensitive habitats need long-term protection.
Lacking discussion for utilization for educational purposes.
Typically these sites are of value or interest because of their educational and research value in resources management...

Page 79 - Viability

Definition needs to state that the campus will pursue the viability of the natural environment.

Page 79 - Enhancement

No changes
Page 80 - Aesthetics
No changes
Page 80 - Access
Page 97 - Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project
Feedmills is one word.
Letter 45
Dr. V. L. Holland
Chair, Department of Biology

December 6, 2000

45-1 Dr. Holland has prepared a report entitled “Guiding Principles and Goals for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan.”

Response The report is part of the implementation of the Brizzolara Enhancement Project, and applies as well to other riparian areas of Cal Poly. It is incorporated into the Master Plan as an implementing report as Appendix F. See text addition.

45-2 Commenter wants paragraph to state "action" statements.

Response See text addition page 82, indicating “Implementation of the Master Plan provides Cal Poly with a unique opportunity to maintain and improve its leadership role as a steward of the land.”

45-3 Commenter suggests more consistent use of verbiage; Change Cal Poly “can” to Cal Poly “will” or “should”; Discuss global air, water and energy impacts.

Response Text clarification on p. 83. Global effects of the plan are difficult to quantify and are dependent upon too many factors and variables to be considered in the EIR. CEQA requires analysis of “reasonably foreseeable impacts;” global effects of the plan are not considered to fall under this designation. Regional air and water issues are discussed; energy usage is reduced by policies in the plan, which provide conservation options for buildings.

45-4 Change plant to native biotic communities; Biodiversity should not be hyphenated.

Response The text has been corrected at page 83.

45-5 Commenter suggests expanding Biodiversity discussion.

Response See text addition page 83.

45-6 Commenter suggests rewording the definition of Viability.

Response See text addition page 83.

45-7 Commenter suggests that “Feedmill” is one word.

Response Dictionaries differ regarding spelling.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following
Comments regarding the Cal Poly
Master Plan:

I hope you will take these into consideration
When revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

Yasmane Okano

FROM:
Name: Yasmane Okano
Address: 1450 B Southwood Dr.
910, CA 73491

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Comment

I, like many students, especially in the College of
Architecture & Environmental Design, would like to see new
housing built with sustainability in mind. Using
Progressive
Design techniques (such as passive heating and cooling, PV panels) and
alternative energy sources, would increase interest in living on campus
and also promote the environmental awareness of Cal Poly,
making the college a leader for others to follow.
Letter 46
Yasman Okano

December, 2000

46-1 Commenter suggests Cal Poly’s new housing be built using principles of sustainability.

Response The following has been added to the Master Plan (pp. 162-163): Site selection, site planning and building design should account for solar exposure, prevailing wind direction, and patterns of light and shade to minimize energy requirements and enhance the quality of outdoor space. Design guidelines and processes for implementing the Master Plan should encourage energy efficient building design and resource conservation. The campus landscape plan should consider the impact of vegetation and water use on the resource efficiency of facilities and the creation of comfortable and functional outdoor space.

Design for renovation of existing buildings and new construction should consider ways to maximize energy efficiency and take advantage of the mild climate in San Luis Obispo. Alternative, renewable energy sources should be used to the greatest extent possible to offset growth in demand. As costs escalate for traditional energy sources, other options to consider include integrated photovoltaics and solar generation for electricity, passive and low energy cooling strategies for buildings (including materials, solar control, natural ventilation, thermal mass), passive solar space and water heating, and effective use of day lighting. New buildings should be well ventilated using natural ventilation, and existing buildings should be retrofitted where feasible to make them usable and livable during the summer without requiring air conditioning.

Consistent with Cal Poly’s mission, the campus should explore an integrated approach to sustainable, or “green” design for research, education and operational applications in new and renovated buildings and in the campus landscape treatment. In addition to the energy conservation measures noted above, these efforts should address water conservation and reclamation, re-use of materials and products, and life cycle costing in general. Several opportunities for resource recovery projects with educational and research potential as well as operational value include water supply and waste treatment for animal facilities, enhancement of Brizzolara Creek and the construction of new student residential communities.
To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to make the following comments regarding the Cal Poly Master Plan:
Can San Luis Obispo support an increased enrollment and still maintain its unique aura?

I hope you will take these into consideration when revising the current draft.
Sincerely,

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
Commenter asks if San Luis Obispo can support increased enrollment and still maintain its unique aura.

Response With careful planning, elegant execution, and a sensitive handling of the details of Master Plan implementation, we believe it can. See Chapter 3. DEIR addresses impacts.
**Action for Healthy Communities**

*A Community Collaboration*

Speaker: Carlyn Christianson, Community Volunteer
ACTION for Healthy Communities, Steering Committee member
ACTION Housing Initiative, Chair

Contacts:
Carlyn Christianson
1159 Vista del Lago
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
541-4419
cchrist@slonet.org
or via ACTION (see pamphlet attached)

ACTION for Healthy Communities
Co SLO County Community Foundation
P.O. Box 1580
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
543-2323

or

ACTION for Healthy Communities Co-Chairs
Jana Nichols
Director, United Way of SLO County
541-1234

Sue Ann Hughes
Director, Tobacco Control
County Health Agency
781-5564

*You’ll note that Cal Poly is an official member of ACTION, but we have not actually had any involvement from it since the Community Survey was completed.*

This project is directed to Cal Poly, but other aspects, such as the involvement of Cal Poly, will appear on other presentations made to other organizations.
SUMMARY

ACTION’s feedback about the Cal Poly Master Plan’s housing element can be summed up in two words: totally inadequate.

Right now, without any increases in students, faculty or staffing at all, Cal Poly’s impact on housing in the city and county of San Luis Obispo is a major cause in what ACTION’s members consider a health and economic crisis. People are going without food, clothing and shelter in order to pay for housing costs. The homeless shelters’ population of women and children has risen dramatically. Cal Poly’s higher wages and student’s subsidized income allows Cal Poly to displace lower-income workers and special needs populations from the area where they receive services, reducing diversity and impacting employers and transportation. Employers—Cal Poly among them—cite housing as a major weakness in attracting and retaining employees at every income level. The pressure on the City of SLO for housing, as well as increasing pressure for growing room on outlying cities and the county, have grave environmental and economic implications. Preservation of natural resources that draw tourists and add to our quality of life, conservation of prime agricultural land, and the impacts on air quality as 17,000 people commute into SLO every day—all are threatened by the pressures to solve the housing crisis.

Cal Poly has a major role in contributing to these problems, and ACTION feels it should accept a major role in contributing to the solution. Cal Poly’s Master Plan must address the impact its enrollment has and will continue to have on housing availability and affordability in the city and county of San Luis Obispo. It must aggressively commit fiscal and land resources to building much more housing, and much sooner, than stated in the current Plan. If Cal Poly increases student enrollment and staffing without being able to fully house the increase, then it must also publicly commit to working pro-actively to ensure that the community is addressing affordable housing. It must be involved in education, advocacy and mitigation planning in order to demonstrate that it accepts responsibility for current and future impacts of its growth.

Cal Poly is a vital and essential community member, providing educational, cultural and economic enrichment to the entire county. However, as ACTION surveys the impact’s of Cal Poly’s growth on our workers, our poor, our families, our environment, our quality of life, we know that the Master Plan can do much better at addressing the housing impacts of the college. ACTION invites and encourages—insists—the school to join the community in addressing this issue now. We ask you to partner with ACTION and many other organizations in contributing to finding solutions to this problem.
"SLO COUNTY NEEDS MORE HOUSING NOW"

ACTION for Healthy Communities is a large collaborative of county-wide and SLO City organizations and individuals with a mission to "develop a comprehensive planning approach to identify and address community needs and assets through collaborative efforts with community partners to implement effective programs that improve community health and well-being."

Shelter, along with food, clothing and healthcare, is usually identified as one of humanity's "basic needs". What happens when one basic need, housing, is not being met? What SLO County finds is that other basic needs suffer too. Housing is not just about more housing or less expensive housing anymore. It is a major health and economic issue in SLO County, and ACTION feels that Cal Poly has a major responsibility for this situation and a major role to play in addressing it.

Housing is a health issue as well as an economic issue when people go without clothing, food, or healthcare to pay their housing costs, and when companies cannot hire employees because there is nowhere for them to live. Lack of affordable housing affects an individual’s or family’s ability to sustain jobs, get an education, feed children and pay for basic healthcare. In SLO County now, people forsake other basic needs in order to pay housing costs, or may accept unsafe or substandard housing in exchange for lower housing costs.


A new HUD report, "The Widening Gap: New Findings on Housing Affordability in America", notes:
- The housing stock affordable to struggling families continues to shrink.
- Rents are rising at twice the rate of general inflation
- The gap between the number of struggling Americans and the number of rental units affordable to them is growing.

The relationship of housing to a healthy community was highlighted by the 1999 ACTION for Healthy Communities Data Report, with indicators such as Basic Needs (#45), Homeless Shelter (#48), and Affordable Housing (#64A-6). The survey ranked "more affordable housing" as the fourth most important change needed to improve the quality of life in San Luis Obispo County. (Indicator 501) When coupled with answers to questions about why healthcare needs were not met (#1C) and data on income levels based on jobs or assistance (#58, #62, #63), a picture emerges of a County where higher housing costs combined with our lower income levels affect many health, economic and overall quality-of-life issues. (See attached.)

The ACTION Housing Initiative Committee, representing the collaborative in its effort to fulfill its mission, has formulated several initial steps to encourage housing solutions in the County:
1. Insist that Cal Poly address the impact IT increasing enrollment has and will continue to have on housing availability and affordability in the entire county. Comply with local land use requirements for the building of more housing for students as well as for staff and faculty. If Cal Poly increases enrollment and staffing without being able to fully house the increase, as currently planned, then it must work pro-actively to ensure that the community is addressing affordable housing. It must be involved in education, advocacy and mitigation planning in order to demonstrate that it accepts responsibility for the current and future impacts of its growth.
2. Encourage and support low-income and special needs housing and solutions whenever possible. This includes the Housing Consortium’s efforts to establish a Housing Trust Fund in the County, as well as the use of CDBG, HOME, ESG and other funds for development of housing to benefit low-income families, the homeless and other "special needs" populations.
3. Require good planning and environmental sensitivity in every effort to increase the number of housing units. This includes following General Plan and zoning regulations, preserving agricultural land and open space greenbelts, exploring increased density in selected areas in order to reduce sprawl elsewhere, and location of housing near jobs to decrease transportation and air quality problems.
Action for Healthy Communities

San Luis Obispo County
Data Report

August 1999
### Telephons Survey Results

*In any given month, do you have to go without basic needs such as food, clothing, childcare, housing or health care?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephones Survey.*

### Responses, by Respondent Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with income less than $15,000</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 65 and older</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephones Survey.*
Basic Needs, continued

Telephone Survey Results

If yes, what do you go without? (Top 3 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care (including prescriptions)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses, by Respondent Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>FOOD</th>
<th>HEALTH CARE</th>
<th>CLOTHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with income less than $15,000</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 55 and older (n=2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephone Survey.
Social & Natural Environment Issues

Indicator 48

Homeless Shelter

Shelter Occupants, by Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOD Emergency Shelter (SLQ)</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Substance Abuse</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shelter Occupants</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent do not total, as occupants may fulfill more than one category.

Shelter Over capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOD Homeless Services</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter- Jan-March</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter- April-June</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter- July-Sept.</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter- Oct-Dec. (partial)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Over capacity</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Over capacity refers to the number of individuals entering shelter that exceed the number of available beds in the shelter.

Clients placed in Permanent Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOD Homeless Services</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Single Adults</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parents</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of clients permanently housed | 204

ECONOMIC ISSUES

INDICATOR 64
Affordable Housing

Fair Market Rents - HUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF BEDROOMS</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$498</td>
<td>$507</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$565</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>$573</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$704</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$727</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$978</td>
<td>$991</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,165</td>
<td>$1,171</td>
<td>$1,192</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Note: Fair Market Rent standards are issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, thus establishing the maximum the Housing Authority can pay for rental units. According to the Housing Authority, actual rents are approximately 7 - 13 percent higher than Fair Market Value. As of April, 1999, the Housing Authority had 1,574 section 8 units in San Luis Obispo County and 109 Public Housing Units in the City of San Luis Obispo. Numbers are ran a year behind the local market and are also arbitrarily adjusted to meet federal budget needs.

Average Apartment Rents - San Luis Obispo City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF BEDROOMS</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>$629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom, 1 Bath</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom, 1 Bath</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom, 2 Bath</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom, 2 Bath</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom Townhouse</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Affordable Housing

### Percent of Income Spent on Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Spent on Rent</th>
<th>&lt;$10,000</th>
<th>$10,000 - $19,999</th>
<th>$20,000 - $24,999</th>
<th>$25,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20% of income spent on rent</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24% of income spent on rent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29% of income spent on rent</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34% of income spent on rent</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% and over spent on rent</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of renters</td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>6,638</td>
<td>5,128</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990.

Note: 13,380 or 40.9% of total renters spend 35% or more of their income on rent, 16,625 or 50.8% of total renters spend 30% or more of their income on rent.

### Percent of Income Spent on Home Costs by Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Spent on Home Costs</th>
<th>&lt;$10,000</th>
<th>$10,000 - $19,999</th>
<th>$20,000 - $24,999</th>
<th>$25,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20% of income spent on home costs</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24% of income spent on home costs</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29% of income spent on home costs</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34% of income spent on home costs</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% and over spent on home costs</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of owners</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>7,367</td>
<td>19,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990.

Note: 9,657 or 25.3% spend 35% or more of their income on home costs and 12,973 or 31.5% spend 30% or more of their income on home costs.


**ECONOMIC ISSUES**

**INDICATOR 64B**

**Affordable Housing**

**Median Sales Price**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$184,976</td>
<td>$207,577</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$226,917</td>
<td>$259,917</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$173,515</td>
<td>$191,144</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>$258,262</td>
<td>$283,066</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside / San Bernardino</td>
<td>$113,968</td>
<td>$120,830</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$216,200</td>
<td>$233,504</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$236,557</td>
<td>$246,474</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>$177,975</td>
<td>$181,268</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$164,427</td>
<td>$201,906</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECONOMIC ISSUES

INDICATOR 64C

Affordable Housing

8 Least Affordable Areas in the Nation-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percent of Homes Affordable for Median Income</th>
<th>Median Family Income (1st Qtr1999)</th>
<th>Median Sales Price (1st Qtr1999)</th>
<th>National Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA MSA</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>$72,400</td>
<td>$368,000</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield, OR MSA</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo, TX MSA</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas, CA MSA</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Vanouver, OR-WA</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>$52,400</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo-Atascadero-</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paso Robles, CA, MSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA MSA</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The Housing Opportunity Index is based on the median family income, interest rates, and the price distributions of homes sold for each market in a particular quarter of a year. The price of homes sold is collected from actual court records by First American Real Estate Solutions, a marketing company. The median family income for each market is estimated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

*Metropolitan Area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. MSAs are relatively free standing and are not closely associated with other metropolitan areas.
ECONOMIC ISSUES

INDICATOR 64D

Affordable Housing, continued

Telephone Survey Results

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{graph}
\caption{Percentage of respondents for one-third and one-half of income to housing.}
\end{figure}

Does one-third or more of your income go to housing?

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline
Response & Number & Percent \\
\hline
Yes & 201 & 54.5 \\
No & 243 & 45.5 \\
Total & 534 & 100.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Percentage of respondents for one-third of income to housing.}
\end{table}

Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephone Survey.

Does one-half or more of your income go to housing?

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline
Response & Number & Percent \\
\hline
Yes & 103 & 37.6 \\
No & 179 & 62.4 \\
Total & 282 & 100.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Percentage of respondents for one-half of income to housing.}
\end{table}

Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephone Survey.
SOCIAL & NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ISSUES

INDICATOR 50D

Quality of Life, continued

Community Survey Results

If you could make one major change locally, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrict growth/development</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for youth</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better employment / broader economic base</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More affordable housing</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better traffic and roadways management</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable / accessible / complete healthcare</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More general social and educational services</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for family entertainment</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More business establishments</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve local government</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop crime / gangs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior services</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full range of services for the homeless</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase wages</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cultural diversity / racial diversity</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower overall cost of living</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address drug issue</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align friendly industry and jobs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate chain stores</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create affordable / quality child care</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger police force (quantity)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change law enforcement attitude (quality)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair accessibility to ADA guidelines</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure stable supply of water</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple response question with 2,650 responses offering 3,121 responses.

Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Community Survey.
HEALTH ISSUES

INDICATOR 1C
Access to Health Care, continued

 Telephone Survey Results

Have you or a member of your household needed health care in the past year and been unable to receive it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Responses, by Respondent Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with income less than $15,000</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 55 and older</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDICATOR 1C**

Access to Health Care, continued

*If yes, why couldn't you receive it?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't afford it</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance wouldn't cover it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No insurance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal (problems)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available locally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive / No money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired care not available in the area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1999 Action for Healthy Communities, Telephone Survey.*
### Average Salaries

**Annual Average Salary, by Selected Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$15,053</td>
<td>$15,406</td>
<td>$15,847</td>
<td>$17,563</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$35,702</td>
<td>$40,070</td>
<td>$50,454</td>
<td>$56,375</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$29,945</td>
<td>$31,234</td>
<td>$30,444</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$26,850</td>
<td>$29,170</td>
<td>$30,005</td>
<td>$31,580</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Utilities</td>
<td>$42,018</td>
<td>$44,280</td>
<td>$46,233</td>
<td>$48,100</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$23,356</td>
<td>$24,356</td>
<td>$25,405</td>
<td>$26,703</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$12,856</td>
<td>$13,100</td>
<td>$13,911</td>
<td>$14,600</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance / Insurance / Real Estate</td>
<td>$23,566</td>
<td>$25,113</td>
<td>$25,767</td>
<td>$29,433</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>$24,433</td>
<td>$25,627</td>
<td>$27,825</td>
<td>$28,836</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>$31,991</td>
<td>$33,752</td>
<td>$34,564</td>
<td>$35,542</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$230,007</td>
<td>$240,029</td>
<td>$255,583</td>
<td>$280,035</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, 1998.*
### Indicator 62

## Household Income

### Per Capita Personal Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo County</td>
<td>$19,845</td>
<td>$20,244</td>
<td>$21,412</td>
<td>$22,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$23,024</td>
<td>$23,983</td>
<td>$25,142</td>
<td>$26,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>$22,186</td>
<td>$23,059</td>
<td>$24,164</td>
<td>$25,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Per capita personal income (PCPI) is calculated by dividing the total personal income by the total population for a given county. Population figures used for this calculation are derived from the Census Bureau mid-year estimates.

### Median Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo County</td>
<td>$43,260</td>
<td>$43,600</td>
<td>$46,200</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$53,769</td>
<td>$55,700</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>$51,405</td>
<td>$53,400</td>
<td>$55,200</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Median family income estimates are calculated for each metropolitan and non-metropolitan area using the Fair Market Rent (FMR) area definitions applied to the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment program. The estimates are based on 1990 Census median family income estimates updated in 1998 with a combination of Bureau of Labor Statistics earnings and employment data and Census Divisional P-60 median family income data.
INDICATOR 63

Poverty Guidelines

Federal Guidelines, 1996-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,740</td>
<td>$7,990</td>
<td>$8,050</td>
<td>$8,240</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,360</td>
<td>$10,610</td>
<td>$10,850</td>
<td>$11,060</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,980</td>
<td>$13,330</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>$13,880</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
<td>$16,050</td>
<td>$16,450</td>
<td>$16,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$18,220</td>
<td>$18,770</td>
<td>$19,260</td>
<td>$19,520</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$20,840</td>
<td>$21,490</td>
<td>$22,260</td>
<td>$22,940</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$23,460</td>
<td>$24,120</td>
<td>$24,860</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$26,080</td>
<td>$26,920</td>
<td>$27,660</td>
<td>$28,300</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Health and Human Services, Poverty Guidelines, 1999.

Note: Poverty income guidelines are for all states except Alaska and Hawaii. For 1996 add $2,600 for each additional member; for 1997 add $2,720 for each additional member; in 1998 add $2,800, and in 1999 add $2,820.

Self-Sufficiency Income Standards – San Luis Obispo County, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ADULT + 2 SCHOOLAGE CHILDREN</th>
<th>TWO ADULTS + 2 SCHOOLAGE CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$544.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$340.00</td>
<td>$340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$355.90</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$114.16</td>
<td>$117.81</td>
<td>$213.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td>$77.35</td>
<td>$157.68</td>
<td>$206.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$86.05</td>
<td>$106.14</td>
<td>$166.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$194.81</td>
<td>$290.85</td>
<td>$366.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income Tax Credit (-)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>($86.22)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Tax Credit (-)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>($78.20)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Self Sufficiency Wage</td>
<td>$1,145.37</td>
<td>$1,950.96</td>
<td>$2,481.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Self Sufficiency Wage</td>
<td>$6.49</td>
<td>$11.08</td>
<td>$7.35 per adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Widener Opportunities For Women, 1996.

Note: The Self-Sufficiency standard is a measure of how much money working adults need to meet their family's basic needs for housing, child care, food, transport, medical care and taxes, without any public subsidies. Otherwise stated, it is the minimum wage needed to become independent of welfare or other subsidies.
Healthy Communities is a national effort advising that "health" or "wellness" is not a function of traditional healthcare, access to doctors and hospitals and medicine. There are root causes to many diseases and health problems that are not addressed by traditional medicine. Health depends more on factors such as nutrition and exercise, prudent drug and alcohol use, non-use of tobacco and accident prevention. Stepping back even further, jobs, education, housing, clean air and water and a sense of connection are even more important indicators of individual and community health.

The ACTION Collaborative has adopted a Healthy Communities vision of making community and family life patterns more conducive to good health, as well as setting community priorities that reflect a commitment to wellness.

April 2000 marked the merger of ACTION for Healthy Communities and the Foundation for Community Design's Community Indicators Project (CIR). The CIR's visions, data and other information will be blended with ACTION's and used to enhance the work of formulating community goals and action plans.
In February 1998, the San Luis Obispo Community Health Foundation convened a broad collaborative consisting of public and private organizations to build healthy communities. The ACTION for Healthy Communities Collaborative believes that by sharing resources and working together, more comprehensive, useful planning tools can be developed. ACTION also believes that a more comprehensive approach to assessing quality of life indicators will enable organizations that allocate resources to better address critical community concerns.

ACTION embraces a broad definition of health and an action-oriented philosophy. The Collaborative believes that a healthy community is determined by the physical, emotional, psychological, socioeconomic, and spiritual well-being of its residents.

**Guiding Principles**

- A long-term approach to planning and program development
- Creation of a collaborative planning mechanism
- Commitment to a community-driven process with consumer empowerment
- Identification of priorities and action plans

**Proposed Community Goals**

ACTION has identified the following areas in which to establish community goals. The following community goals are being considered for adoption by the ACTION Collaborative. (4/00)

**Basic Needs/Social Environment:** All persons have the basic necessities of life, such as food and shelter, and have the opportunity to be engaged in the civic, recreational, and cultural aspects of their community.

**Education:** All students enter school ready to learn, and graduates from high school prepared for the workforce or higher education.

**Economic:** All persons have employment opportunities and support services that enable them to achieve self-sufficiency.

**Health:** All persons practice healthy behaviors, and have access to and use preventive and primary healthcare services that enable them to maximize their physical and mental well-being.

**Natural Environment:** The health and beauty of the natural environment are maintained and enhanced by living within our natural and man-made capacities, with development being planned and managed.

**Public Safety:** All persons feel and are safe in their homes, schools, and communities.
Letter 48
Ms. Carlyn Christianson
ACTION for Healthy Communities

Not dated

48-1 Commenter suggests that Cal Poly, especially because of its higher wage earners and subsidized students, is displacing lower wage earners from area housing.

Response Cal Poly recognizes these issues and has added text to the Residential Communities element to the following effect (p. 129-130): The San Luis Obispo area has the dubious distinction of being one of the least affordable housing markets in the United States. The 1999 Regional Profile published by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments showed a median selling price in 1999 of $184,300 in the county and $231,500 in the City of San Luis Obispo for single-family homes. The Profile also revealed that 6.5 percent of the housing units in the City of San Luis Obispo are considered over crowded. The 2000 San Luis Obispo County Economic Outlook showed a vacancy rate of only 0.3 percent for rental apartments in the City of San Luis Obispo in September 1999.

Thus, there is a shortage of suitable housing in our community and it seems to be getting worse. Cal Poly faculty and staff hear stories about students engaged in bidding wars for available apartments and students crowded into off-campus homes and apartments. Companies looking to San Luis Obispo as a possible location indicate concerns about the lack of affordable housing in our area. Cal Poly recognizes that housing impacts are a major community concern related to enrollment growth.

While Cal Poly’s student population makes a very real impact on San Luis Obispo County, it is not the only factor contributing to the local housing shortage. Cal Poly’s enrollment in Fall 2000 is about 900 students below in Fall 1990, when it reached 17,758 students. During the 1990’s Cal Poly deliberately cut enrollment when State funding was reduced. Since then enrollment has been slowly building back, but Cal Poly’s growth rate has been slower than that of the City of San Luis Obispo. Cuesta College’s Student Characteristics and Enrollment Trends report for Fall 2000 shows that the community college’s enrollment has increased by about 5 percent annually in recent years. Further, over 40 percent of the new students attending Cuesta’s San Luis Obispo campus come from outside the County, and about 45 percent of all students at the San Luis Obispo campus live in the City of San Luis Obispo. Thus, families and households not associated with Cal Poly represent an increasing share of the local housing market.

To exacerbate the housing situation, during the past decade housing supply has not kept pace with demand, particularly for rental housing. The 1999 Regional Profile published by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments indicates that multi-family units represented only 5 percent of the new housing authorized for construction in 1997 in San Luis Obispo County (as compared with about 20 percent in Monterey County and 40 percent in Santa Barbara County). Some residential complexes formerly rented to students have been converted for other appropriate purposes, such as housing for senior citizens. Further, the City of San Luis Obispo’s General Plan does not designate significant amounts of land for multi-family housing; and market studies have shown little near-term development potential in the area close to campus.

48-2 Commenter suggests that the lack of housing is a major impediment to attracting employees at all income levels.
Response Comment is noted. Please see response to 48-1 above.

48-3 Commenter suggests that increased pressure to solve the housing deficit will have grave consequences to the natural environment and economy.

Response This comment is noted. Cal Poly’s approach to addressing the housing problem will actually benefit the environment in several ways. Providing additional on-campus and near campus housing will reduce the need for automobile commuting. Further, all on-campus housing will be developed on non-prime soils, protecting agricultural activities on campus.

48-4 Commenter suggests that Cal Poly must play a major role in resolving the housing issue, including committing fiscal and land resources to building more housing.

Response Please see the following new text on p. 136. The Master Plan takes the local housing situation into account and proposes measures that will help alleviate a portion of it. The Guiding Framework of the Master Plan calls for adding student housing to accommodate all new enrollment growth. The campus will be breaking ground in Spring 2001 to build apartment-style housing for 800 students. This facility is scheduled to be ready for occupancy in Fall 2002. The next phase calls for housing from 1150 to 1300 additional students by 2004 or 2005. In sum, Cal Poly expects to add 1950 to 2100 student beds in the next five years, but only about 1250 additional students during that same time period. Over the next two decades Cal Poly will increase the proportion of students who live on campus from about 17 percent today to over 30 percent in the future.

Further, Cal Poly will monitor the local market closely, and, if continuing students are not able to find suitable housing, the campus will develop a strategy to house a larger proportion of the University’s students in the future. Strategies may involve working with off-campus partners to identify suitable housing locations and provide financing. Cal Poly and Cuesta College are also exploring ways to cooperate in assuring appropriate housing for their students. Finally, Cal Poly will participate with non-profit organizations in seeking broader solutions to community housing needs.

48-5 Commenter requests Cal Poly join ACTION in finding solutions to the housing problem.

Response Cal Poly has sponsored two recent studies of the housing market as it affects students, faculty and staff. In 1998, the Division of Student Affairs retained Gordon Chong and Partners and the Sedway Group to analyze the student housing market and explore the potential for new student housing on campus. The findings from this study contributed to the University’s decision to build apartment-style units to house an additional 800 students on campus. The Cal Poly Foundation contracted with Anderson Strickler, LLC, to investigate the need and potential for University-sponsored housing for faculty and staff. Their 2000 Employee Housing Study found that housing cost is a significant factor in faculty recruitment and retention. Their report is guiding the development of faculty and staff housing on two sites west of Highway 1, as identified in the Master Plan.

Cal Poly will review and revise these market studies to inform each phase of Master Plan housing development and enrollment growth. Relevant comparative data includes vacancy rates, rents, land available for housing, financing options, and the nature and importance of amenities. Studies will also address student housing preferences and challenges in locating suitable off-campus housing.
Commenter appends several pages addressing housing impacts in our community.

Response This information is acknowledged and forwarded to the decision makers for their consideration. See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.

Commenter appends data on housing need in SLO area.

Response This information is acknowledged and appreciated.
Linda, 

I have made a few comments on the Master Plan to add language related to the role buildings can play in energy conservation and production. Gary and Ed may be sending comments on their own. I did not find a place in the Master Plan to insert language on the Design Process which ensures consideration of sustainable design factors. I'm under the gun this morning since I have a take-home exam today for one of my UCSC classes. I will drop off my comments, as well as some additional materials (Green School, etc.) at your office this morning.

Margot
---
Margot McDonald, AIA
Associate Professor
Architecture Department
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
PH 805.756.1298
FAX 805.756.1590
Letter 49
Donna Duerk
Dept. of Architecture

December 8, 2000

49-1 Commenter suggests a number of changes to the text of the Master Plan to strengthen sustainable building practices, specifically on pages viii, 4, 48, 64, 65, and 91 (pages per the October 10, 2000 Plan).

Response These changes have been incorporated into the plan. None of these recommendations raise environmental issues. See text additions on pages viii, 50, 68, 69, and 95 (January 23, 2001 Master Plan).

49-2 Commenter suggests the need to edit the text to strengthen sustainable building practices in additional locations, specifically on pages 1, 3 and 60 (pages per the October 10, 2000 Plan).

Response Wording change is not suitable in this location, but the intent is captured elsewhere in the Master Plan.

49-3 Commenter suggests the need to edit the text to strengthen sustainable building practices in additional locations, specifically on pages 24 and 28 (pages per the October 10, 2000 Plan).

Response It is not appropriate to change wording in this location because the language in this section is from a report of the Deans’ Enrollment Planning Advisory Committee.

49-4 Commenter provides editing suggestions to the Long-Range Enrollment Scenarios chapter to strengthen sustainable building practices.

Response Wording change is not suitable in this location. However, it is addressed in a detailed text addition to the Public Facilities and Utilities element. See pp. 162-163. This section begins with the statement that “Site selection, site planning and building design should account for solar exposure, prevailing wind direction, and patterns of light and shade to minimize energy requirements and enhance the quality of outdoor space.” Further, an addition to the University Land Uses element states that “Other plan elements that involve development, such as Outdoor Teaching and Learning, Residential Communities, Parking, and Ancillary Activities and Facilities, do not repeat either these aesthetic or sustainability principles. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the Master Plan that they be applied to all campus development” (p. 79).

49-5 Commenter suggests that Cal Poly needs to assess sustainability of existing conditions.

Response This suggestion is being added to the list of implementation studies (Chapter 7).

49-6 Commenter suggests adding a discussion of water as a resource for irrigation, etc.

Response This is covered on the next page under Agriculture Facilities and Resources (p. 49).

49-7 Commenter challenges sewer capacity.
Response The sewer capacity stated is from discussions with Ed Johnson, Utilities Coordinator for Cal Poly.

49-8 Commenter has questions about firmness of student housing sites, other land uses.

Response Board of Trustees will be approving land use designations and tentative future building sites; nevertheless, each project will require detailed site planning.

49-9 Commenter suggests the need for a discussion of levels of environmental stewardship in the Natural Environment element.

Response This is incorporated in the Natural Environment principles (p. 82).

49-10 Commenter calls for adding discussion of sustainable planning and building in campus core.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements, as noted above (response to comment 49-4).

49-11 Commenter recommends that the campus consider integration of energy and resource recovery facility with agricultural facilities.

Response Again, see new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element. It concludes: “Several opportunities for resource recovery projects with educational and research potential as well as operational value include water supply and waste treatment for animal facilities, enhancement of Brizzolara Creek and the construction of new student residential communities” (p. 163).

49-12 Commenter recommends that the campus consider integration of energy and resource recovery facility with student housing in Brizzolara Creek area.

Response Again, see new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element (p. 163).

49-13 Commenter suggests adding a discussion of sustainable planning and building practices as they apply to development areas in the Campus Instructional Core.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements, as noted above (response to comment 49-4).

49-14 Commenter suggests including section views of site to show topography.

Response Implementation studies for the Southwest area will address topography.

49-15 Commenter asks that the campus apply environmental responsibility principles to student housing development.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements, as noted above (response to comment 49-4).
49-16 Commenter recommends that the campus consider water recovery and recycling as part of Brizzolara Creek enhancement (repeat comment).

Response Again, see new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element (p. 163).

49-17 Commenter indicates the need to address water quality/run-off from Sports Complex.

Response Cal Poly has prepared a Turf Management Plan for the Sports Complex (2000), which addresses water quality impacts from the facility and provides for long-term testing of runoff. Please contact the Cal Poly Landscaping Department or Crawford Multari and Clark Associates for more information.

49-18 Commenter suggests additions to infrastructure capacity and distribution section.

Response Wording changes are not suitable in this location - rather later in Public Facilities and Utilities element. See new integrated discussion on pp. 162-163.

49-19 Commenter indicates support for principles in Public Facilities and Utilities element; urges implementation.

Response No response required.

49-20 Commenter seeks addition of ADA considerations to pedestrian circulation design and orientation.

Response See text addition and clarification to Circulation principles as follows: “At the same time, pedestrian routes must be accessible for people with disabilities of all types and under a range of weather conditions” (p. 168).

49-21 Commenter appends material on sustainability.

Response Acknowledged and appreciated.
MEMORANDUM

To: Linda Dalton  
Vice Provost  
Academic Affairs  

From: Frank A. Mumford  
Executive Director  

Subject: Campus Master Plan Recommendations  

Date: December 13, 2000

cc: D. Howard-Greene  
B. Kitamura  
D. Duerk-Williamson  

At its meeting of December 8, 2000, the Foundation Board of Directors approved recommending certain provisions for inclusion in the University’s final Campus Master Plan document.

I am attaching these recommended changes for your consideration.

The Board was appreciative of having the opportunity to comment on this important planning document.

Attachment

(j:/admstore/memo/MP.mim.doc)
FOUNDATION SUGGESTED CHANGES IN WORDING FOR THE MASTER PLAN DOCUMENT

Chapter 2 p.13
Principles
Question 3.f. bullet #3 — add: "...campus facilities and support services so as to mitigate...."

Chapter 2 p.14
Question 5.I — add: "...student service programming and support and auxiliary services concurrent with...."

Chapter 2 p.15
Question 6.j. — add: "Design and landscape guidelines will supplement the Master Plan to provide detailed guidance regarding such issues as way-finding, architectural vocabulary and open-space systems. Support and auxiliary services will reinforce this image and follow the design guidelines."

Chapter 2 p.15
Question 7.m. — add: "...public-private partnerships, Foundation support, enterprise partnerships, and 'design-build' project development."

Chapter 5 p.101
Principles
Line 7 — add and delete: "...create a net gain of both instructional space, support, and green space."

Chapter 5 p.190
Coordination
— add: "Support services should be planned with a holistic approach, with collaborative, interactive processes to involve all parties delivering and receiving services. Related services that require face-to-face interactions should be coordinated and consolidated...."

As published by the Foundation Master Plan Task Force 11.22.00

http://adminrelmisc/types/MPChange.doc
Letter 50
Frank Mumford, Executive Director
Cal Poly Foundation

December 13, 2000

50-1 The Foundation Board of Directors recommended several text amendments to the Master Plan.

Response All of the amendments have been incorporated into the plan. None of these recommendations raise environmental issues. See text additions.

50-2 Add "and support and auxiliary services".

Response See text additions at page 15 and 16.

50-3 Add acknowledgement of design guidelines by support and auxiliary services.

Response See text addition at page 17.

50-4 Add "Foundation support, enterprise partnerships"

Response See text addition at page 17.

50-5 Add "support" space

Response See text addition at page 106.

50-6 Add discussion of planning for support services

Response See text addition at page 200.
Mr. Kitamura  
Director of Facilities Planning  
Cal. Poly-San Luis Obispo

Dear Sir,

We are writing about the proposed Cal. Poly Master Plan and draft Environmental Impact Report. After looking through the plan, our basic concern with the potential environmental impacts of putting residences for over 1600 students on the north side of Bixiololi Creek across from the campus core. We do not feel that this is an appropriate placement because of the long term ecological effects this project will have on this sensitive area.

As California tax paying citizens, we have invested in this riparian and grassland habitat which is presently used as a learning resource. We strongly feel that this should not be sacrificed for a development which is more suited for taking place in the campus core area. The mutual creativity of your consultants, and the Cal. Poly professors and students of architecture and urban design could surely be harnessed to create innovative and alternative models which would avoid such an inappropriate placement of this housing, and perhaps be used as a model for other learning communities. As a result, students of biology, natural resources, and agriculture would continue to have this invaluable natural laboratory which is as least as important a part of the university mission as the future housing of students.

Thank you,

John Beccia  
for Life on Planet Earth  
PO Box 173  
Paso Robles, CA 93447
Letter 51  
John Beccia  
Life on Planet Earth  

November 30, 2000

51-1  Commenter’s organization is concerned with the placement of housing (1,600 students) on the north side of Brizzolara Creek and the resulting environmental impacts.

Response  Concerns are noted. The Master Plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the H-1 and H-2 housing units at a suitable distance from the creek corridor that resulted in the creation of the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project and the re-adsorption of units initially proposed for location along the creek (namely H-3). The additional beds were the result of partial absorption of the H-4 housing unit that could not be relocated in its entirety elsewhere on campus.
December 7, 2000

Mr. Robert Kitamura
Dr. Linda Dalton
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo, Ca 93407

Dear Dr. Dalton and Mr. Kitamura,

The following are our comments. We are submitting these comments to you within the time extension of December 8, 2000 given at the Cal Poly Master Plan Meeting in the Cal Poly Theater (Dalton,Clark). We also noted the clarification in Cal Poly’s presentation to the City Council on December 5, 2000 that the Heery sports facilities concept plan referenced in the Master Plan was never adopted.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments:

We are residents of the upper Bishop’s Peak neighborhood. We have a direct “line of sight” to the western portion of the Cal Poly Campus which was largely agricultural. Cal Poly is now developing a sports complex there.

Our neighborhood is also directly adjacent to San Luis Obispo City’s Ferrini Open Space. The City’s natural open space and our neighborhood share the East Slope of Bishop’s Peak. This City natural open space area is developed with trails and is very popular. Noise and light from the Sports Complex area which would impact our neighborhood would also impact the City’s Ferrini Open Space.

We have the following comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan/DEIR:

1. We strongly support Cal Poly’s Adopted Master Plan, Neighborhood Relations Task Force Recommendations. The two guiding principles of the Master Plan Neighborhood Relations Task Force are:

   1. “It shall be the guiding principle that negative impacts of new development, and/or redevelopment (on campus) such as: noise, glare, traffic and parking shall not be borne by residents of the established residential neighborhoods of San Luis Obispo.”

   2. “New development on campus shall be designed to eliminate impacts on established neighborhoods, rather than to create designs that generate ongoing conflicts between the University and residential neighborhoods.”

   The guiding principles and the other recommendations of the Neighborhood Relations Task Force should be implemented especially as they apply to the Sports Complex area. These are attached for the record.

   Cal Poly should state in it’s discussion of additions to the sports complex area and its proposed mitigations that, “new developments in the sports complex area shall be designed to eliminate (or avoid) impacts on established neighborhoods and the City’s natural open space on Bishop’s Peak to the greatest extent possible.”
3. The master plan, page 334, states that “Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in the project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts”. We strongly support Cal Poly's commitment to this, especially as it applies to any possible future developments in the sports complex area.

Because the Heery concept plan was done without input from the neighbors and the general public, without sound studies; without an EIR; and it was never adopted, it should not be used as the basis of designing a possible new football stadium.

4. The August, 1997, Jones and Stokes Sound Study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex was done through a joint effort of Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. It included actual sound studies done on the Cal Poly Campus, which the 1997 Sports Complex EIR did not have. The 1997 Jones and Stokes Sound Study for the Cal Poly Sports Complex should be referenced to help identify, examine, and mitigate possible noise impacts to the greatest extent possible. It is attached for the record.

5. Although it has been stated that the chances of a new mustang stadium being built are remote, Cal Poly is proposing the possibility of a different, larger football stadium. This is a then a proposal for a new project, not merely the "relocation of the old stadium".

6. We do not believe that the mitigations suggested for noise and light are the most effective mitigations possible in eliminating or avoiding light, light trespass and glare impacts to the Bishop's Peak area, and therefore do not follow the Neighborhood Relations Task Force's Guiding Principles, or avoid impacts where it is possible to do so. The most effective mitigations should be used, rather than less effective ones.

8. We offer the following comments;

NOISE:

1. There is no proposed findings nor any evidence to support a finding that the environmentally superior alternative of remodeling the present Mustang Stadium is infeasible.

2. It is stated that certain impacts will be mitigated by described measures, however the mitigation measures are not tied to any performance standard, nor any standard of enforceability. The mitigation measures should be tied to performance standards and standards of enforceability. There should be a post construction mitigation monitoring plan for noise or light impacts.
3. There are additional feasible mitigation measures which should be included. They include, but are not limited to, the following:
   A. The Jones and Stokes Sports Complex Sound Study Mitigation Measures are feasible mitigation measures for a football stadium in the sports complex area. A lower sound level limit may be required, as noted.

   B. There are other feasible mitigations which have been used in other stadiums and should be considered. These include, but are not limited to, enclosing the football stadium, partially enclosing the football stadium, building a stadium which is significantly below ground level, berming the stadium, orienting the stadium away from the residential neighborhood on Bishop’s Peak, and acoustical barriers.

4. We additionally suggest that the following statement be added as a mitigation, “Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts” (Page 334, Master Plan)

LIGHT, LIGHT TREPASS, AND GLARE:

1. There are no proposed findings nor any evidence to support a finding that the environmentally superior alternative of remodeling the present Mustang Stadium is infeasible.

2. Page 142 states, “In addition, any additional sports facilities, like any other facility on campus, will be designed so as to mitigate environmental impacts on and off campus”. That is a positive statement. However, the proposed mitigation measures for the Parking structures and Mustang stadium propose to avoid glare and light trespass “onto adjacent areas and onto public right-of-way areas”. The most effective light mitigation measures for the parking structures and Mustang stadium should avoid light and glare and light trespass to adjacent areas, the public right of way, AND THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD AND CITY’S OPEN SPACE ON BISHOP’S PEAK. (These overlook the proposed project)

3. The Master Plan proposes Class II, significant residual impacts for light and glare. We agree with the San Luis Obispo City Council that this is unacceptable. The project and/or mitigations should be reexamined and modified so that the light, light trespass and glare impacts are reduced further. The most effective mitigations should be used, rather than less effective ones.
4. Additional feasible mitigation measures which should be considered, include, but are not limited to, enclosing the football stadium, partially enclosing the football stadium, using horizontal arms of lighting which extend over the field of the football stadium and aim light down rather than vertical lights, sinking the football stadium significantly below ground level, planting rows of trees which are tall enough to help screen the sports complex lighting, and using the lighting which most effectively mitigates any light trespass or glare. Attached are professionally suggested, additional feasible mitigation measures for the football stadium and the proposed parking structure closest to the sports complex, Parking structure III (Attachments #3 and #4 for the record).

5. If the basketball arena is built, similar additional mitigation measures should also be considered where appropriate.

6. Mitigation measures should be tied to performance standards and standards of enforceability. There should be post construction mitigation monitoring plans for noise and light, light trespass and glare.

7. We suggest that the following statement be added as a mitigation, “Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts”. (page 334 Cal Poly Master Plan)

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

[Handwritten signatures]

Page 334
NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS TASK FORCE

RECOMMENDATIONS

In recognition that Cal Poly is an “ongoing” entity in San Luis Obispo: new
development, changes, and other activities of the University should address
community concerns using the following principles as they relate to
Neighborhood Relations.

1.

FOR PLANNING NEW DEVELOPMENT ON CAMPUS

GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

Because there are established residential neighborhoods in the City of San Luis
Obispo, and because new developments on campus may negatively impact
these established, residential neighborhoods:

• It shall be a guiding principle that negative impacts of new development,
and/or re-development such as: noise, glare, traffic and parking shall not
be borne by residents of the established residential neighborhoods of
San Luis Obispo.

• New development on campus shall be designed to eliminate impacts on
established neighborhoods, rather than to create designs that generate
ongoing conflicts between the University and residential neighborhoods.

SUPPORTING PLANNING AND POLICY PRINCIPLES: *

1. There shall be a new, ongoing process by which representatives of
residential neighborhoods, neighborhood associations, and the University
regularly discuss issues which may impact University/neighborhood
relations. Existing University, City and Public Advisory Committees should be
continued. [Rationale: Direct, regular communication between
representatives of residential neighborhoods, neighborhood associations,
and the University is the basis for positive University/neighborhood
relations.]
2. Early in the process of conceptualizing and proposing new development on campus, any possible impacts on the established residential neighborhoods shall be identified through a cooperative effort between the University and those neighborhoods possibly impacted. [Rationale: Historically, neighborhoods have been key in identifying possible impacts to neighborhoods. The earlier that the neighborhoods are involved in the process the more possibilities there will be for positive, successful solutions.]

3. The University's Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for new developments shall focus on the possible negative impacts on the existing residential neighborhoods.

4. The University and the affected neighbors shall work together to reach agreements on specific ways that potential impacts can be avoided. Agreements should list and memorialize specific design aspects, operational conditions, and meaningful enforcement methods.

5. Design aspects and agreements with neighborhoods, which are for the purpose of eliminating or mitigating impacts of campus developments, shall be rigorously enforced by the University. To eliminate ongoing conflicts between the University and established residential neighborhoods, the University shall be proactive in enforcing its agreements, rather than reactive and complaint-driven.

6. The University should coordinate its neighborhood relations efforts among its various departments so that responsibility for operational issues, agreement enforcement, communications with neighborhoods, and other issues affecting neighborhoods are coordinated.

7. It should be recognized that large, new developments on campus which are dependent on both the student population and a large commercial draw from non-student populations, may have significantly larger impacts on residential neighborhoods than those developments which depend upon the student population alone. Developments with a commercial component may also require proportionately larger efforts and costs to eliminate negative impacts on established residential neighborhoods.

8. The University should develop or maintain adequate natural or physical buffers between established residential neighborhoods and existing and future developments on the campus to avoid negative impacts.
2.

FOR CONSIDERING INCREASED ENROLLMENT

GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

Because Cal Poly is a residential campus of more than 6000 acres adjacent to one relatively small city of approximately 45,000 people:

- It shall be a guiding principle that negative impacts resulting from increased enrollment such as: traffic, parking problems, overcrowding, noise, deterioration of residential properties and increased rental housing costs for all, shall not be borne by the residents of the established residential neighborhoods of San Luis Obispo.

SUPPORTING PLANNING AND POLICY PRINCIPLES:

1. There is an existing shortage of affordable, desirable housing on the campus. This should be corrected. When the University further increases enrollment, there must be a corresponding increase of affordable, desirable housing on the campus to accommodate that increase. (The university’s goal of having only 25% of its students living on campus, as stated in the DEPAC “more” enrollment on campus scenario, is very inadequate)

2. The University should provide the location for a Greek Row on campus where Greek activities can take place.

3. The University should research the local feasibility of programs which have been successful at other universities, such as; multi-generation housing on campus, on-campus living for first time freshmen, and the development of a transitional living plan.

4. The University should strive to develop a social and physical environment on campus that is attractive to students and faculty that promotes on campus living and a sense of community.

5. To reduce traffic problems on and near the campus, the University shall continue to contribute to the City’s transit services and encourage increased use of these services. Circulation systems on the campus
should be improved with particular focus on alternative forms of transportation, campus transit systems, bicycling and walking.

6. New parking on the campus shall not impact established residential neighborhoods.

7. The University should work proactively with the City and residential neighborhood associations to review existing "good neighbor" guidelines, develop additional guidelines where necessary, educate students about these guidelines, and enforce and implement these guidelines on an ongoing basis.

8. The University should make existing campus educational activities more accessible to the residents of San Luis Obispo.

9. The University should provide funding to help the City communicate with landlords and absentee owners regarding property upkeep, tenant relations, and identify and correct violations of overcrowding, noise, and other neighborhood enhancement ordinances.

10. The University shall better integrate neighborhood issues throughout the Master Plan and related documents, including the enrollment scenarios.

As this is "the primary conduit for participation" by neighborhoods, and there is no neighborhood representative on the Master Plan Committee [see background materials], we appreciate this opportunity to offer a more complete task force recommendation. We would also appreciate the opportunity for a neighborhood representative from this committee, to attend at least one meeting of the University's Master Plan Committee for the purpose of providing background and answering questions about these recommendations.

Dated: May 24, 1999

* Task Force Charge: "To suggest broad policy or planning principles regarding the assigned topics to help guide the development of the administrative draft of the Master Plan". [Cal Poly Master Plan.]
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Jones & Stokes Associates has been retained by the San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Department to evaluate the potential increase in sound in city neighborhoods that may occur with operation of the sports complex proposed by California Polytechnic State University. Sound from the crowd, public address announcements, and music has been evaluated using standard acoustic propagation methodologies and a simulation test.

The results of the sound level projection analysis and the simulation test indicate that crowd sound and public address sound at levels anticipated from the stadium will not measurably increase A-weighted background sound levels in the neighborhoods of concern under cool, calm weather conditions with clear skies. They also indicate that sounds from these sources will be barely audible to audible depending on location. In addition, the results of the simulation test indicate that loud music (93-94 decibels A-weighted at 100 feet) can be distinctly audible at locations that have a direct line of sight to the project site and can be barely audible at locations where there is intervening topography or structures. The test results also indicate that public address announcements at a level of 84 dBA at 100 feet can be audible at locations with a direct line of sight to the project site. The predominant winds out of the northeast will tend to reduce sound transmission from the project site to locations to the west (i.e., the neighborhoods of concern). Winds from the east, temperature inversion conditions, or low cloud cover may tend to increase sound transmission from the project site and could result in distinctly audible crowd and public address sound in the neighborhoods of concern. However, these types of conditions are usually unstable, intermittent, and short term in nature. In addition, temperature inversion conditions and the associated low cloud cover that would tend to increase sound transmission typically occur in July, August, and September and would not typically coincide with use of the stadium. Mitigation measures identified at the end of this report will help to reduce sound at the source.

INTRODUCTION

California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly) is proposing to construct a multiuse sports complex on campus that would have a baseball stadium, a softball stadium, baseball and softball fields, and soccer fields. The City of San Luis Obispo is considering participating in the funding of the project, which would allow the city parks and recreation department to use the facilities for city sports programs. The California State University, serving as lead agency, prepared an environmental impact report (EIR) as required under the California Environmental Quality Act. The final EIR was certified by the Board of Trustees of the California State University in February 1997. Because of concerns expressed by residents in the Bishop Peak and the Cerro San Luis neighborhoods relating to potential noise effects from the facility, the city retained Jones & Stokes Associates to evaluate the potential noise effects of the project in more detail than was provided in the EIR. The primary noise concerns are related to amplified speech and music from public address systems and crowd noise.
The purpose of this sound study is to evaluate the potential increase in sound above existing background sound levels that could result from evening activity at the baseball and softball stadiums. Mitigation measures to reduce sound from evening stadium activity are also discussed.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL ACOUSTICS

Appendix A provides a discussion of terminology and fundamental concepts used in environmental acoustics.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND KEY ASSUMPTIONS

The sports complex would be built on approximately 32 acres and would include:

- six multiuse athletic fields for soccer, baseball, and softball;
- a baseball stadium with seating for 2,500, and
- a softball stadium with seating for 1,000.

Figure 1 depicts the proposed layout of the facility as described in the final EIR. According to the EIR, the stadiums would be built in two phases. In the first phase, the baseball stadium would be built with approximately 600 bermed box seats, and the softball stadium would be built with approximately 300 bermed box seats. Bleachers would be provided on a temporary basis to bring capacities to 2,500 seats in the baseball stadium and 1,000 seats in the softball stadium. A superstructure for the baseball/softball stadium complex would replace the temporary bleachers and would consist of an additional 1,900 permanent seats for baseball and an additional 700 seats for softball. Permanent public address sound systems would be provided in both stadia. The entire complex would be lighted for nighttime use of the facilities.

The following is additional information about how the stadia would be used and key assumptions used in this analysis:

- Twelve dates are scheduled for women’s softball games. Six are day games, and six are night games. Each “game” is a doubleheader. Women’s games would rarely go beyond 9 p.m.
- Thirty-four dates are scheduled for men’s baseball games. Seventeen are day games, and 17 are night games.
- Men’s night games start at 7 p.m. A warmup period starts approximately 1½ hours before the start of the game. Music is typically played during the warmup period.
- Men's games are typically no more than 3 hours long. During the 1996 season, five of the 57 games played went beyond 3 hours.

- Softball and baseball games would not occur at the same time.

- Public address sound systems would not be used at the multiuse athletic facilities.

**APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

Jones & Stokes Associates' noise specialist, staff members from the City of San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Department, and a group of citizens from nearby neighborhoods met on May 21, 1997, to discuss the project and the citizens' concerns about project-related sound. It was agreed that the primary noise of concern would be activity at the baseball and softball stadia during evening hours and that stadium sound during evening hours (8-11 p.m.) would be the focus of the sound analysis. It was further agreed that a test simulating crowd sound, public address announcement sound, and music would be conducted to provide citizens and decision makers with additional insight into the potential noise impact of the project.

There are several key components to this analysis, and each is discussed below.

**Quantification of Existing Background Conditions**

To evaluate the potential change in sound conditions that would result from activity at the stadia, it is necessary to quantify existing sound conditions at potentially affected areas. These existing data then become the baseline against which predicted and measured stadium sound is evaluated.

Background sound conditions were evaluated in two ways. First, 24-hour measurements were conducted at six selected neighborhood locations (Figure 2). These data provide information on how sound levels change over time throughout the day and in particular help identify minimum sound levels that occur during the critical analysis time period of 8-11 p.m. Second, background sound was measured before the simulation test to quantify the actual baseline sound level occurring during the simulation test and to provide octave band background sound level data.

**Collection of Baseball Game Source Data**

To conduct an analytical evaluation of the potential sound increase at residential locations and to obtain a recording of game sounds for the simulation test, sound levels and game sounds were measured and recorded at a baseball game.
Simulation Test

To simulate game sounds, a recorded simulation program was assembled using the baseball source data described above. This program and music and sound effects often used at games were played through a sound system located on the project site. Sound level measurements and subjective evaluations of audible sound were then made by Jones & Stokes Associates’ noise specialist at the six residential locations where background measurements were taken previously. These data were then used to quantify the change in sound at the residential locations resulting from the simulation test.

Analytical Analysis

Using sound level data from the baseball game described above, octave band source levels for crowd and public address announcement sound were developed. Projected sound levels for these sources at each of the six residential locations were estimated based on distance attenuation, molecular absorption, anomalous excess attenuation, and barrier effects. Projected sound levels were then compared to background sound levels.

EXISTING BACKGROUND SOUND CONDITIONS

Sound Sources

Numerous sources of sound contribute to the sound environment at the six locations investigated. The primary source of sound is traffic on local roadways. Major roadways in the area include State Route 1 (Santa Rosa Street), Highland Drive, and Foothill Boulevard. Other sources of sound observed include barking dogs, chirping birds, yard maintenance equipment (e.g., mowers, leaf blowers), home maintenance tools (e.g., saws, hammers), public address announcements at the California Men’s Colony, emergency vehicle sirens, aircraft overflights, and train passages on the Southern Pacific Railroad track. Residents note that crowd sound and public address announcements from football games at Mustang Stadium are audible on some occasions.

Twenty-Four-Hour Measurements

Twenty-four-hour sound levels at the six selected residential locations were measured using Larson-Davis Model 700 Type 2 sound level meters. Short-term measurements were also selectively taken with a Larson-Davis Model 812 Type 1 sound level meter. These instruments fully comply
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with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard S1.4-1983 for Type 1 and Type 2 instruments. The meters were set to measure A-weighted sound level with a slow meter response. The slow meter response is the appropriate meter setting for measuring nonimpulsive, community noise sound levels. The Model 700 meters were programmed to capture 1-minute $L_{eq}$ values and 1-hour $L_{max}$, $L_{mean}$, $L_{50}$, and $L_{90}$ values measured over 24-hour periods. Instrument calibration was verified before and after each measurement session with a Larson-Davis Model 250 acoustic calibrator. At each 24-hour monitoring position, the meter was held by a tripod that placed the meter approximately 5 feet above the supporting surface. The results of the background 24-hour sound measurements are summarized in Table 1 and Figures B-1 through B-12 in Appendix B and are discussed below.

Table 1. Summary of $L_{eq}$ and $L_{min}$ Sound Levels
Measured between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>$L_{eq}$ Value Range (dBA)</th>
<th>$L_{min}$ Value Range (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>242 Ferrini Road</td>
<td>May 22, 1997</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>37-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>672 Oakridge Drive</td>
<td>May 22, 1997</td>
<td>3:42 p.m.</td>
<td>43-47</td>
<td>45-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>189 San Jose Court</td>
<td>May 22, 1997</td>
<td>3:20 p.m.</td>
<td>35-26</td>
<td>35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Brittan Circle</td>
<td>May 23, 1997</td>
<td>4:46 p.m.</td>
<td>34-26</td>
<td>34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>320 Twin RVide Drive</td>
<td>May 23, 1997</td>
<td>5:02 p.m.</td>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>41-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>807 Skyline Road</td>
<td>May 23, 1997</td>
<td>5:14 p.m.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Refer to Figures B-1 through B-12 for additional data.

Weather Conditions

Weather conditions observed during placement of sound meters at each position are discussed below. Weather data measured at San Luis Obispo Airport were provided by Sharon Grace at television station KSBY and is consistent with observations by Jones & Stokes Associates. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Position #1 - 242 Ferrini Road

The sound level meter was placed in the backyard of this residence and began collecting data at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 22, 1997. Fencing and structures block the line of sight to the project site. Skies were clear with a slight breeze. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-1 and B-2, provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour $L_{eq}$ values measured at this location
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Table 2. Summary of Weather Data for May 21, 22, 23, and 24, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Relative Humidity</th>
<th>High Temperature (°F)</th>
<th>Low Temperature (°F)</th>
<th>Wind Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Wind Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 1997</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 1997</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 1997</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 1997</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Wind speed/direction and relative humidity were measured at 3 p.m.

*Gusts up to 14 mph.

between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. varied between 35 decibels A-weighted (dBA) and 40 dBA. Lₚₐ values varied between 27 dBA and 42 dBA.

Position #2 - 672 Oakridge Drive

The sound level meter was placed in the front yard of this residence and began collecting data 2:43 p.m. on Thursday, May 22, 1997. There is a direct line of sight to the project site and Highway 1 from this location. Skies were clear with a slight breeze. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-3 and B-4 provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour Lₚₐ values measured at this location between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. varied between 43 dBA and 47 dBA. Lₚₐ values varied between 45 dBA and 51 dBA.

Position #3 - 189 San Jose Court

The sound level meter was placed in the backyard of this residence and began collecting data at 3:20 p.m. on Thursday, May 22, 1997. Fencing and structures block the line of sight to the project site. Skies were clear with a slight breeze. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-5 and B-6, provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour Lₚₐ values measured at this location between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. varied between 35 dBA and 36 dBA. Lₚₐ values varied between 35 dBA and 38 dBA.

Position #4 - Brittany Circle

The sound level meter was placed in an empty lot in this undeveloped residential subdivision and began collecting data at 4:46 p.m. on Friday, May 22, 1997. There is a direct line of sight to the City of San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Department.
the project site, and Highway 1 from this location. A storm was developing, skies were cloudy, and winds were gusty. The meter was placed near a large tree to visually screen the meter for security reasons and to provide some protection from the weather. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-7 and B-8, provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour $L_{eq}$ values measured at this location between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. varied between 34 dBA and 36 dBA. $L_{eq}$ values varied between 36 dBA and 39 dBA.

Position #5 - 320 Twin Ridge Drive

The sound level meter was placed on an unprotected deck elevated above the backyard of this residence on the up-slope behind the residence. The meter began collecting data at 5:02 p.m. on Friday, May 23, 1997. There was no line of sight to the project site as a result of intervening topography and structures. A storm was developing, skies were cloudy, and winds were gusty. Slight sprinkles were noticed. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-9 and B-10, provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour $L_{eq}$ values measured at this location between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. varied between 39 dBA and 40 dBA. $L_{eq}$ values varied between 41 dBA and 43 dBA.

Position #6 - 807 Skyline Road

The sound level meter was placed in the backyard of this residence and began collecting data at 5:14 p.m. on Friday, May 23, 1997. Fencing and topography block the line of sight to the project site. A storm was developing, skies were cloudy, and winds were gusty. Slight sprinkles were noticed. The meter was fairly protected by nearby trees and structures. Twenty-four-hour measurement results are depicted in Figures B-11 and B-12, provided in Appendix B. The 1-hour $L_{eq}$ values measured at this location between 8 p.m. and 12 a.m. were all at 37 dBA.

SOUND ANTICIPATED FROM THE
SPORTS COMPLEX STADIA

Crowd Sound, Public Address System, and
Music Source Levels

Estimates of sound levels produced by the crowd, public address announcements, and music were made by evaluating sound level data measured by Jones & Stokes Associates, data provided in the Cal Poly Sports Complex EIR, and data from standard references.

Sound levels from the crowd and the public address system were measured by Jones & Stokes Associates at a high school championship game at American River College on Saturday, May 31, 1997. Data were collected using a Larson-Davis 812 sound level meter with output connected to a Sony TCD-D3 digital audio tape recorder. Officials at the event were contacted and...
reported that the size of the crowd was approximately 525. The crowd was evenly distributed in
bleachers located along the first and third base lines. A distributed public address system with horn
speakers elevated above the bleachers and aimed at the bleachers was employed. Measurements
were taken beyond the center field fence at a distance of 370 feet from home plate. This distance
is considered to be reasonably representative of the distance to the acoustic center of the crowd.

Maximum sound levels produced by the crowd in response to events such as strikeouts,
dropped fly balls, and single base hits were typically in the range of 61-71 dBA. In response to a
home run, the maximum sound level produced was 73 dBA. Maximum sound levels produced by
the public address system were in the range of 61-65 dBA. Music was briefly played through the
system and produced a maximum sound level of 68 dBA.

The Cal Poly Sports Complex EIR reports sound levels measured at the 2,500-seat John
Thurman Field in Modesto, California, on July 25, 1996 (Fugro West 1997). A crowd of 665
attended the game. $L_{eq}$ values from general game sound (e.g., yelling, clapping, and organ sound)
was measured in the range of 65-70 dBA at 100 feet. Following a home run, $L_{max}$ values in the range
of 74-79 dBA were measured at 100 feet. A distributed sound system with 12 speakers was used
at this facility.

The Handbook of Noise Control (Harris 1979) reports the sound level produced by a person
yelling with maximum vocal effort is 88 dBA at 1 meter (3.28 feet).

To allow comparison of these measured and reference sound levels, each has been scaled to
a reference distance of 100 feet. This is done by using point source attenuation of 6 decibels (dB)
per doubling of distance. The maximum crowd sound of 73 dBA at 370 feet measured by Jones &
Stokes Associates corresponds to 84.4 dBA at 100 feet. This is calculated by adding 11.4 dB to
73 dBA. The value of 11.3 dB is 20 times the logarithm of the ratio 370/100. This sound level has
been scaled up to correspond to the sound produced by 2,500 people by taking 10 times the
logarithm of the ratio 2,500/525, which equals 6.8 dB. The reference maximum sound level for
2,500 people at 100 feet is therefore 91.2 dBA (73 + 11.4 + 6.8). Estimated reference sound levels
based on the Cal Poly EIR data and the Harris data are summarized in Table 3.

The source level of 91.2 dBA at 100 feet is considered to be a reasonable estimate of the
maximum crowd sound level for a crowd of 2,500 people and is conservative relative to data
reported in the Cal Poly EIR. The estimate of 92.3 dBA from the Harris data is probably overly
conservative because it is based on all 2,500 people yelling in unison with maximum vocal effort.
Table 2. Estimated Maximum Source Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Sound Source</th>
<th>Calculated Reference Maximum Sound Level at 100 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>2,500-person crowd</td>
<td>91.2 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>Public address system</td>
<td>76.4 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>79.4 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>2,500-person crowd</td>
<td>84.7 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly EIR</td>
<td>2,500-person crowd</td>
<td>92.3 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simulation Test

Simulation Program and Test Configuration

A test simulating crowd sound, public address announcement sound, and music was conducted to provide citizens and decision makers with additional insight into the potential noise effects of the project. To conduct the test, program material for the simulation was developed. Selected portions of audio recordings from the baseball game at American River College were assembled into a program of 5 minutes and 20 seconds. The program includes announcements over a public address system; crowd responses from relatively minor events, such as strikeouts and dropped fly balls; and crowd response from a home run. Home runs clearly resulted in maximum crowd sound levels. The crowd sound from a single home run was played three times throughout the crowd program. During the first time, the public address announcement of the home run and an airhorn were included with the crowd sound. During the second and third times, the public address announcement and airhorn were edited from the program. The simulation program was assembled using the live digital audio recordings, a computer-based digital audio editor, an Alesis ADAT 8-track digital audio tape recorder, a Mackie 1604 16-channel mixer, and a Jtec C-3RX stereo cassette deck.

The simulation test was conducted on the evening of Wednesday, June 18, 1997. A professional sound system was placed at the proposed location of the softball stadium. The sound system consisted of two Peavey SP-5T1 speakers spaced approximately 25 feet apart on stands approximately 5 feet above the ground. Two Peavey SP-5T1 speakers were placed between the SP speakers approximately 3 feet above the ground. The speakers were oriented toward the Bishop's Peak area. The speakers were powered by a Peavey CS800 professional stereo power amplifier (600 watts). A Denon DN-610F precision audio component CD/cassette was connected to a Diamond Studio master 12-channel audio mixer, which drove the power amplifier.
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A reference sound level meter was placed 100 feet in front of the speakers. The sound level produced by the speakers was then adjusted so that the maximum sound level from the "home run" crowd sound (in the range of 91-92 dBA) would correspond with the 91.2 dBA estimate shown in Table 3. A second recording of the crowd program recorded at a level 2 dB lower than the first program follows the first program to simulate a smaller crowd of 1,600 people. Ten times the logarithm of the ratio 2,500/1,600 is 1.9 dB. This program was then followed by 2 minutes of rap music ("It's All Good" by M. C. Hammer) and sound effects, including a fire engine bell, a circular saw, and tubular bells. The rap music was adjusted to play at approximately 79 dBA at 100 feet to correspond to music sound levels measured by Jones & Stokes Associates at American River College. The sound effects were followed by 2 minutes of rock music ("Got to Be Funky" by Stevie Ray Vaughan) played at the maximum level that the sound system could produce without audio distortion. Music would never be played this loud at the stadium. Table 4 summarizes maximum sound levels produced by each element of the 15-minute simulation program as measured at 100 feet.

Table 4. Simulation Maximum Sound Levels Measured at 100 Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Sound</th>
<th>$L_{max}$ at 100 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowd</td>
<td>91-93 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public address</td>
<td>84 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap music</td>
<td>78-79 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire engine bell</td>
<td>70-71 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular saw</td>
<td>72 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular bells</td>
<td>72 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock music</td>
<td>93-94 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulation program was then played six times throughout the evening, between 8 p.m. and midnight, while sound level measurements and observations were made at each of the six residential receptor locations.

Weather Conditions

Sharon Grace of television station KSBY was contacted and provided weather data that were measured at San Luis Obispo Airport on the evening of the test. These data are summarized in Table 5.

Skies were clear throughout the evening. When sound level measurements were taken at each position, there was no wind with the exception of a very slight breeze at position #3, San Jose.
Court. These calm, cool, and stable weather conditions were ideal for the simulation test. Winds are predominantly out of the northwest in San Luis Obispo. Winds out of the northwest would tend to reduce sound transmission between the project site and the neighborhoods of concern. Accordingly, the absence of wind provided stable baseline weather conditions for the test.

Ms. Graves also provided information concerning temperature inversion conditions in the San Luis Obispo area. She said that inversion conditions tend to occur in July, August, and September and taper off in October. Sometimes inversion conditions can develop as early as May or June, but this is fairly rare. Low cloud cover conditions in San Luis Obispo tend to coincide with these inversion conditions. Given that the baseball season is from January to May, it appears that inversion conditions that could increase sound propagation would typically not occur during the baseball season.

Sound Levels in the Neighborhood

At each position, background sound levels were measured for 1-2 minutes before the simulation program was played. Measurements were then taken for the entire duration of the simulation program. Measurements of background sound levels and sound levels measured during the simulation program are summarized in Table 6. Although sound from the simulation program was audible at some locations, program sound was not clearly measurable above the background sound level at any location. Tonal sound, such as speech and music that is not measurable above the background sound level, can often be audible if the sound level of the tonal sound is within approximately 10 dB of the background sound level. Maximum sound levels reported in Table 6 are not from the program but rather from sources such as car passages, radio transmissions, and aircraft.

The following is a discussion of observations and measurements made by Jones & Stokes Associates. It is important to note that these observations were made by an individual with critical listening skills who was very familiar with the program material. Other individuals unfamiliar with the material may not even notice sound described below as barely audible.

Position #1 - 242 Ferrini Road. Measurements and observations were taken in Throop Park, across the street from this residence because the occupants were not home. Background sound
levels included sound from traffic on Highway 1 and Foothill Boulevard and crickets. No part of the simulation program was audible at any time. A train passage resulted in sustained sound levels at approximately 42 dBA for several minutes before the simulation was played.

Position #2 - 672 Oakridge Drive. Background sound levels included sound from traffic on Highway 1 and crickets. The first "home run" crowd sound peak and announcements were barely audible. The second "home run" crowd sound peak was audible, as was the closing announcement statement. The rock music was distinctly audible with intelligible singing. Sound peaks in the range of 43-47 dB were noted during the rock music; however, it was not possible to clearly determine that these peaks were from the music. The rap music and sound effects were inaudible.

Table 6. Summary of Sound Levels Measured before and during the Simulation Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>$L_{max}$</th>
<th>$L_{50}$</th>
<th>$L_{10}$</th>
<th>$L_{mean}$</th>
<th>$L_{Aeq}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>242 Ferrari Road</td>
<td>11:40 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>672 Oakridge Drive</td>
<td>9:02 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>189 San Jose Court</td>
<td>8:36 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Brittany Circle</td>
<td>8:02 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>320 Twin Ridge Drive</td>
<td>9:59 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>807 Skyline Road</td>
<td>10:52 p.m.</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum sound levels measured during the 15-minute program were not from the program but rather from sources such as car passages, radio transmissions, and aircraft.

b Measurements were taken in Throop Park, across the street from this residence, because the residents were not home.
Position #3 - 189 San Jose Court. Background sound levels included sound from traffic on Foothill Boulevard, crickets, and birds. The first "home run" crowd sound peak was audible, and the rock music was just barely audible. None of the simulation program was measurable above the background sound level. The public address announcements, rap music, and sound effects were inaudible.

Position #4 - Brittany Circle. Background sound levels included sound from traffic on Highway 1 and crickets. The "home run" crowd sound peaks and the rock music were barely audible. None of the simulation program was measurable above the background sound level. The public address announcements, rap music, and sound effects were inaudible.

Position #5 - 320 Twin Ridge Drive. Background sound levels included sound from traffic on Highway 1 and crickets. The "home run" crowd sound peaks were just barely audible. The rock music, public address announcements, rap music, and sound effects were not audible. None of the simulation program was measurable above the background sound level.

Position #6 - 807 Skyline Road. Background sound levels included sound from traffic on Highway 1 and crickets. The "home run" crowd sound peaks, part of the announcements, and the rock music was just barely audible. The rap music and sound effects were inaudible. None of the simulation program was measurable above the background sound level.

Calculated Sound Level Projections

Crowd and public address sound has been evaluated using the source levels indicated in Table 4 and an acoustic propagation model. Octave band sound levels for recorded crowd sound, public address announcement sound, and background sound was determined using Spectra Plus Version 4.0, a PC-based spectral analyzer. Tables B-1 through B-6 in Appendix B summarize the sound attenuation calculations for each of the six residential locations. Attenuation calculations were conducted in accordance with procedures recommended in Noise Control for Buildings and Manufacturing Plants (Hoover & Keith 1996). Assumed source levels, distance attenuation, molecular absorption, anomalous excess attenuation, and estimated barriers effects are summarized. A nominal temperature of 30°F and a relative humidity of 50% was assumed in the determination of attenuation from molecular absorption.

The resulting calculated sound levels at each receptor locations can be compared in Tables B-1 through B-6 to L_{eq} dBA background sound levels measured on the night of June 18, 1997. Estimated octave band L_{eq} values are also shown. Calculated sound levels can be compared to background levels measured in May by comparing the results in Tables B-1 through B-6 to L_{eq} dBA values reported in Table 1.

The results of the sound projection calculations are generally consistent with measured results. Projected public address A-weighted sound levels are below background sound levels. In some cases, the 500-Hz octave band public address sound levels approach the background sound levels.
level for this octave band. This would explain the audibility of public address announcement sound at position #2 on Oakridge Drive. With the exception of position #6 on Skyline Drive, predicted maximum crowd sound levels are below background L_10a dBA values. The predicted crowd sound value of approximately 40 dBA at position #6 is approximately 4 dB higher than the background sound level of approximately 36 dBA. However, crowd sound was barely audible and not measurable at this site. This is inconsistent with a 4-dBA increase. Barrier effects and molecular absorption were conservatively estimated in this analysis. The actual barrier effect at position #6 is probably higher than in the prediction.

As discussed in Appendix A, short-term atmospheric effects relating to wind and temperature gradients can cause bending of sound waves and can influence changes in sound levels at large distances (i.e., greater than approximately 1,000 feet). These effects can either increase or decrease sound levels depending on the orientation of the source and receptor and the nature of the wind and temperature gradient. The effects of wind, temperature gradients, and other meteorological effects are very unstable and cannot be predicted with certainty. Accordingly, these atmospheric factors are not included in the basic calculations described above. Studies indicate that wind with speeds up to 10 knots may increase sound levels at downwind locations and decrease sound levels at upwind locations by as much as 5 dBA (Cotnoir/Beland 1995). Variations in sound levels attributed to atmospheric effects as high as 20 dBA have been observed at some outdoor venues (Cotnoir/Beland 1995). It would not be unreasonable to expect that meteorological effects would reduce or eliminate the barrier effects identified in Tables B-1 through B-6.

Winds would need to be blowing from the east to substantially increase sound transmission from the project site to neighborhoods of concern. Winds are predominantly out of the northwest in San Luis Obispo. Accordingly, winds that would increase sound propagation westerly appear to be unusual. Several residents that were interviewed indicated that on some days, sound from the Mustang Stadium, including public address announcements, are clearly audible. This is likely the result of the large crowd size, loud public address system, and increased sound transmission resulting from wind, temperature inversion conditions, or low cloud cover. These conditions likely would increase the sound transmission from the project site also. However, temperature inversion conditions and the associated low cloud cover that would tend to increase sound transmission typically occur in July, August, and September and would not typically coincide with use of the stadium.

SURVEY RESULTS

Survey forms were sent to approximately 1,000 residents in the area. Copies of the cover letter and survey form sent to residents or made available at the parks and recreation department are provided in Appendix B. The survey forms were color-coded as follows based on the area of the city surveyed:

- green - Tassajara, Foothill, and Cal Poly areas;
- pink - Bishops Peak area;

Survey forms were returned by approximately 600 residents. The respondents were asked to rate the noise levels by using a scale from 1 to 5: 1 being very low, 2 low, 3 moderate, 4 high, and 5 very high. The results were as follows:

- 132 responses (20% of the distribution) rated the noise level as very low (1);
- 394 responses (65% of the distribution) rated the noise level as low (2);
- 64 responses (11% of the distribution) rated the noise level as moderate (3);
- 16 responses (3% of the distribution) rated the noise level as high (4);
- 3 responses (0% of the distribution) rated the noise level as very high (5).

The average noise level rating was 2.0, indicating that the majority of respondents believed the noise levels were low.

Survey results were also analyzed by age, gender, and housing type. The results showed that younger residents were more likely to rate the noise levels as high, while older residents rated the noise levels as moderate.

Survey results were compared to the predicted sound levels at the same locations. The comparison showed that the predicted sound levels were generally lower than the actual sound levels measured during the survey. This suggest that the actual sound levels are higher than predicted.

The survey results were used to identify areas with the highest noise levels and to prioritize noise reduction measures. The results were also used to identify areas where additional surveys were needed to ensure comprehensive coverage.

In conclusion, the survey results provided valuable information on the perceived noise levels and helped to identify areas where noise reduction measures are needed.
- purple - Teach School area; and
- yellow - available for pickup at the parks and recreation department.

One hundred and fifty-nine survey forms were returned, and no yellow forms were returned. Forty-six of the forms did not include check marks but rather included written comments, many of which were not related to sound. Tables 7 through 10 summarize the survey results for the 113 forms that were returned with check marks. Tables 7 through 9 summarize responses for each area; Table 10 summarizes responses for all areas. The tables indicate the time period when the simulation test was conducted. They also identify responses of audibility when the simulation was not being played, which indicates that sound from other sources was mistaken for the simulation test.

The simulation test was originally scheduled to be complete by 11:00 p.m. Because of unforeseen delays, an additional test was run at 11:40 p.m. Seven of the survey respondents from the Bishops Peak area indicated that sound (primarily music and speech) from the test was distinctly audible and, in some cases, audible from inside their homes. This increased audibility is attributed to the reduced ambient sound level resulting from reduced street traffic and the reduced atmospheric sound attenuation associated with increased humidity.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the sound level projection analysis and the simulation test indicate that crowd sound and public address sound at levels anticipated from the stadium would not measurably increase A-weighted background sound levels in the neighborhoods of concern under cool, calm weather conditions with clear skies. They also indicate that sounds from these sources would be barely audible to audible depending on location. In addition, the results of the simulation test indicate that loud music (95-94 dBA at 100 feet) can be distinctly audible at locations that have a direct line of sight to the project site and can be barely audible at locations where there is intervening topography or structures. The test results also indicate that public address announcements at a level of 84 dBA at 100 feet can be audible at locations with a direct line of sight to the project site. The predominant winds out of the northeast would tend to reduce sound transmission from the project site to locations to the west (i.e., the neighborhoods of concern). Winds from the east, temperature inversion conditions, or low cloud cover may tend to increase sound transmission from the project site and could result in distinctly audible crowd and public address sound in the neighborhoods of concern. However, these types of conditions are usually unstable, intermittent, and short-term in nature. In addition, temperature inversion conditions and the associated low cloud cover that would tend to increase sound transmission typically occur in July, August, and September and would not typically coincide with use of the stadium. Mitigation measures discussed below would help to reduce sound at the source.
MITIGATION MEASURES

The following are several suggested mitigation measures that would reduce the sound that propagates to the west from the stadium and from the complex in general. Jeff Markowitz, project manager for Cal Poly, was contacted to gain information on the potential design of the stadium and the sound systems for the stadium. He indicated that the project design is schematic only and that there is no detail available on the design of the stadium or the sound systems. The mitigation measures are as follows:

- Employ a distributed sound system at the stadium that minimizes the sound produced by each speaker while providing adequate speech intelligibility. Orient speakers to point away from residences to the west and south. The maximum sound level produced by any individual speaker shall not exceed 65 dBA as measured at 50 feet from the speaker. (This assumes a maximum of 15 speakers in each facility. If more speakers are required, a lower sound level limit may be required.)

- Provide sound monitoring equipment with the public address systems that will allow the system operator to monitor system sound levels so that the sound limits specified above are not exceeded.

- Require that sound systems be operated only by trained technicians.

- Prohibit the use of portable sound systems that increase sound levels in the stadiums.

- Prohibit the use of public address systems on the multiuse fields.

- Prohibit music-related events, such as rock concerts, at the sports complex.

- Provide solid barriers (4 pounds per square foot surface area minimum) to block the line of sight between seating areas and residential areas to the west and south.

- Prohibit the use of music and sound effects after 7 p.m.

CITATIONS


ATTACHMENT #3

Parking Structures

The ideal parking structure should meet the IESNA minimum illuminance values (not exceed) with excellent uniformity. With the measures listed below, the overall effect should provide a safe non-overlighted environment while minimizing the light trespass potential.

Per recommendations in the IESNA 9th Edition Lighting Handbook, parking structures should meet the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum Horizontal Illuminance</th>
<th>Maximum to Minimum Illuminance Ratio</th>
<th>Minimum Vertical Illuminance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure Interior</td>
<td>1.0 footcandles</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>0.5 footcandles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Areas (Day)</td>
<td>50 footcandles</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>25 footcandles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure Top Level</td>
<td>0.5 footcandles</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>0.25 footcandles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The highest horizontal illuminance area, divided by the lowest horizontal illuminance point or area should not be greater than the ratio shown.

Design entries and exits such that higher illuminance levels occur during the day for daylight adaptation. At night, the lighting controls should lower the lighting levels to match the rest of the interior garage.

To minimize light trespass:
- Use fully shield luminaires such that lamp and/or reflector brightness is not seen when viewing parking structure from outside.
- Luminaires should have the option of additional shielding if required.
- All fixtures must be shielded to avoid glare and light spill-over onto adjacent areas and onto public right-of-way areas.
- Landscape lighting should be accomplished with low wattage, low glare luminaires aimed down.
- The use of specular or highly reflective materials on the exterior of all structures shall be minimized.
- Internal light-wells will be provided to maximize the amount of natural light.
- Solid rails shall be included around the perimeter to block light spillage from headlights on cars within the structure and the parking structure lights.
- All top pole mounted top deck luminaires shall be IESNA full cut-off luminaires.
- All top deck luminaires mounted on poles shall be located on the interior columns to keep light from spilling out on to adjacent areas and include additional shielding to minimize luminaire brightness.
- Any luminaires mounted on the exterior walls shall be IESNA full cut-off luminaires.
Sports Lighting Criteria

The design for Mustang Stadium shall include measures to reduce light levels, light pollution and glare. This glare is visible to area residents that have a direct view of the stadium and from parks with sensitive habitat.

For aerial sports such as baseball and football, the luminaires need to be located high above the fields (100' or greater) in order to safely light the field with minimal light trespass. With lower the pole heights and the higher the aiming angles, there is greater light trespass potential.

Once the aiming and installation has met the criteria, luminaire type, location and aiming shall not be altered during re-design or general maintenance without proper notification of affected property owners.

- Pole heights shall be 100' or greater.
- Preferable lighting equipment would incorporate IESNA full cut off luminaires with no adjustable floodlights.
- If adjustable floodlights are used, every effort shall be made to minimize offensive glare to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Adjustable floodlights must be equipped with both internal and external shielding.
- Aiming angles above 60 degrees from vertical is not allowed.
- Field lighting shall be controlled such that when fields are not in use, the sports lighting equipment is turned off. In no case shall the sports lighting be on after 11PM.
- Lighting levels shall not exceed IESNA recommendations as listed in the 9th Edition Handbook.
- After the first 100 hours of operation, lighting levels shall not exceed IESNA RP-33-99 “Lighting for Exterior Environments” recommendations for minimizing light pollution and light trespass for an environmental zone E1 (intrinsically dark). For environmental Zone E1, the maximum illuminance value given measured anywhere off the property at the eye in a plane perpendicular to the line of sight is 0.1 footcandle.
- Lighting equipment shall have a galvanized or natural aluminum matte finish in order to minimize daytime appearance.
Letter 52
[neighbors]
Bishops Peak Neighborhood Association

December 8, 2000

52-1 Commenter urges implementation of guiding principles from Neighborhood Relations Task Force.

Response The text in the Guiding Framework now reads: “Planning future campus facilities and support services so as to minimize and mitigate environmental impacts on and off campus to the full extent feasible as part of project design” (p. 15).

52-2 Commenter suggests specific language to mitigate impacts in sports complex area.

Response While the recently opened Sports Complex is not a component of the Master Plan update, there are numerous principles that apply to any further development of this type. With respect to any future development in the area around the Sports Complex, text has been added as follows: “Particular consideration will be given to minimizing impacts on established neighborhoods and public open space” (p. 150).

52-3 Asks that Heery plan not be used as a basis for any future football stadium location/design

Response Although the Heery plan offers guidance the provision of future recreational facilities on campus, it does not necessarily guide design; comment is noted for future reference. The Heery plan will not be used for the stadium design. The location in the Heery Plan for Mustang Stadium is consistent with the Master Plan stadium alternative location, should the stadium move.

52-4 Commenter requests reference 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study be made in EIR and plan.

Response The Jones and Stokes study has been cited in the bibliography. A summary of its findings have been incorporated into the discussion of the Mustang Stadium relocation alternative. The Master Plan text has been modified to include references to the Jones and Stokes sound study as well (see pp. 150 and 152).

52-5 Commenter suggests the plan consider the possible future football stadium as new project since it is not just a relocation of same size facility.

Response Comment noted. If Mustang Stadium were to move, it would require additional environmental analysis. Note that the refurbishment of the current Mustang Stadium has been clarified in the Master Plan as the most appropriate current option (see p. 151).

52-6 Commenter suggests the need for more effective mitigation for noise.

Response The Jones and Stokes study has been cited in the bibliography. A summary of its findings have been incorporated into the discussion of the Mustang Stadium relocation in the EIR.
52-7 Commenter requests the plan address feasibility of remodeling Mustang stadium (compare noise impacts.)

Response The refurbishment of the current Mustang Stadium has been added to the Master Plan as an alternative. The Jones and Stokes study provides the following guidance for expected noise levels at the stadium location:

“The results of the sound level projection analysis and the simulation test indicate that crowd sound and public address sound at levels anticipated from the stadia will not measurably increase A-weighted background sound levels in the neighborhoods of concern under cool, calm, weather conditions with clear skies. They also indicate that sounds from these sources will be barely audible depending on location. In addition, the results of the simulation test indicate that loud music (93-94 dBA and 100 feet) can be distinctly audible at locations that have a direct line of sight to the project site and can be barely audible at locations where there is intervening topography or structures. The test results also indicate that public address announcements at a level of 84 dBA at 100 feet can be audible at locations with a direct line of sight to the project site. The predominant winds out of the northeast will tend to increase sound transmission from the project site and could result in distinctly audible crowd and public address sound in the neighborhoods of concern. However, these types of conditions are usually unstable, intermittent, and short term in nature. In addition, temperature inversion conditions and the associated low cloud cover that would tend to increase sound transmission typically occur in July, August, and September and would not typically coincide with use of the stadia.”

52-8 Commenter suggests that noise and light mitigation must be monitored.

Response CEQA requires the development of a mitigation-monitoring plan, a condition of certifying the EIR and its measures. Future environmental work will be more specific to each project and will allow for identification of more concrete applications for mitigation measures.

52-9 Commenter recommends the Jones and Stokes and other studies for alternative noise mitigation.

Response Although the Jones and Stokes study was designed for the Sports Complex, it will be useful for future projects. Specific noise mitigation measures will be developed on a project-by-project basis. The Jones and Stokes study, in conjunction with additional studies, will be used for any modifications to Mustang Stadium, or any similar facility.

52-10 Commenter suggests adding working with neighbors as a component of noise mitigation.

Response See p. 348 where the University includes in its future communication principles that it will consult with neighbors prior to the development of any facility that could have negative impacts in their neighborhood.

52-11 Commenter suggests plan address feasibility of remodeling Mustang stadium.

Response This recommendation has been added to the plan, noting that the refurbishment of the current Mustang Stadium is the most appropriate current option (see p. 151).
52-12 Commenter suggests adding specific language to clarify mitigation of light and glare impacts on residential areas and open space.

Response Additional language includes the following: “As noise and light impacts are significant concerns, the campus will conduct further studies, like the Jones and Stokes Sound Study prepared in 1997 by the City and community for the Sports Complex.” And, further along in the same paragraph: “Particular consideration will be given to minimizing impacts on established neighborhoods and public open space” (p. 150).

The light mitigation for Mustang Stadium has been modified to read (underlined text is revised):

**Mustang Stadium.** If Mustang Stadium were to be moved, design shall include measures to reduce light and glare visible to area residents. The stadium will be redesigned from that which is shown in the Heery Plan in order to accomplish the following measures:

- All lights must be designed to avoid glare and spillover onto adjacent areas and onto public right of way areas and minimize impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.
- The use of reflective materials will be minimized
- Landscape illumination will be accomplished with low-level, unobtrusive fixtures
- Minimum safe lighting levels will be used in adjacent parking and other facilities.

An analysis of the lighting and glare impacts would be required as part of future environmental review for this project.

52-13 Commenter calls for more effective mitigation for light and glare - Class II finding not acceptable based on proposed mitigation.

Response Additional mitigation has been added to the EIR. The essential change is that the Heery Plan will not necessarily be used for the design of any future facility, and certainly not for the football stadium (which is not proposed for relocation in this Master Plan).

52-14 Commenter offers suggestions for alternative, more effective mitigation of light and glare.

Response Additional mitigation has been added to the EIR. The essential change is that the Heery Plan will not necessarily be used for the design of any future facility, and certainly not for the football stadium (which is not proposed for relocation in this Master Plan).

52-15 Commenter suggests applying similar mitigation measures for light and glare if basketball arena is built.

Response Any sports facility constructed on campus will be subjected to additional environmental scrutiny. The mitigation developed in the Master Plan EIR will be applied to the Field House (basketball arena).

52-16 Commenter suggests noise and light mitigation must be monitored.
Response  CEQA requires mitigation to be monitored through the mitigation-monitoring plan, a condition of adopting the EIR and its measures. Future environmental work will be more specific to each project and will allow for identification of more concrete applications for mitigation measures.

52-17  Commenter suggests adding working with neighbors as a component of light and glare mitigation.

Response  See p. 348 where the University will consult with neighbors prior to the development of any facility that could have negative impacts in their neighborhood.
December 4, 2000

TO: B. Lowe
Facilities Planning
Cal Poly University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Re: Cal Poly Master Plan

The Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo (ECOSLO) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Cal Poly Master Plan. The Plan has many good features and attempts to address the potential future impact of housing needs in San Luis Obispo County regarding Cal Poly’s projected enrollment. The Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo (ECOSLO) feels that there are some remaining areas of concern in the Plan. The purpose of this letter is to state our concern with the placement of housing, and to bring to your attention certain requirements mandated by the State of California.

Many people have commented on the placement of housing. ECOSLO is concerned with the planned placement of housing in the mouth of Poly Canyon and along the Brizzolara (Brizzolara) Creek flood plain. These areas are sensitive habitats that should not be displaced in the quest for campus housing. A previously made recommendation by the Biology Department offers an alternative to destroying the sensitive areas of Poly Canyon and Brizzolara Creek.

The proposed housing sites located behind the Brick Dorms and their parking lots, the North Mountain Dorms, and the housing site near California Blvd. should be built first in whatever sequence deemed desirable. After these sites are fully developed, the housing needs on the campus should be re-evaluated to determine what additional housing may be needed.

The housing built at these locations should encompass parking beneath the structure in a quantity sufficient to accommodate the number of students housed in the unit. This would allow for a four or five-story building that would require less ground space for its existence thus minimizing the impact on the environment while supplying much needed housing and parking, the idea being to build up rather than out. This idea of in-filling within the campus core could be carried out in many locations on campus and would help eliminate the need to destroy sensitive habitats to house more students, faculty and their attendant requirements.
Cal Poly Master Plan Comments
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ECOSLO recognizes Cal Poly’s “learn by doing” philosophy and enjoys being involved with students and faculty. On August 2, 2000, Governor Gray Davis issued executive Order D-16-00:

“...to site, design, deconstruct, construct, renovate, operate and maintain state buildings that are models of energy, water, and materials efficiency; while providing healthy, productive, and comfortable indoor environments and long term benefits to Californians.”

We think that Cal Poly should be designing the most environmentally advanced residence halls in the world. This is an opportunity for Cal Poly to build residence structures that provide a unique living and learning opportunity, emphasizing resource efficiency and renewable energy. The new dorms should be designed with environmental considerations focusing on energy, building materials, sustainable living practices and student involvement in the planning process.

The McLean Environmental Living and Learning Center at Northland College in Wisconsin achieved energy and water efficiency at a rate 50% greater than a typical building designed to code. The systems employed by Northland included high efficiency heating, heat recovery, advanced lighting control, natural daylighting, wind power, photovoltaic panels, and solar water heating. Cal Poly could do the same or better. You have the opportunity in designing the new residence halls and faculty housing to showcase Cal Poly’s environmental commitment.

Thank you for your time and consideration in committing to a sustainable future.

Pamela Marshall Heatherington
Executive Director
Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo
864 Osos St., Suite C
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Letter 53
Pamela Heatherington
EcoSlo

December 4, 2000

53-1 The commenter suggests that the housing north of Brizzolara Creek should only be built after housing has been constructed at sites H-4, H-5, H-6 and H-7 (see Figure 5-9) and only if a reevaluation suggests the additional housing would be needed. This would protect sensitive habitats.

Response Concerns are noted. The Master Plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the H-1 and H-2 housing units at a suitable distance from the creek corridor that resulted in the creation of the Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project and the re-absorption of units initially proposed for location along the creek (namely H-3). The additional beds were the result of partial absorption of the H-4 housing unit that could not be relocated in its entirety elsewhere on campus.

53-2 The commenter suggests that housing provide parking underneath and be built upwards of four and five stories to reduce the need for land.

Response Several commenters have suggested the University develop housing in a more compact form to save land, especially through the use of taller buildings – “up not out.” Housing on campus was designed to meet several parameters. One was to avoid the development of high-rises. Student housing is effective when it provides an atmosphere of community. This requires air and open recreation space, as well as a connection to everyday living patterns. Taller structures create a disconnection from the student to the student community. In addition, taller structures increase the risk of catastrophe from fire or seismic events. Nevertheless, the proposals are compact, at a density equal to or greater than that elsewhere on campus. Furthermore, a constraints analysis undertaken at the outset of the Master Plan process identified areas appropriate for housing development. The housing proposals are consistent with that analysis. See Constraints and Opportunities analysis. Where feasible, the Master Plan calls for “integration of parking into structures at ground leve 195).

53-3 The commenter suggests Cal Poly should adhere to principles of building sustainability in all future development, becoming a model for the community. Use infill sites for housing

Response Additional text has been added on pp. 162-163, as follows. Site selection, site planning and building design should account for solar exposure, prevailing wind direction, and patterns of light and shade to minimize energy requirements and enhance the quality of outdoor space. Design guidelines and processes for implementing the Master Plan should encourage energy efficient building design and resource conservation. The campus landscape plan should consider the impact of vegetation and water use on the resource efficiency of facilities and the creation of comfortable and functional outdoor space.

Design for renovation of existing buildings and new construction should consider ways to maximize energy efficiency and take advantage of the mild climate in San Luis Obispo. Alternative, renewable energy sources should be used to the greatest extent possible to offset growth in demand. As costs escalate for traditional energy sources, other options to consider include integrated photovoltaics and solar generation for electricity, passive and low energy
cooling strategies for buildings (including materials, solar control, natural ventilation, thermal mass), passive solar space and water heating, and effective use of day lighting. New buildings should be well ventilated using natural ventilation, and existing buildings should be retrofitted where feasible to make them usable and livable during the summer without requiring air conditioning.

Consistent with Cal Poly’s mission, the campus should explore an integrated approach to design for research, education and operational applications in new and renovated buildings and in the campus landscape treatment. In addition to the energy conservation measures noted above, these efforts should address water conservation and reclamation, re-use of materials and products, and life-cycle costing in general. Several opportunities for resource recovery projects with educational and research potential as well as operational value include water supply and waste treatment for animal facilities, enhancement of Brizzolara Creek and the construction of new student residential communities.

53-4 Commenter suggests becoming a model for advanced environmental design.

Response The following text has been added to the University Land Uses element, p. 79. Several of the plan elements contain principles and recommendations to guide future building and landscape design so as to achieve healthy, productive and comfortable indoor and outdoor environments. The Campus Instructional Core element provides the most direction with respect to design principles such as Sense of Place, Compactness, and Visual Continuity. It also includes a section specifying how a green space plan and a landscape plan should be developed as implementation studies. In addition to establishing aesthetic and user-sensitive design, the Master Plan is concerned with energy efficiency and resource conservation. The Public Facilities and Utilities element covers these characteristics of campus development. Other plan elements that involve development, such as Outdoor Teaching and Learning, Residential Communities, Parking, and Ancillary Activities and Facilities, do not repeat either these aesthetic or sustainability principles. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the Master Plan that they be applied to all campus development, including projects undertaken by campus auxiliaries, the Foundation and Associated Students, Inc. As the building and landscape design guidelines are developed, they will take into account the different features of different parts of campus, particularly, the Campus Instructional Core, agricultural facilities in the extended campus, and residential communities.
Dear Ms. Lowe,

After study and discussion in our Issues Committee and in our Legislative/Economic Action Committee, the San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce would like to forward the following comments concerning the Revised Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft EIR:

We encourage a comprehensive circulation plan which will promote pedestrian use of the campus, keep parking on the perimeter, ease congestion by a sequencing of links in city roadways as suggested, and provide for an effective and adequate student transit system to include a city/campus shuttle system. We agree with the proposal to discourage Freshman students from bringing cars to campus. We request that you explore the possibility of a city/county/campus joint venture to tap into monies available from transit organizations.

In the area of housing we would like to see the "new urbanism" applied to on campus apartments and to off campus faculty, staff, and married student housing proposed across Hwy. 1. Innovative design with compact urban form is preferred; this is an opportunity to use creative and perhaps groundbreaking design solutions. We would like Cal Poly to consider the following possibilities with regard to the financing and placement of new housing: 1) forming a non-profit with the Cal Poly Foundation to develop housing in other areas of town in addition to those listed in the plan, 2) consider obtaining property on the perimeter of the campus which is now owned by the local school district as a site for development of faculty and staff housing, 3) look into the feasibility of obtaining other properties in close proximity to campus to be used for faculty and staff housing.

We believe that ancillary and conference facilities would be a plus for the community at large.

We would like to see more services and facilities provided for students on campus; for example, full service food markets. We like the idea of apartment style housing on campus and additional amenities will create a more "resident friendly" culture.

We request that the privatization of housing and of commercial businesses on campus be considered.

We very much appreciate the time, effort, and sensitivity to the community that Dr. Linda Dalton and her team have committed to this process and we look forward to continued updates.

Sincerely,
Patricia Wilmore
Director of Governmental Affairs
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce
Letter 54
Ms. Patricia Wilmore
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce

December 7, 2000

54-1 Commenter offers support for circulation and parking proposals.

Response No response required; See Circulation, Alternative Transportation and Parking elements.

54-2 Commenter suggests applying "new urbanism" concepts to housing on campus.

Response Several of the plan elements contain principles and recommendations to guide future building and landscape design so as to achieve healthy, productive and comfortable indoor and outdoor environments. The Campus Instructional Core element provides the most direction with respect to design principles such as Sense of Place, Compactness, and Visual Continuity. It also includes a section specifying how a green space plan and a landscape plan should be developed as implementation studies. In addition to establishing aesthetic and user-sensitive design, the Master Plan is concerned with energy efficiency and resource conservation. The Public Facilities and Utilities element covers these characteristics of campus development. Other plan elements that involve development, such as Outdoor Teaching and Learning, Residential Communities, Parking, and Ancillary Activities and Facilities, do not repeat either these aesthetic or sustainability principles. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the Master Plan that they be applied to all campus development, including projects undertaken by campus auxiliaries, the Foundation and Associated Students, Inc. As the building and landscape design guidelines are developed, they will take into account the different features of different parts of campus, particularly, the Campus Instructional Core, agricultural facilities in the extended campus, and residential communities.

54-3 Commenter recommends land and financing options for student, faculty and staff housing.

Response See additional language regarding project financing on page 346: “…to the extent possible, the University should explore a range of alternatives, such as public-private partnerships, Foundation support, enterprise partnerships and collaborative ‘design-build’ project development techniques.”

54-4 Commenter offers support for ancillary and conference facilities.

Response No response required; see pp. 205-206.

54-5 Commenter offers support for services and facilities on campus for student residents.

Response No response required; See also a new section on Commercial Retail Services (pp. 202-203), cited below in response to comment 54-6.

54-6 Commenter requests consideration of "privatization" of housing and commercial services on campus.
Response As planning for an increased range and volume of services occurs, the campus will need to determine which it should offer directly and which might be provided through franchise or “privatization.” The vision of the Master Plan calls for a primary campus activity center near the University Union that is focused on students. Thus, the range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center. Cal Poly understands that there is a delicate balance in determining how much of what services will be sufficient to support the campus community and manage commuting. Effective alternative transportation will allow students, faculty, and staff – as well as members of the broader community – to take advantage of the range of services and facilities both on and off campus without adding to traffic congestion. The Cal Poly Foundation is presently the exclusive provider of certain services – e.g., food service, vending machines and bookstore. Other services compete for campus outlets – e.g., travel service, ATMs. As planning for an increased range and volume of services occurs, the campus will need to determine which it should offer directly and which might be provided through franchise or “privatization.”
December 3, 2000

Dr. Linda Dalton  
Vice Provost for Institutional Planning  
c/o Ms. Bonnie Lau  
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  

Dear Dr. Dalton:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to Cal Poly's Master Plan and discussions from your recent community presentations. The most important issue that I have as both a resident of San Luis Obispo and a very close neighbor to the university, is the lack of trust I have in the process Cal Poly has historically taken with development. I do not feel that Cal Poly will protect our neighborhoods' best interests as a good neighbor and truly follow this plan. I am unsure that Cal Poly will not unilaterally add or modify projects to their institutional needs that could significantly impact our low density neighborhoods.

I feel it is important that Cal Poly understand and appreciate the dynamic of our two communities' interdependent relationship, in the past, and to a certain extent through this current Master Plan process, Cal Poly has appeared to take a patronizing attitude toward interested community members. This perspective is more than evident by the monologue nature of your presentations and the absence of answers to questions asked. Just writing our questions down in cryptic form on a sheet of butcher paper is not a "public relations savvy" manner to demonstrate an open and interactive dialogue process. Some effort toward answering the questions would have placated most, and at a minimum, it would have demonstrated some genuine interest in the concerns voiced. Additionally, an aggressive mail campaign notifying affected residents, both tenants and owners, of the plan development would have demonstrated an open approach to the process. Be that as it may, the Cal Poly Master Plan directly affects the quality of life of our neighborhoods and since our neighbors are your employees and students, I would think that you would be more than over-cautious in designing projects that will ultimately affect city residents.

To the questions at hand that need significant clarification:

- What guarantee is there that the current open space bordering Slack St. (colored pink on maps indicating Ancillary Facilities) will not be used as building sites in the future?
- How far up the hillside is Cal Poly expecting to develop? (The notorious pink shading ancillary facilities, differs with almost every map and on some maps the print-cut does not show the entire hillside)
- Why won't Cal Poly commit that land to an open space buffer and/or Ag grazing lands as supported by the December 5, 2000 SLO City Council Agenda Report?
- Will Cal Poly re-designate and add two-way arrows along the Slack St. border east of Grand Ave. Indicating neighborhood impact, as supported by the December 5, 2000 SLO City Council Agenda Report?
- How large is the proposed Visitor Center, including parking and ancillary buildings if any?


Page 373
- What is "or additional conference facilities" (pg. 195 CP Master Plan) in reference to the Grand Avenue entrance Visitors' Center? Use? Clientele? Additional building? Capacity/size?
- Why, all of a sudden, does "conference facilities" appear as just a simple word addition but wholly a new and potentially impactful entity? (This is the "trust" issue being tested between Cal Poly and the community!)
- What are the structural/size/EIR differences between a Visitors' Center and conference facility?
- What impact to traffic flow, intersection and pedestrian safety, and aesthetics will the Visitors' Center have on the narrow Slack St. roadway and Pacheco Elementary School?
- Will it necessitate widening the roadway or installing a traffic light? (against neighborhood wishes?)
- Couldn't the Visitors' Center be located further up Grand Ave., on campus, in the area of the proposed 136 bed apartment complex?
- 136 beds versus the 3,000 seems a very small percentage of beds to warrant the disturbance and challenge of infringing on a buffer area. What was the criteria for placing a 136 bed apartment complex in an existing buffer area?
- Will the complex remain at 136 beds with a guarantee of no expansion?
- Doesn't this apartment complex set a precedent for possible future development up the mountain side and into the buffer area with "add-ons" similar to what is being observed with the LOVR/Madonna Home Depot/Costco development—not trustworthy politics?
- Why can't a 136 bed apartment complex be included into the Brizzolaro Creek site since it is such a small addition rather than a completely new complex?
- What type of substantial buffer/landscaping will be used to soften the visual and noise impact of the apartment complex on the neighboring residential homes?
- What (or to whom) is the appeal process for both initial plans (including EIR findings), and any changes that may supersede the Master Plan?
- Who makes the final decision on each phase of the plan?
- How will the bordering neighborhood be notified of final design plans, building schedules, EIR hearings, etc.?
- Can't Cal Poly and the City of SLO develop a Memorandum of Understanding that would bind both entities to the prescribed/approved Master Plan eliminating the fear of unilateral development?
- Can the Board of Regents or whatever governing body who will ultimately approve the plan, conduct the hearings in San Luis Obispo? (again it would demonstrate good faith interest in our community needs)
- How or when will I receive answers to the aforementioned questions?

Thank you for listening to my concerns for the place I call "home". And thank you in advance for taking the time to address my questions.

Sincerely,

Terry Elfrink
1983 Slack St.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
549-8560
tyrone1@man.com
elfrink@slocsd.org
Letter 55
Mr. Terry Elfrink

December 8, 2000

55-1 Commenter notes his distrust of Cal Poly's planning process.

Response Comment noted. See discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.

55-2 Commenter requests more notice and greater consideration of neighbors by Cal Poly.

Response As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan provides for early meetings with neighbors so as to design projects to relieve potential impacts.

55-3 Commenter seeks greater specificity of development potential at Slack and Grand.

Response Exhibit i shows a more limited development area and adds a buffer. The area beyond the ancillary designation will remain “Outdoor Teaching and Learning,” consistent with the grazing activities there.

55-4 Commenter makes request for recognition of potential neighborhood impacts along Slack Street.

Response A double arrow has been moved on Exhibit 4.10 to the east of Grand Avenue to indicate potential neighborhood conflicts.

55-5 Commenter requests that the plan clarify the Visitor Center site and conference facility expectations at Grand and Slack.

Response The building outlines are shown on Exhibit 5.7 and on a graphic at page 207. These are only conceptual, as project designs will be developed later. However, they do identify the relative size and scope of a visitor center. Further, new text on page 206 provides the following clarification of expectations:

“The most commonly mentioned ancillary activities include a visitor center, conference center, and applied research park. This section explores the nature of each briefly; however, each would require further detailed analysis at such time as a specific proposal is made.

“A visitor center would provide a facility to welcome guests to the campus. It could include a station where visitors could obtain parking permits, campus maps, and directions to their destinations. The visitor center could serve as the starting point for campus tours conducted by Poly Reps. It could also include a small exhibit covering Cal Poly’s history and accomplishments.

“No detailed program has been suggested for a conference center, yet the idea has been studied several times and continues to arise. Presently, Cal Poly’s Conference Services use regular campus facilities during times that they are not scheduled for instruction, and house attendees in some of the residence halls during the summer. The Master Plan calls for an expansion of
alumni services near the present Alumni House, which may include small conference or retreat facilities. In addition, the area near Grand Avenue and Slack Street has been suggested for potential conference facilities. Cal Poly will continue to use its residence halls during the off season to support conferences.”

55-6 Commenter seeks clarification on traffic impacts of Visitor Center on Grand Avenue.

Response A visitor center would most likely have the effect of reducing the distance existing visitors would have to travel into the campus. Grand Avenue would have only minimal impacts from the proposed project. Access will not be provided off of Slack Street. Future environmental review will also address this topic.

55-7 Commenter requests the plan consider relocating Visitor Center further onto campus.

Response A map change (Exhibit 5.7) shows a different orientation of the Visitor Center and adds a buffer. This is an excellent site for a visitor center, an activity that should have very little effect on the neighborhood.

55-8 Commenter asks for the basis of locating 136 beds at the northeast corner of Slack Street and Grand Avenue - and is that a maximum number that may be built there? Why not elsewhere?

Response The site was selected because it is adjacent to existing student housing, and the tree-lined swale to the south will continue to serve as a buffer. The number of beds represents one estimate of how many units could be built on the site; however, the specific number of students housed will depend on building type and will be determined by more detailed feasibility analysis. Significant changes to this proposal would require a Master Plan amendment from the Board of Trustees. This site was chosen in part to reduce the potential impacts to Brizzolara Creek. Commenter is directed to see Land Use element - Compatibility principle on page 69, proposing buffers between residential neighborhoods and on-campus student residences.

55-9 Commenter asks why the 136-bed complex cannot be moved to the Brizzolara Creek area.

Response The Master Plan team was presented with its greatest challenge when it sought to fulfill the policy of housing all new enrollment on campus. The density assigned to all new housing equals or exceeds that of existing housing on campus. The earlier draft of the plan had considerably more housing near Brizzolara Creek. In order to allow for the enhancement of the creek, the team looked elsewhere to meet the mandate. The area near Slack Street and Grand Avenue is relatively low quality soil, therefore not great for agriculture, is low in biological resources, and has a relatively flat gradient, all of which contribute to it being an excellent site for campus development. However, concern with neighborhood impacts led the team to keep housing to the north of the large swale, behind a natural screen, and to limit the development near Slack Street to non-residential activities. The revised map shows the limits of the area designated for student housing in the Master Plan.

55-10 Commenter requests information on mitigating visual and noise impacts of new student housing.
Response  A substantial buffer is currently provided for the complex by the vegetated drainage swale bisecting the site. Additional landscaping to screen light and noise will likely be a part of the project mitigation when proposed.

55-11 Commenter asks about the review and appeal process for the plan and specific developments.

Response  The Master Plan will be forwarded to the California State University Board of Trustees for approval and EIR certification at their March 2001 meeting. This will be conducted as a public hearing. Appeal from their decision is to the Superior Court. Subsequent filing to the Board will occur as the development plans are prepared and processed.

55-12 Commenter asks who makes the final decision on each phase of the plan.

Response  See response 55-11 above. The Board of Trustees has final decision-making authority over the Master Plan and the individual projects proposed within it.

55-13 Commenter asks how notification will take place for neighbors regarding any development, EIRs, etc. near Grand Avenue and Slack Street.

Response  As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan provides for early meetings with neighbors who may be impacted by a campus project. Chapter 7 also addresses future environmental review.

55-14 Commenter requests the City and Cal Poly enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to avoid concerns of unilateral actions.

Response  As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan includes provision for consultation with elected officials and local and regional agencies. The University has no provision or current intent to enter into a general Memorandum of Understanding with the City to limit its authority, especially in furtherance of its academic mission.

55-15 Commenter asks if the CSU governing body can meet in SLO.

Response  The CSU Board of Trustees will hold their deliberations on the Cal Poly Master Plan as part of a much larger agenda at their March meeting, and, therefore, will not travel to San Luis Obispo for the discussion of the Plan.

55-16 Commenter asks how will he receive answers to his questions.

Response  Responses will be included in FEIR as an appendix to Master Plan; individual commenters will receive correspondence noting responses to their concerns.
Subj: MP comment from Cal Poly Suggestion Form Feedback
Date: 12/6/00 8:22:14 AM Pacific Standard Time
To: ciculli@calpoly.edu
Cc: cweclam@isol.com, niknamur@calpoly.edu, bbowe@calpoly.edu

As Darlene

.inda

Subject: Cal Poly Suggestion Form Feedback
MIME-Version: 1.0
From: dbbeck@calpoly.edu
To: dbbeck@calpoly.edu
Content-Type: multipart/Mixed; boundary="openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000002"

--openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000002
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

.inda, this came through CP's home page comment section.

--openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000002
Date: Fri, 8 Dec 2000 12:05:51 -0800
Content-Type: message/rfc822

Subject: Cal Poly Suggestion Form Feedback
MIME-Version: 1.0
Sender: www@poly.ftp.unix.calpoly.edu
R: m@poly.ftp.unix.calpoly.edu
To: dbbeck@calpoly.edu
Content-Type: multipart/Mixed; boundary="openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000003"

--openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000003
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

type of comment/complaint: Problem
Category: (Other) <Growth>

understand the need of the CSU system to accept more students however, campuses located in ecologically sensitive areas i.e., Humboldt, Chico, and San Luis Obispo should really consider the impact on the environment that a larger enrollment has. I did not understand that the environmental impact will not affect our campus due to the University's size. I am concerned that even though the university is not as large as the other CSU campuses, the impact is still significant.

Submitted By:
Jim Finley
Phone: 805-546-9233
Email: bfinley@calpoly.edu
User Request: Contact Response
Originating Host: (216.224.130.156)
--openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000003--
--openmail-part-0f953c2a-00000002--
Letter 56
Ben Fine

December 8, 2000

56-1 The commenter notes that Cal Poly is “killing San Luis Obispo.” He is concerned about the environmental impacts of increasing enrollment.

Response This statement is too broad to be addressed here. The commenter is referred to the EIR located in chapter 6 of the Master Plan for a discussion of environmental impacts from the master plan. The comment is noted for the consideration of the decision makers. See DEIR discussion of alternatives.

56-2 Commenter notes fertilizer is going to enter Brizzolara Creek from the Sports Complex.

Response The Sports Complex is not part of the Master Plan update. However, for informational purposes, the Sports Complex has been designed with a number of mitigation measures to reduce the introduction of pesticides and fertilizers into Brizzolara Creek. Furthermore, the creek will be monitored to identify changes in water quality.

56-3 Commenter would prefer new students only be admitted into vacated positions.

Response See Chapter 3 for a discussion of different scenarios for meeting enrollment demand.
The Cal Poly Master Plan is available in print, on CD-ROM and on the Web. Print copies are available at SLO City-County Library, 995 Palm St., SLO, and on campus at the Kennedy Library and in the Facilities Planning office on campus. Access the Web version at www.campus.projects.calpoly.edu. Info: 756-2581.

OK, Here's the Plan

It's all over. If you didn't get to have your say, it's too bad. It's too bad.

No, I'm not talking about last week's election. I'm talking about all you civically-minded citizens who missed your chance to call Cal Poly what you think about what they're doing. As you read this, the two public meetings are over and gone, right along with your two cents' worth.

It was your chance to sound up and be heard by university officials, who could have commented on the latest Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. Not that the plan matters very much. I'm not saying that it doesn't. It's just that growth at Cal Poly has been going on for 30 years, and someone is going to have to pay for it. It's going to affect your life every second of the time you live here. But the Master Plan is in, so do your thing, and there are so many other important things to do with our time, like trim our own hedges or tutu for dinner on the Cartoon Network.

QUESTION: Who cares? Who cares where they're going to put all these new students? Who cares about the environmental impact of building out along Bixler and Bronco lakes creeks?

And who cares about "ancillary activities"? That's the university's code phrase for its public/private partnerships—just like the PAC, and stuff like that. But which always seem to benefit everyone else a lot more than the students—and who cares about them, anyway? They'll be gone in five years, replaced by a new batch of foot-stomping foofooes who'll only have five years to complain. So who cares?

ANSWER: You do. Because some of those "ancillary activities"—the plan mentions include a research park and a golf-learning center (Really? I'm not making this up! It's right there on p. 193 of the new standards that could be built right there on top of those brand new sports fields). You know those fields—the ones the city finally backed out of partnering up on. Maybe the city could actually read the Master Plan and realized all that money they're going to pony up for "guaranteed usage" just didn't pencil out.

But if you happen to get a bit too excited about any of Cal Poly's Master Plan bliss, you really don't need to worry about having missed those public meetings. Because, according to Cal Poly officials, they may or may not have taken any public comments into account. If you'd shown up to pitch about the plans, they probably wouldn't have listened anyway.

That's what folks learned at the last round of public meetings when it became clear that Cal Poly's attendant officials weren't bothered to take any notes. When one guy asked about this strange way to conduct public comments and concerts, he was told that only comments in writing would be taken into account.

Hmmm. I may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer, but I have to wonder why anyone would bother to attend a meeting if their comments were going to be evaporated into the vaporous ether of limbo-land. But, you have until Monday, Dec. 4, at 3 p.m. to get your written comments in. So grab a copy of the Master Plan, then grab yourself a beer and dig in. There are all kinds of interesting little morrows to be found. And, hey, maybe your comments will even be taken into consideration.

Then again, maybe not.

OHH, SHUT UP! McCarthy's bar in downtown San Luis was pretty crazy last Wednesday night following day's wildly inconclusive presidential election that keeps going on and on and on. "Who the heck is going to win this thing?" someone said to someone else. I wasn't paying much attention. "Gimme Bush," I said.

"Bush?" the guy next to me said, as if I'd just admitted to being a sex offender. "You must be outta yer goddamn mind!"

"Why?...I mean, what's wrong with you?"

"I'll TELL you what's wrong! You want badly to vote in the war? That's what! It's absolutely the worst choice! My God!"

"But that's not very likely," I said. "I mean, they're really careful about that—"

"No, but about it! You're totally wasted!"

"Well," I said. "You'd pick?"

"What the hell do YOU think?"

I didn't know. That's why I asked. "Geez! I'd never heard of that. Is that from some microbrewery?"

I asked. "I'm not familiar with it—"

"What are you TALKING about!"

"Beep," I said. "What are you talking about?"

"The damn election—what else?"

"Look, I said, 'Gimme Bush! They don't have it here!'"

"As it turns out, they didn't."

"But?" I asked.

"What?" the guy said, getting off his barstool and facing me. "Gimme Budweiser," I said to the bartender.

"Yes, sure wish they'd get things unraveled down in Florida so this damn election can be over! You can't even order a beer in this town without getting into politics.

TRAVELING for the HOLIDAYS?

Letter 57
December, 2000

57-1 Commenter notes that it was too late to comment on the Master Plan if the public did not attend the two informational meetings held in December.

Response Commenter corrects this erroneous statement at Comment 57-9 below.

57-2 Commenter suggests the meetings were an opportunity to “stand up and be ignored.”

Response The purpose of the meetings was to provide information and respond to questions from the public about the Cal Poly Master Plan.

57-3 Commenter suggests that the plan is the “blueprint for the explosive growth Cal Poly expects over the next 20 years.”

Response Cal Poly’s enrollment increase of approximately 3,000 students is half what was requested by the CSU Chancellor’s office. Environmental constraints and a lack of housing in the community necessitated Cal Poly’s reducing that increase. See charts in Chapter 3 comparing proposed growth for Cal Poly with San Luis Obispo area, CSU and State of California.

57-4 Commenter questions whether anyone would care about where the new students would be housed or the impacts of developing along Brizzolara and Stenner Creeks.

Response Numerous comments were received from members of the public who showed concern about housing and impacts to riparian habitats. For the record, development is not proposed along Stenner Creek.

57-5 Commenter questions whether anyone cares about the development of ancillary activities, such as a research park and a golf-learning center and the relocation of the football stadium.

Response Numerous comments were received from members of the public who showed concern about these activities. There comments are addressed above.

57-6 Commenter suggests that attending the meetings was of no value to the public because the Cal Poly “flacks” probably weren’t listening.

Response I’m sorry, what did you say?

57-7 Commenter suggests no one was taking notes at the meetings.

Response A Cal Poly representative stood at a two foot by three-foot note pad located on an easel in the front of the room and wrote down every comment made by the public.

57-8 Commenter questioned the value of attending the meeting.
Response  Attendance at the meeting was an opportunity to hear and be heard, as is the purpose of public meetings.

57-9  Commenter states that the public had until Monday, December 4\textsuperscript{th} to submit written comments.

Response  The comment period was extended until Friday, December 8\textsuperscript{th} at 5:00 pm.

57-10  Commenter suggests that comments made by the public may or may not be taken into consideration.

Response  Perhaps the preceding 356 pages of comment and response will suffice.
December 4, 2000

Re: Comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan and Draft EIR
Meeting Date: 12/05/00
Item Number: 1B

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

Once again, we appreciate the opportunity to present to you our written comments on the Cal Poly Master Plan. They are attached and include the following documents:

1. Response to the City Staff report with suggested actions. [Page 1 - 3]
2. Response to Cal Poly Master Plan Draft EIR with suggested actions. [Page 4 - 6]
3. RQN’s previous Master Plan Comments. [Page 7]

As you know RQN has been actively involved with this process from the beginning. After digesting three versions of the plan, we still have very serious concerns regarding the impacts this plan will have on our neighborhoods and community as a whole.

We, therefore, ask the council to consider our recommendations and incorporate them into the City’s response to the Cal Poly Master Plan.

Sincerely yours,

Cydney Holcomb
Chairperson, RQN
COMMENTS ON THE CAL POLY MASTER PLAN
AND
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(October 10, 2000)

1. RGN RESPONSE TO: City of San Luis Obispo - Staff Report - 12/05/00

   Pages 1B-1 & 1B-2
   Report in Brief: Concepts 1-10
   1. We agree.
   2. We agree.
   3. We agree.
   4. We agree.
   5. We agree.
   6. We agree. Add sentence: Housing should be provided prior to increases in enrollment.
   7. Heavy Sports Facilities Master Plan. We disagree with citing the Heery Plan. Please refer to our comments to Page 1B-9.

   Jones and Stokes Noise Study. A sound study for the Cal Poly Sports complex was done in 1997 through a joint effort of Cal Poly and the City of San Luis Obispo. It included specific mitigations for noise from the Sports Complex. The City has previously asked Cal Poly to use these mitigations in its Sports Complex.

   We agree with citing the 1997 Jones & Stokes Sound Study and its recommended mitigations.

   Action: Change #7 to read: "Cite the Jones and Stokes Sound Study and its recommended mitigations and show their use in the evaluation and design of a new Mustang Stadium. Also, list the Jones and Stokes recommended mitigations as feasible mitigations in the EIR for Mustang Stadium."
8. We agree.

9. We agree.

10. Change to read: "Include a definitive process for Plan development and Plan amendment, which assures early community notification, involvement and consultation." 
Rationale: This is especially important as Cal Poly is proposing to defer identification of impacts until such time as specific projects are considered for development.

Page 137
Page 137
Items 1 through 11

We Agree.

Page 138 & 138
Comments on the October 10, 2000, Master Plan and Draft EIR

Page 71, Campus Development Map [re: Greend/Slack Neighborhood Interface]

Action: We suggest that the removal of pink shading indicating "possibility of future development" apply to any and all other maps on which it may appear throughout the Master Plan.

Page 139

Page 137, Introduction [re: Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan citation]

Note: The 1995 Heery Sports Facility Master Plan proposes and includes drawings for a new and larger football stadium in the Sports Complex. This stadium would cover four [4] of the brand new multi-use playing fields and proposes large vertical light towers which will face the Bishop's Peak Neighborhood as well as the City's open space area.

This plan was done by Cal Poly without an EIR, without a sound study and without input from neighborhoods and the general public, therefore, because the council and general public have probably never read the Heery Plan it should not be endorsed or used as a basis for future design of the football stadium.

Action: Add the following sentences: [1] The City Council does not endorse the Heery Plan as a basis for future development of a new Mustang Stadium. [2] If Cal Poly should build a new football stadium, it is the expectation of the City
Council that it will be designed to avoid noise and light impacts on established neighborhoods and the City's open space areas to the greatest extent possible. (For example: rather than designing a stadium with vertical light poles facing the Bishop's Peak Neighborhood, Cal Poly should design a stadium which more effectively avoids lighting impacts by utilizing horizontal arms of lights that extend over the field and aim down on the field rather than towards an existing neighborhood.)

Page 13B, third paragraph, last sentence [re: Mustang Stadium location clarification]

The Master Plan presumes phasing of Mustang Stadium from its present location to the Sports Complex. The Master Plan does not discuss remodeling of the existing Mustang Stadium, which is probably the environmentally superior alternative.

Action: Remodeling should be discussed as an alternative and be subject to the Environmental Review Process.

Page 1B-10

Page 333, Communication and Consultation [re: Community and Neighborhoods]

See our comments to page 1B-2, concept #10.
2. RON RESPONSE TO: Cal Poly Master Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report

Page 210, Cal Poly Master Plan (10/10/00)

Noise

Movement of Mustang Stadium

Action: Include the recommended mitigations from the 1997 Jones and Stokes Sound Study as feasible mitigations.

Action: Add the following statement: "Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts." [Cal Poly Master Plan, Page 334]

Rationale: Cal Poly has stated it will do this, but it does not appear in the mitigation.

Action: Consider other feasible mitigations that have been used for other stadiums, such as: berms, acoustical barriers, enclosing or partially enclosing the stadium and sinking the stadium significantly below ground level.

Page 211

Aesthetics

Third box

Question: Cal Poly is proposing Class II [significant] residual impacts. Certainly, Cal Poly is not proposing light impacts so great that they will "interfere with a persons ability to sleep, overwhelm existing views, adversely affect the view shed from the Ferrini natural open space or other public viewing areas, diminish the character of the area from the Ferrini natural open space or other publicly accessible properties or parks, or pose safety hazards which interfere with a persons ability to walk, drive, or from using or enjoying their property? [Class II, Significant Impacts]

Action: City Council should state that these Class II significant residual impacts are not acceptable.
Third & Fourth Box

Action: Add the following statement: "Cal Poly will meet with neighbors early in project planning and design about projects that may affect them and have cooperative discussions on ways to relieve possible impacts." [Cal Poly Master Plan, Page 334].

Rationale: Cal Poly has stated it will do this but it does not appear in the mitigations.

Action: Add statement: "All light fixtures must be fully shielded, or have internal and external louvers (which ever is most effective) to avoid glare and light spill-over onto adjacent and non-adjacent areas and onto public rights of way. Light trespass shall be avoided to all extent feasible."

Rationale: Fully shielded lights or lights with internal and external louvers avoid impacts on established neighborhoods and the City's open space to a greater extent than "hooded lights". City open space and some neighborhoods are not adjacent to Cal Poly.

Page 212

Mustang Stadium – second box

Action: Change first sentence to read: "If this project were to occur, final design shall include all feasible mitigation measures possible to avoid light trespass, and light and glare visible to area residents."

Action: Add statement: "All light fixtures must have internal and external louvers or be fully shielded (which ever is most effective) to avoid glare and light spill-over onto adjacent and non-adjacent areas and onto public rights of way. Light trespass shall be avoided to all extent feasible."

Rationale: Fully shielded lights or lights with internal and external louvers avoid impacts on established neighborhoods and the City's open space to a greater extent than "shielded lights". City open space and some neighborhoods are not adjacent to Cal Poly.

Action: For new parking structures, new Mustang Stadium, the Slack and Grand area and the Goldtree area, add other feasible lighting mitigations such as: fully shielded lighting, internal and external louvers, lighting, landscaping, enclosing or partially enclosing structures, lighting fixtures of non-reflective materials and horizontal lighting arms which are aimed in a downward direction.
Rationale: Cal Poly seems to be offering minimal mitigations rather than more effective ones that would go further to avoid impacts on established neighborhoods.

Page 210 through 212
Noise and Light Impacts

Action: The Council should request that the mitigation measures should be tied to performance standards and standards of enforceability. There should be post-construction mitigation monitoring plans for noise and light impacts.
3. RQN's PREVIOUS MASTER PLAN COMMENTS

On June 6, 2000, the City Council forwarded RQN's comments on the Master Plan along with their own to Cal Poly. RQN's comments frequently incorporated the adopted Guiding Principles of Cal Poly's own Neighborhood Relations Task Force. They are as follows:

- It shall be a guiding principle that negative impacts of new development, and/or re-development such as: noise, glare, traffic, and parking shall not be borne by residents of the established residential neighborhoods of San Luis Obispo.
- New development on campus shall be designed to eliminate impacts on established neighborhoods, rather than to create designs that generate ongoing conflicts between the University and residential neighborhoods.

Cal Poly responded positively to the City's comments, but for the most part, RQN's comments were not incorporated into the current document.

Cal Poly staff indicated to the City Staff that they have not adopted many of RQN's previous recommendations (page 18-21 through 18-28 of the City Staff Report [12/05/00]) because Cal Poly believes "that the total elimination of impacts on established neighborhoods is not technically possible".

Environmental law supports avoidance of impacts, rather than creating impacts and then attempting to mitigate them. This seems very similar and in the same spirit as "designing new developments on campus to eliminate impacts on established neighborhoods".

Since our original language seems to be controversial, we suggest that Cal Poly re-consider RQN's recommendations, substituting the word "avoid" or "minimize to all extent feasible" in place of the word "eliminate".

Action: City Staff has suggested that Cal Poly re-consider RQN's previous [6/6/00] comments. We agree. Council should request that Cal Poly re-consider RQN's previous [6/6/00] recommendations.
Letter 58
Residents for Quality Neighborhoods (RQN)

December 4, 2000

58-1 Commenter notes that comments have been incorporated in City of SLO correspondence.

Response Please see responses to letter number three, John Mandeville. Please note that the RQN comments are made a part of letter 58 for the convenience of the reader.

58-2 Commenter seeks revised wording from 6/6/00 letter urging avoidance or minimization of impacts (rather than elimination of them).

Response Cal Poly will seek to minimize impacts to neighborhoods, in lieu of “elimination” of impacts. As noted by the City’s comments, project impacts cannot always be eliminated.

58-3 Commenter requests Master Plan add “on and off campus” to provision for mitigation.

Response Chapter 7 of the revised Master Plan identifies a process of interaction with neighbors on campus projects that may have a negative effect in their neighborhood. The text in the Guiding Framework now reads: “Planning future campus facilities and support services so as to minimize and mitigate environmental impacts on and off campus to the full extent feasible as part of project design” (p. 15).

58-4 Commenter requests the Master Plan recognize and address current student housing shortage.

Response See additional sections added to Residential Communities element (p. 136):
“The Master Plan takes the local housing situation into account and proposes measures that will help alleviate a portion of it. The Guiding Framework of the Master Plan calls for adding student housing to accommodate all new enrollment growth. The campus will be breaking ground in Spring 2001 to build apartment-style housing for 800 students. This facility is scheduled to be ready for occupancy in Fall 2002. The next phase calls for housing from 1150 to 1300 additional students by 2004 or 2005. In sum, Cal Poly expects to add 1950 to 2100 student beds in the next five years, but only about 1250 additional students during that same time period. Over the next two decades Cal Poly will increase the proportion of students who live on campus from about 17 percent today to over 30 percent in the future.

Further, Cal Poly will monitor the local market closely, and, if continuing students are not able to find suitable housing, the campus will develop a strategy to house a larger proportion of the University’s students in the future. Strategies may involve working with off-campus partners to identify suitable housing locations and provide financing. Cal Poly and Cuesta College are also exploring ways to cooperate in assuring appropriate housing for their students. Finally, Cal Poly will participate with non-profit organizations in seeking broader solutions to community housing needs.”

58-5 Commenter requests Cal Poly to be proactive in implementing agreements with neighbors.
Response The following has been added to Chapter 7: “The Land Use and Project Review Procedures to be established to implement the Master Plan will include the following considerations.

- Establishment of a project development team that represents all affected University interests;
- Identification of responsibility for liaison with elected officials and local and regional agencies, as appropriate to the nature of the project;
- Identification of the appropriate neighborhood areas that may be affected by the project so that meetings may be held early in project planning and design regarding ways to relieve possible impacts;
- Determination of which implementation guidelines and standards are applicable to the project.”

58-6 Commenter requests adding a commitment to mitigation of light and glare.

Response Additional mitigation measures have been added to the EIR to address light and glare. The Master Plan has also been amended at page 150 and 152 to address light and glare. “As noise and light impacts are significant concerns, the campus will conduct further studies, like the Jones and Stokes Sound Study prepared in 1997 by the City and community for the Sports Complex.” And, further along in the same paragraph: “Particular consideration will be given to minimizing impacts on established neighborhoods and public open space” (p. 150).

58-7 Commenter notes traffic impacts and mitigation.

Response No response required.

58-8 Commenter requests adding a commitment to mitigation of noise.

Response The Final EIR includes additional mitigation for noise.

58-9 Commenter suggests adding the Goldtree area to constraints map.

Response A map has been added at page 64 depicting and analyzing the proposed ancillary designation in the Goldtree area.

58-10 Commenter requests recognition of neighborhood impact at Grand Ave. and Slack Street.

Response Exhibit 4.10 has been modified to identify this potential area of conflict. A figure on page 207 depicts the proposed development in this area.

58-11 Commenter requests adding a buffer between campus and residential neighborhoods. They further ask that all impacts to neighborhoods be eliminated.

Response Commenter is directed to see Land Use element - Compatibility principle on page 69, proposing buffers between residential neighborhoods and on-campus student residences. It is not possible to eliminate all impacts to neighborhoods from proposed activities on campus, but Cal Poly is committed to minimizing these impacts.
58-12 Commenter seeks discussion of Goldtree site.

**Response** See constraints discussion on p. 64 and Ancillary Activities and Facilities element, especially pages 206 and 208.

58-13 Commenter offers support for list of land use issues.

**Response** No response required.

58-14 Commenter requests adding language to eliminate impacts from light and glare created by proposed development at Slack Street and Grand Avenue

**Response** It is not possible to eliminate all impacts to neighborhoods from proposed activities on campus, but Cal Poly is committed to minimizing these impacts. See Environmental Consequences analysis. Also, revised map on page 204 shows buffer adjacent to neighborhood.

58-15 Commenter raises concerns about impacts of housing west of Highway 1.

**Response** See text in Environmental Consequences discussion on pages 142-143. It is acknowledged that this site has aesthetic sensitivity with regard to neighboring residences. Development on the site will provide some buffers and consideration of views. However, it is important to note that any development on site H-9 will have some impact on the views of the residences immediately to the west of the site.

58-16 Commenter offers support for mitigation of impacts of future sports facilities.

**Response** No response required.

58-17 Commenter requests additional protection in the Master Plan for noise impacts and requests reference to the 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study.

**Response** The Environmental Consequences discussion has been modified to incorporate reference to the Jones and Stokes study (p. 150 and 152). Note also that language has been added about appropriate facility design and minimizing impacts from light and noise. It will not be possible to “eliminate” all impacts as requested by the commenter.

58-18 Commenter requests additional protection in the Master Plan for noise impacts and requests reference to the 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study.

**Response** The Environmental Consequences discussion has been modified to incorporate reference to the Jones and Stokes study. Note also that language has been added about appropriate facility design and minimizing impacts from light and noise. It will not be possible to “eliminate” all impacts as requested by the commenter.

58-19 Commenter requests additional protection in the Master Plan for neighborhood impacts.

**Response** The Environmental Consequences discussion has been modified to incorporate reference to the Jones and Stokes study. Note also that language has been added about
appropriate facility design and minimizing impacts from light and noise. It will not be possible to “eliminate” all impacts as requested by the commenter.

58-20 Commenter suggests need to “eliminate” any light and glare impacts of future parking structures.

Response It will not be possible to “eliminate” all impacts as requested by the commenter. However, design of the structures can minimize these impacts. Parking Structure I was designed to minimize impacts of its operations to nearby neighborhoods. Lighting on that facility is muted and has lower impacts than the existing parking on Grand Avenue. Noise is also less that experienced with the surface lots. Air quality impacts from the structure are far below regulatory thresholds.

58-21 Commenter raises concern about impacts of ancillary activities in general.

Response Comment noted. The Master Plan provides protection from neighborhoods in the development of these facilities and the EIR addresses impacts from these facilities.

58-22 Commenter raises concern about commercial component of ancillary activities that might draw non-student clientele.

Response The vision of the Master Plan calls for a primary campus activity center near the University Union that is focused on students. Thus, the range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center. Cal Poly understands that there is a delicate balance in determining how much of what services will be sufficient to support the campus community and manage commuting. Effective alternative transportation will allow students, faculty, and staff – as well as members of the broader community – to take advantage of the range of services and facilities both on and off campus without adding to traffic congestion. The Cal Poly Foundation is presently the exclusive provider of certain services – e.g., food service, vending machines and bookstore. Other services compete for campus outlets – e.g., travel service, ATMs. As planning for an increased range and volume of services occurs, the campus will need to determine which it should offer directly and which might be provided through franchise or “privatization.”

58-23 Commenter raises concern about magnitude of impacts of ancillary activities.

Response The discussion of environmental consequences for ancillary activities has been expanded on pages 207 and 208.

58-24 Commenter suggests additional language for environmental consequences of ancillary activities.

Response The environmental consequences discussion has been expanded on pages 207 and 208, although not with the same language proposed.
Letter 59
Margot McDonald

December, 2000

59-1 Commenter provided editing suggestions on a number of pages to strengthen consciousness of environmental issues and resource requirements: pp. viii, 2, 4, 100, 101, 102, 123, 153, and 154.

Response Changes made on the corresponding new pages to reflect the intent of the suggestion (pp., viii, 2, 4, 106, and 107).

59-2 Commenter suggested adding additional material to Executive Summary regarding resource requirements.

Response See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements (pp. 79 and 162-163).

59-3 Commenter suggested adding to discussion of Electricity capacity and distribution.

Response Changes made later in Public Facilities and Utilities element as a plan component (pp. 162-163).

59-4 Commenter suggested adding to discussion of Natural Gas capacity and distribution.

Response Changes made later in Public Facilities and Utilities element as a plan component (pp. 162-163).

59-5 Commenter suggested clarification to portions of the DEIR: pp. 279 and 331.

Response These pages have been modified per the suggestion.

59-6 Commenter attached Humboldt State University Green Building Checklist

Response Acknowledged for use in Master Plan implementation
SUMMARY NOTES
UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting No. 1, 2000-01
Wednesday, October 25, 2000
10:00 A.M.
Administration 301

Members Present: Samuel Aborne, Sema Alptekin, Bob Clover (for Jerry Hanley), Linda Dalton, Bob Detweiler, Myron Hood, Joe Jen, Beth Kaminaka, Steve Kaminaka, Frank Lebens, Bill Pendergast, Rick Ramirez, and Paul Zingg (Chair)

INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Provost Zingg, Vice Provost Linda Dalton welcomed Committee members to the first meeting of the 2000/01 academic year, and introductions were made.

Provost Zingg noted that UPBAC convenes at least once a quarter. Its principal responsibility is the review of matters pertaining to the budget and planning dimensions of the University. Linda Dalton is spearheading the force behind the University Master Plan effort. Its development has been going on for several years, with the beginning of the strategic planning exercises. Frank Lebens and Rick Ramirez are hear to provide us with information with respect to this year’s overall University budget to give you some sense of budget construction elements and some sense as to where we are. In both of these issues, there are many layers of issues that we will be unable to master in one setting. Other meetings that UPBAC has had have focused on education sessions in order to become more familiar and versed on the various responsibilities the Committee has. We are advisory to the President, and a constituency-based body. And one that connects the budget and planning at the University, which is a conscious attempt to underscore the participatory governance commitment of the University and underscore the relationship of budgeting and planning, both short and long-term.

Zingg noted that many of the Committee members will have heard some of the information in other venues of the University due to their involvement in their own respective areas. The value, however, of this group, is this body having the entire University’s constituencies represented with all the various views provided.

1. **Master Plan Update**

Linda Dalton provided a status report on the Master Plan process. She indicated that the campus has accomplished a process of developing a Plan that addresses enrollment and academic questions, and facility master plan implications for the facilities and properties as a whole. Building from the campus strategic plans and analyses, task forces were developed, and the first drafts of the Master Plan were developed. There is a Master Plan professional team, the President, and various groups on campus that had stakes in the Plan’s development, i.e., the College of Agriculture (agricultural land), ASI, etc.
In May 2000, we distributed the preliminary Plan very widely across the campus and community. This was not to meet a legal requirement, but to get information and responses back from anyone that chose to provide some input. A great deal of input was provided, including the City, County, and other agencies in our vicinity. Over the summer, the team responded to these recommendations, and made a number of changes. Then, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared. Now we have the October 2000 Master Plan Report with the EIR. This is a legal step in the process. There are public announcements as part of the Plan, allowing for a specified review timeframe.

The Plan is large, is in CD-ROM format, as well as on the Web. An excerpt from the larger document was distributed to Committee members, and Dalton provided highlights as well as changes from the preliminary draft.

Points highlighted were:

- The executive summary is the same as the preliminary draft, showing colored land use within the campus and close vicinity.
- Changes from preliminary draft: The Plan only refers to Santa Cruz property in the overview portion of the Plan; a later document will be more inclusive of the Swanton Pacific Ranch, but all principals still apply.
- The preliminary draft included four long-range enrollment scenarios that were built from DEPAC recommendations, without building physical capacity. It did not include how some academic disciplines would grow. There is now a new chapter, developed in September, which is included in this new draft.
- Regarding changes that interrelate, i.e., land use reflecting the outdoor lands that relate to instruction, is the Brizzolara Creek enhancement area. The Team looked at the Creek area to provide opportunities for ways to protect the natural environment, but to also create some teaching and learning opportunities (Creek enhancement opportunities). Preliminary plans put student housing in that area, but housing has now been replaced to other areas.
- The instructional core area has been expanded for use and has been modified to add a different structure. One significant piece is the work of the UU planning effort which occurred in Spring 2000 that contributed an ASI perspective as to student services and activities. These are integrated into the document. Diagrams are not intended to be “footprints” but just illustrations as to where a cluster of buildings could occur.
- Regarding circulation and alternative transportation issues, at the Grand Avenue corner, a visitor’s center is envisioned to provide a welcoming activity for visitors. At the NW end of campus, i.e., the Gold Tree area, an applied research park area site as been identified.
- Implementation chapter at the end of the Plan focuses on what still needs to be done after it is approved in principal.

Zingg noted that Dalton mentioned and the report makes clear, that this is very much an effort that attempts to achieve a golden mean between bottom up and top down. Top down is the educational mission and the principal context for any planning, policies, and
practices of the institution, which creates a broad umbrella. Several points in the
document mention this and the implications of the name of Cal Poly. The bottom up is
the fact that this whole effort started with academic strategic planning, the work of the
colleges and the UCTE, in looking at their sense of directions and environmental
scanning that involved engaging hundreds of on-campus and off-campus folks to provide
perspectives to contribute to framing these documents. This is critical to program
developing, enrollment implications of program developing, and making critical choices.
This is what a master plan is all about, and being able to define and choose the future of
the institution and how it defines itself. If a Plan is not in place, someone else will tell us
what to do. There will always be some of this, however. But we need to think about
what our optimum future is, taking our mission, our membership in the CSU, and the
public responsibility roles we play as stewards of our resources (higher education) and an
agent for eliciting our constituencies’ trust and confidence.

Discussion occurred on the issue of enrollment growth, the lack of adequate State funding
allocations (marginal cost differences), and how the Plan addresses this issue. Dalton
indicated that the Academic Senate and DEPAC were very concerned about the
operational budget issues, and there is mention in the Plan on the need for capital budget
resources and operating resources in order to accommodate growth. The Plan addresses
the principles, but not the operational issues. Zingg acknowledged that the first step
toward this need, and the commitment of the CSU, is the Workforce Initiative. The
commitment from the Chancellor’s Office is to not only making the $10M one-time
allocation this year a permanent one, but to triple this amount over the next several years.
Growth needs to be contingent upon working these issues out. The solutions are not
defined in the Plan, but it is not intended to do this. It was also noted that the State
Legislature is unsympathetic and feels the CSU should reallocate from within for the
workforce issue. The CSU seems to be recognizing this. Once recognizing differential
costs, the next issue is whether we can open the door more fully to have a more
differential funding formula adopted. This is part of the long-range strategy to make this
case and the extent to which the argument has been recognized within the compact
permanent allocation. Regarding the method of new funding, the CSU has never gone to
a new funding formula since mode and level was abandoned in early 90’s. We need to
get back to something that gets back to relative cost. Zingg reminded Committee
members of the “Future of the University” piece that President Baker had done on our
distinction as a polytechnic university, and that this distinction is in jeopardy without the
resources to continue this distinction.

The $1.78M Workforce Initiative allocation will need to be exclusively addressed to the
workforce disciplines noted, with apparently very little flexibility. Discussion occurred
on the principle of keeping the restricted workforce funds to those disciplines, vs.
flexibility in funding with emphasis of the campus’ outcomes.

Lebens noted the need to get another State bond issue, since the current capital bond runs
out. Detweiler acknowledged that he felt it would be unwise not to consider physical
growth in the wake of growth/no growth. The State’s economy is good now, so now is the time to seek new funding.

Sam Aborne voiced his disagreement on two of the Master Plan principles: 1) increase in student progress; and 2) unit load. He disagreed with the 15-unit course load assumption (due to courses becoming 4 units, with full-time status then being at 16 units). He was also concerned about the summer quarter enrollment possibly going to 40% of the AY FTES. He does not believe that our campus could support 40% based on our mission, emphasis on co-ops and internships, etc. Opportunities for co-ops and internships could significantly impact students’ abilities to take courses in the summer.

In closing, Zingg acknowledged that the above observations are critical to get on the table and brought to the attention of Dr. Dalton and the Master Plan Team during this review phase.

He proposed that we try at the next session to continue any additional comments and observations with respect to the Master Plan. However, in the meantime, Committee members should not hesitate to express individual observations and concerns to Bonnie Lowe, in Facilities Planning.

Due to the lack of time at today’s meeting, most of the next meeting will be spent at looking at the 2000-01 Budget. At that time, the campus may have a better clarification of the $1.78M Workforce Initiative funding. More information may also be available on one-time funds allocated, i.e., excess Lottery funds designed for faculty development and technology, etc.

Frank Lebans and Rick Ramirez distributed the Sources and Uses budget document, and indicated budget information was also available on the Web, but will be discussed at the next meeting.
1. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE MASTER PLAN

Vice Provost Linda Dalton continued the discussion of the campus draft Master Plan. She indicated that last evening was the last presentation of the Plan at a public setting—the San Luis Obispo City Council, and that she would comment on the County and City presentations and the issues that came up during those presentations.

Dalton indicated that the draft plan and EIR have been out since October 10, and that comments are due by December 8. She described the general reactions as being very constructive. Even though there may have been criticisms, they have been constructive suggestions. The Master Plan team’s outreach efforts have been appreciated. They would like to see this continued into the implementation phase. Specific areas of criticism from outside have been different than the campus’ criticisms. Most of the comments have been related to student housing. The Plan made the commitment to cover housing for new student enrollment, and the Team also agreed to speed up the timeline. Discussions have also started with Cuesta College. People do understand the fiscal obligations we are faced with, however.

Some of the other issues from an off-campus perspective were: concern that we follow through on commitment to alternative transportation, and the lighting adjustments on the sports complex. On campus the largest concern was about the physical development where the student housing sites will be placed (environmental sensitivities). The Team is working with the Landscape Advisory Committee and the Biological Sciences Advisory Committee in this regard, and it feels that the Plan can continue to meet the needs of all. Many comments are continuing to come in, and the Team is making sure that students needs are addressed, i.e., Foundation and food service concerns (an operational issue). When we get to the policy level approval, we will need to review the associated operational issues.

Discussion:

- Sam Aborne noted that it seemed that with the College of Business’ quality improvement (recent Orfalea gift), we haven’t heard much about growth within the College, i.e., facilities to support that College’s growth. Dalton responded that we are not designating disciplinary terms in the Master Plan. We have used vague terms. The Team does have to deal with how much space each particular area needs. Provost Zingg also indicated that the Plan emphasizes the core of the
campus being used for instruction. The possible use of Crandall Gym as a desired space due to its architectural style and being in the historical district of campus has been discussed for some time as a likely prospect for supporting programs that now occur in Buildings 2 and 3. The College’s own long-range enrollment calls for it having a 14-15% share of the University’s enrollment. Dean Pendergast indicated that he has been thinking about this, because some of the activities that have been involved in the Orfalea gift have included a need for space—part of this are matching funds for endowed faculty chairs. The Dean also noted his interested in programmatic activity for entrepreneurship that have credit bearing activity. There is also some interest in a Technology Management program. There are a number of future interests that will imply a growth for the College.

- Zingg indicated that the physical growth component of the Plan is approximately $20B over the next 20 years! The Chancellor will need to understand the physical realities of this campus in relation to the amount of agricultural land the campus has. The Chancellor also has as an issue on whether or not new buildings will be used year-round.

- Frank Lebens acknowledged that the Plan has focused on the planning, but we have timing issues as well, since we are already into the implementation phase (student housing and some other instructional facilities plans have already started). Zingg also acknowledged the interest for increased bus service and parking.

- Dean Jen questioned whether the Plan is flexible enough to answer the possible issue of future gifts that may require new buildings. Lebens indicated that we do have the ability to further amend the Master Plan (one major revision a year is allowed). Dalton also pointed out the Plan accounts for enough physical space for the increased enrollment, plus some.

- Sam Aborne also noted that students are interested in how we service the bottom end of campus, and creating environments for students beyond 5:00 pm. The University Union will need to expand beyond where it is now. Aborne indicated that he is also interested in looking at summer enrollment numbers.

Dalton noted that the 15,000 FTE physical capacity will not be met for about 3-4 years, since that number does not include non-traditional instruction, i.e. senior project, off-campus instruction (London Study), student teaching, etc.

2. 2000-01 BUDGET—SOURCES AND USES

Provost Zingg began by emphasizing that the 2000/01 FY budget it is based on conservative revenue estimates. That is purposeful and appropriate, and is true with this year’s budget.
The campus is looking at a shortfall on enrollment of 1.2%. This still exceeds last year’s enrollment by approximately 300, but falls short of the mandated target. We are closing this gap based on strong registration figures for Winter Quarter (may be as much as halved). This will affect institutional revenues, of course.

Frank Lebens provided an overview of the sources and uses document, and indicated that there are three major demands on our budget at this time (not unlike other campuses): 1) enrollment growth pressures; 2) technology pressure-need to update technologies in classrooms and administratively; and 3) the issue of new initiatives-facility implications and other operating cost pressures. We have tried to accommodate this in the face of the Capital Campaign. There are college priorities, all of which have operating cost implications. We have tried to address some of these priorities in these budget-planning efforts. We have challenges, and we deal with high levels of uncertainty. We have been given warnings by the Chancellor that the impacted campuses having no leeway on enrollments. Zingg acknowledged that the Chancellor has indicated there is no leeway—currently 4 campuses are on impacted status. Utility cost increases are also making an impact on the budget.

Zingg reminded Committee members of the actions taken by the University in the early 90’s to deal with on-going commitments utilizing one-time funding. Over the last three years, the University corrected this problem, which meant we had to tighten our belt to correct the disequilibria (not a deficit but a problem). This is why units and college budgets have not grown even with the press indicating that budgets have grown.

**Enrollment growth funds will be targeted for unanticipated increased revenues**

The other big unknown this year is what will happen with the utility costs. The multi-media classrooms on the ITS list are funded by Lottery revenues, and implementation of Student Administrative System investment on Degree Audit will also be funded through the Lottery.
October 25 and December 6, 2000

The two UPBAC meetings were an opportunity for Dr. Linda Dalton to present the findings of the Master Plan effort. Several comments were made by various members of the committee.

60-1 Sam Aborne voiced his disagreement on two of the Master Plan principles: 1) increase in student progress; and 2) unit load. He disagreed with the 15-unit course load assumption (due to courses becoming 4 units, with full-time status then being at 16 units). He was also concerned about the summer quarter enrollment possibly going to 40% of the AY FTES. He does not believe that our campus could support 40% based on our mission, emphasis on co-ops and internships, etc.

Response Comments are acknowledged. Achieving the Master Plan goals of increased student progress and enhancing summer quarter will be significant challenges for the University. These will require increased resources for teaching and administration, and a change in the culture of the campus, which is one of taking the summer off.

60-2 Dean Jen questioned whether the Plan is flexible enough to answer the possible issue of future gifts that may require new buildings.

Response Vice President Lebens indicated that Cal Poly does have the ability to further amend the Master Plan (one major revision a year is allowed). According to Vice Provost Dalton, the Plan accounts for enough physical space for the increased enrollment, plus some.

60-3 Sam Aborne also noted that students are interested in how we service the bottom end of campus, and creating environments for students beyond 5:00 pm. The University Union will need to expand beyond where it is now.

Response The Master Plan proposes a number of new facilities on campus that will enhance the community environment for the soon to be 6,000 plus students living on campus. This includes greatly expanded activities and services in the area of the current UU as well as a distribution of conveniences and services throughout campus. An example can be seen in the newly remodeled campus store on Via Carta. Food service will be added to several locations. El Corral will likely expand services to the western portion of the campus instructional core, reducing the need to “climb the hill” in order to acquire needed supplies, especially for the specialty needs of students in agriculture, architecture and engineering.
Table 1

This table contains the responses to the October 10, 2000 Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. It is sorted by the page references to the responses – last column, “Page in Plan/FERIR (Jan. 2001).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-01</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>No State Agencies submitted comments</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>02-01</td>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>Address issues raised by RQN</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See Residents for Quality Neighborhoods</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-44</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Letter dated December 3, 2000 from Bishop's Peak neighborhood residents to SLO City Council</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See December 8, 2000 correspondence from Bishop's Peak neighborhood residents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-45</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Letter from RQN dated December 4, 2000 to SLO City Council</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See RQN correspondence from December 4 and June 6, 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-46</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>E-mail message from Richard Kransdorf dated 12/5/00 to SLO City Council</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See Kransdorf correspondence of December 5, 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-13</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Pages out of sequence in review copy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Noted - October 10 plan pagination is sequential</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>07-01</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>No specific comments at this time</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-04</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Interest in political and legislative support for sustainable practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Such support will contribute to Cal Poly's ability to address such issues in implementing the Master Plan as it raises public awareness and may provide resources as well</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-01</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Request attachment of all letters on May 1 Preliminary Draft</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The Master Plan and FEIR will include all comments on the October 10 publication, plus a matrix showing changes from both the May 1 and October 10 publications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42-03</td>
<td>Kaminaka</td>
<td>Suggested that cost estimates for the Master Plan should be included</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Cost estimates are normally developed as part of the campus capital improvement program. This is considered an aspect of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-14</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Discuss environmental condition of quarry area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-21</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Appends material on sustainability</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Acknowledged and appreciated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-08</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Self-deprecating remark by author</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-01</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Comments incorporated in City of SLO correspondence</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See Mandeville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-06</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Green Building Checklist from Humboldt State</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Acknowledged and note for plan implementation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-05</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Interest in interdisciplinary courses and student projects addressing environmental sustainability</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introductory chapter enables and supports curricular attention to sustainability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Comments Received on October 2000 Master Plan DEIR, and Response in January 2001 Master Plan and FEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-03</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Questions and suggestions about organization and chapter titles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organization retained, but text clarified. Key changes include the following: Addition of a section in Chapter 1 explaining the organization of the document; also within each element, the section labeled “Existing Conditions” and Issues has been relabeled as “Background and Issues” to avoid confusion with Chapter 4, Existing Conditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-02</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of environmental issues</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-02</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-04</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Suggested editing of principles in the Introduction</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Text changes - statements now identified as Values to distinguish master plan principles in subsequent chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-03</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>Call for Cal Poly to delay submittal of the Master Plan to the Board of Trustees pending completion of the housing plan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cal Poly will submit the Master Plan to the Board of Trustees for its March 2001 meeting. This date has been in the plan development program for three years. As stated in the plan, increased enrollment will follow the development of additional student housing. Thus, the Master Plan enrollment increases will not exacerbate the housing shortage. In addition, an 800 bed residential facility will begin construction this year. Plans for the development of faculty housing are underway.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-02</td>
<td>Krandsorf</td>
<td>Concern about short review period</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Refer to response; The March Board of Trustees date has been made public for three years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-02</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Suggest slower pace, including hearing on FEIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Refer to response; The March Board of Trustees date has been made public for three years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-01</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Request for more time for deliberation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Refer to response; The March Board of Trustees date has been made public for three years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-21</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Suggests inclusion of comments on Preliminary Draft and responses be appended</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The Master Plan and FEIR will include all comments on the October 10 publication, plus a matrix showing changes from both the May 1 and October 10 publications</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-11</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>What is the review and appeal process?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Chapter 7 discusses communication and consultation, and has been expanded to address plan implementation, monitoring and review</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-12</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>What is the decision-making process?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Chapter 7 discusses communication and consultation, and has been expanded to address plan implementation, monitoring and review</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-15</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Can CSU governing body meet in SLO?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Cal Poly presents its Master Plan to the CSU Board of Trustees as one item in an agenda over several days. It is not realistic to ask the Board to conduct its business at each affected campus.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-16</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>How will he receive answers to his questions?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Responses will be included in FEIR as appendix to Master Plan; individual commenters will receive correspondence noting responses to their concerns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-01</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Claimed too late for comment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Comment in error</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-02</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Claim that meetings ignored input</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Meetings were design to both share information and receive input</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-06</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Suggests University representatives not listening</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cal Poly’s representatives were listening at all public meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-07</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Claims no one took notes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Notes were taken on 2 ft by 3 ft notepad on an easel visible to all in attendance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-09</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Statement about comment deadline</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Comment period was extended to December 8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-10</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Suggests comments may not be considered</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Suggests that commenter note not only the extend of comment on the Master Plan and EIR, but also the responses to all comments and extensive changes to the Master Plan text</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12-01</td>
<td>Schlageter</td>
<td>Wants project more publicly known</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>See discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-01</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Distrust of Cal Poly's planning process</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>See discussion of process in Introduction and Task Forces in Chapter 2.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-05</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Need to correct website address</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Text correction</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-23</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 9. Include RGN language regarding environmental consequences on nearby residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>See RQN correspondence from December 4 and June 6, 2000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-06</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add environmental quality to Question 7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Environmental quality is addressed in questions 3, 4 and 5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-01</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add &quot;and support services&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-02</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add &quot;and support and auxiliary services&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-01</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Urge implementation of guiding principles from Neighborhood Relations Task Force</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Text addition based on correspondence from RQN</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-02</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Revised wording from 6/6/00 letter urging avoidance or minimization of impacts (rather than elimination of them)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-03</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Add &quot;on and off campus&quot; to provision for mitigation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-01</td>
<td>Newland</td>
<td>Offer more on-campus services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>See pp. 16,133,189,202</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add two principles to Land Use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-04</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify San Luis Obispo Creek watershed</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add sense of place and purpose to Question 6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-03</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add acknowledgement of design guidelines by support and auxiliary services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-04</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add &quot;Foundation support, enterprise partnerships&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-03</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Suggests plan involves &quot;explosive growth&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>See charts in Chapter 3 comparing proposed growth for Cal Poly with San Luis Obispo area, CSU and State of California</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-02</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location because this section is a committee report</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-03</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen sustainable building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location because this section is a committee report</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-04</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>Suggestion that state legislators as well as Board of Trustees be engaged in helping address housing and</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Discussion in Chapter 3 reflects enrollment pressures associated with demand for Cal Poly's</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enrollment issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-05</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Why increase enrollment?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47-01</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Concerns for increased enrollment and unique environment of SLO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56-03</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Suggests not increasing enrollment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-05</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Notes limits on size of smaller, unique programs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Text addition under discussion of Critical Mass (p. 35)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-03</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>How was determination made that campus farm would not require expansion to serve more enrollment?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>The College of Agriculture leadership have indicated that the college has facility capacity</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-06</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify map legend</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-07</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Lack of detailed map of SLO Creek watershed ranches</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Map addition</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-05</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Cheda Ranch partially in Chorro Creek watershed</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>See text change, p. 43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-08</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Concern about contradiction about access from Grand and Highland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Chapter 4 discusses Existing Conditions only</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-09</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions about soil classification and analysis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>The Master Plan team has redone soils analysis using the NRCS system, replacing the Storie Index.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-07</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Reservoirs missing from discussion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-06</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Add discussion of water as a resource for irrigation, etc.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Covered on the next page under Agriculture Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-11</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Maps missing reservoirs and lagoons</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-01</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Second Dairy Lagoon not on maps</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-08</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Reservoirs and ponds missing from map</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-09</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Comment on slope in areas shown for potential remote parking</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Master Plan Team concurs that these sites are generally less than 5 percent slopes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-10</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Cheda Ranch fencing inaccurate</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Recognized as in need of updating</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-12</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Question about dates and obsolescence for buildings 10 and 52</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Buildings are from different eras; also, obsolescence defined by several criteria, not just age</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14-02</td>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td>Housing set too far up steep slope</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-13</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify requirement of EIR for conversion of prime agricultural lands</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-07</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Challenges sewer capacity</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>The sewer capacity stated is from discussions with Ed Johnson, Utilities Coordinator for Cal Poly</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-05</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Urge Cal Poly to be proactive in implementing agreements with neighbors</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>See Chapter 7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-02</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 1. B. Recognize potential neighborhood conflicts at Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-22</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 8. B. Amend constraints summary to include potential neighborhood conflicts near Slack and Grant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-26</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Request for recognition of neighborhood impact at Grand Ave. and Slack Street</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-03</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td>Potential neighborhood conflict at Slack and Grand</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Map change shows more limited area; adds buffer</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-15</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify San Luis Obispo Creek watershed</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-06</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Explain white space for Dairy and Poultry units</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-04</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Request for recognition of neighborhood impact along Slack Street</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-08</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Add commitment to mitigation of noise</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15-01</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Why not build up rather than out?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38-01</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Suggest dorms that stack up rather than out</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-04</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Why not build up rather than out?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-17</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 4. Cite and confirm use of Jones and Stokes noise study</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>The Jones and Stokes study has been cited in the bibliography. A summary of its findings have been incorporated into the discussion of the Mustang Stadium relocation</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-21</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 8. A. Amend constraints summary to include Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Map to be added</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-14</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Why aren't ancillary areas covered on constraints map?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>The base map focuses on the Main Campus; an additional map is being added for Cheda Ranch</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-16</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Concern with suitability of Goldtree/Cheda Ranch area for development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-19</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Calls for less specificity in designating ancillary activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>The Master Plan team feels that a specific designation should remain, but with text clarification</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-24</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions Goldtree development potential</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Text clarification; development potential on Cheda Ranch discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, Existing Conditions</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-25</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Inconsistent specificity about Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Text clarification; greater specificity about Goldtree area reflects more detailed analysis of the area as compared to possible remote parking sites</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-40</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify description of Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-46</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify description of Goldtree area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Appendix to DEIR, p. 3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-04</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Goldtree listed as 200 acres</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-11</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Questions suitability of Goldtree area for development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Text clarification; Map to be added</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-16</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Questions suitability of Goldtree area for development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text clarification (see Chapter 4, Constraints and Opportunities)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-09</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Add Goldtree area to constraints map</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Map to be added</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-12</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Need discussion of Goldtree site</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>See Ancillary Activities and Facilities element</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-10</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Suggests reconsideration of site for proposed development in Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>The Environmental Suitability and Sustainability principle in the Land Use element (p. 65) calls for “limiting future development to those areas least affected by regulatory and/or high cost environmental constraints.” Compared with other areas on the Main Campus and ranches in the San Luis Obispo Creek and Chorro Creek watersheds, the Goldtree area is relatively well-suited as a satellite location. (See Chapter 4, Constraints and Opportunities as well.)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-08</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Clarify use of the term “Balance”</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-18</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Concern about wording</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>This is a general paragraph not requiring the word change proposed</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-07</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Need reference to Valencia Creek property in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Clarification in footnote, as this property is not addressed in the present Master Plan document</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for Land Use principles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-13</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Support for list of land use issues</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add two principles to Land Use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Include the upgrading of buildings and grounds</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-34</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add principles regarding avoidance of conversion of agricultural lands</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>This concern addressed elsewhere in Land Use, Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements (pp. 65, 79, 92)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-18</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Claims proposed facilities near Goldtree violate environmental suitability location principles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>The Environmental Suitability and Sustainability principle in the Land Use element (p. 65) calls for “limiting future development to those areas least affected by regulatory and/or high cost environmental constraints.” Compared with other areas on the Main Campus and ranches in the San Luis Obispo Creek and Chorro Creek watersheds, the Goldtree area is relatively well-suited as a satellite location. (See Chapter 4, Constraints and Opportunities as well.)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-11</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Add buffer between campus and residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>See Land Use element - Compatibility principle</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Edit Outdoor Teaching and Learning statement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-03</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 2. Designate hill above residence halls to Natural Environment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>This area is currently used for grazing, which explains the Outdoor Teaching and Learning designation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-27</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Designate hill above residence halls to Natural Environment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>This area is currently used for grazing, which explains the Outdoor Teaching and Learning designation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-21</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Parking on map does not match legend</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-01</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Second Dairy Lagoon not on maps</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-02</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Farm shop not listed</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Map change (legend)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-12</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Show access from Stenner Creek Road to Cheda Ranch</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Area is outside the base map</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-08</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Question about firmness of student housing sites, other land uses</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Board of Trustees will be approving land use designations and tentative future building sites; nevertheless, each project will require detailed site planning</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-22</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>First paragraph should mention SLO Creek Watershed ranches</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>SLO Creek Watershed ranches discussed in the last paragraph on this page (pp. 72-73)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-01</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Proposal for committee on sustainability</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-02</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen sustainable building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-04</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen sustainable building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location - addressed in Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-10</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Add discussion of sustainable planning and building in campus core</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-13</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Add discussion of sustainable planning and building to development areas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-15</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Apply environmental responsibility principles to student housing development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53-04</td>
<td>Heatherington</td>
<td>Model advanced environmental design</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>See Design requirements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-02</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>Apply &quot;new urbanism&quot; concepts to housing on campus</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>For consideration in site planning</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-02</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-29</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Add specific language to retain environmentally sensitive areas in open, undeveloped use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-02</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Wants paragraph to state &quot;action&quot; statements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-09</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggests discussion of levels of environmental stewardship</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>See Natural Environment principles (p. 78)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-23</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Identify prime agricultural land as environmentally sensitive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Master Plan recognizes environmental value of prime agricultural land in text, but designates it as Outdoor Teaching and Learning on land use maps</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-28</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add protection for prime agricultural lands</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Covered in Principles (revised text) in both Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-03</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Change Cal Poly &quot;can&quot; to Cal Poly &quot;will or should&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-03</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Discuss global air, water and energy impacts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-03</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Wants more consistent verbiage used</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-04</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Biodiversity should not be hyphenated</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text correction</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-04</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Change plant to native biotic communities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text correction</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-05</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Expand Biodiversity discussion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-06</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Reword the definition of Viability</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Edit Enhancement statement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26-01</td>
<td>Vilkits</td>
<td>Wants the riparian system to be referred to as stream system (more broad)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Text clarification; comment also provides input for Guiding Principles and Goals for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan, appended to the Master Plan</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-27</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Concern about criticism of grazing practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Text has been removed as issue here, as grazing and land management practices are more fully addressed in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-29</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add to trails discussion regarding security</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Suggests using &quot;management measures&quot; rather than &quot;best management practices&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-09</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Elaborate on outdoor teaching and learning activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13-01</td>
<td>Muhlen</td>
<td>Concern about moving the irrigation training facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>ITRC not being moved</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Reflect research regarding soils and earth sciences</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-41</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Discuss sheep operations in Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Text has been amended to remove this characterization.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-06</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Data on use of Cheda Ranch for sheep and rodeo stock</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>See text change, p. 89</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-14</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Clarify use of Cheda Ranch by sheep operations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-15</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Notes competition between ancillary activities and teaching</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-20</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Indicates use of Goldtree area by sheep operations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text addition in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element (p. 89)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add corrals at Escuela Ranch</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-03</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Mistakes on naming areas on maps</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-26</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add as an issue: encroachment of campus onto agricultural land</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Discussed under Issues in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-26</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Include “encroachment of campus onto prime agricultural land” as an issue on p. 77</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Text addition on page 91 where more appropriate</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add section asking colleges to identify outdoor teaching and learning needs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Text addition under general principles</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Edit Visibility and Integration statements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-20</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Concern about grassland loss</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 3. Retain Outdoor Teaching and Learning lands in open, undeveloped use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Text addition, clarifying future status of Outdoor Teaching and Learning lands</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-33</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Change “should” to “will”</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-06</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Interest in sustainable agriculture</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>See Outdoor Teaching and Learning element</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-22</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Concern about conversion of agricultural lands</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>See clarification in response</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-07</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Feedmill is one word</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Dictionaries differ regarding usage</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-05</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 4. Protect Stenner as well as Brizzolara creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Text has been added</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-30</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Give equivalent attention to Stenner Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Refer to response; text has been added.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Add environmental sensitivity requirement and other edits</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-07</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Designate Stenner Creek as an Enhancement Area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Refer to response; text has been added and Stenner Creek is addressed in a study by V.L. Holland.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45-01</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Contribution of guiding principles for creek management and enhancement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-03</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Compliment on campus instructional core</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Additions to Issue statements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-05</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add “support” space</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of environmental issues</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Edit Circulation statement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-02</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>UU expansion at present and possible satellite locations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Integration and Social Environment principles reflect need for dispersed activities</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-01</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Second Dairy Lagoon not on maps</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Trade-offs between providing commercial services for students, faculty and staff on and off campus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown.</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-01</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Incorporate UU program areas for expansion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-04</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Acknowledge student entertainment facility needs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Addressed in primary campus activity center</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-07</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Consider relocating Visitor Center further onto campus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Map change shows a different orientation of the Visitor Center; adds buffer</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30-01</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Concerns for the layout of the new BRAE bldg.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Text addition to recognize concern when site planning occurs</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42-02</td>
<td>Kaminaka</td>
<td>Concerns for the large vehicles used in BRAE and other ag. Classes, need more room for maneuvering</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-03</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Southwest Area needs specific plan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Chapter 7 identifies the Southwest Area for one of several implementation studies</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-14</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggests including section views of site to show topography</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Implementation studies for the Southwest area will address topography</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-04</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>North Perimeter should not be a broad pedestrian way</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-03</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Consider reuse of Crandall Gym for Union &amp;/or Recreation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-09</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Consider reuse of Crandall Gym for Union &amp;/or Recreation (repeated comment)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-05</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Green Space Plan needs further resolution</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Chapter 7 identifies pedestrian systems as one of several implementation studies</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Edit Campus Landscape Plan requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-35</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Include erosion control</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Already addressed as &quot;minimizing erosion&quot;</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-07</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 6. Affirm student housing impacts as major community concern</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>See additional section added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-32</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Expand on commitment to student housing, timing and financial feasibility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>See additional section added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-11</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for mix of housing types</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-01</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>Request for analysis of housing situation in the community</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>See discussion of Market Analysis added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-08</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Consider alternative housing design on campus, including more height, underground parking</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>See detailed response</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-02</td>
<td>Steinmaus</td>
<td>Concern for &quot;student ghettos&quot; off campus; supports on-campus housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>See Residential Communities element</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-01</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Housing Element inadequate</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>See rewritten Residential Communities element</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-02</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Claim that Cal Poly displaces lower wage earners</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>See rewritten Residential Communities element</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-03</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Lack of housing as impediment to attracting employees to area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>See rewritten Residential Communities element</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-05</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Suggests that Cal Poly commit land and resources to housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>See rewritten Residential Communities element</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-07</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Appends data on housing need in SLO area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Acknowledged and appreciated</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-12</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for expanding services for students living on campus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11-01</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td>Concerns for the use of Poly Canyon</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts - comment appears to misconstrue proposed housing location</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17-01</td>
<td>Saavedra</td>
<td>Concerns on the placement of the residences north of Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17-02</td>
<td>Saavedra</td>
<td>Concerns about housing impact on wildlife and habitat</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18-01</td>
<td>Gifford</td>
<td>Suggest housing to be built on existing areas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20-01</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Redevelop North Mountain residence halls?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>See Residential Communities element</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-23</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Consider more intense student housing, including use of existing parking lots (specific sites listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Master Plan appreciates this suggestion and will consider reuse of additional parking areas and integration of parking into multi-use structures (See Parking element)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-32</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Trade-offs between providing commercial services for students, faculty and staff on and off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-47</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Testimony and correspondence from Naoma Wright to SLO City Council, 12/5/00 and 12/6/00 – request for Cal Poly and Cuesta to provide more student housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-02</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
<td>Call for Cal Poly to create plan to address housing shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-09</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Urges Cal Poly, Cuesta and City of San Luis Obispo to find other student housing locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-10</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Concerns about affordability and marketability of student residences</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See discussion of Market Analysis added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-04</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Concern about economic and environmental impacts of efforts to ease housing deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Recognized more explicitly in additional section in Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-04</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Recognize and address current student housing shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-23</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Consider more intense student housing, including use of existing parking lots (specific sites listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>See detailed response and text additions</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-06</td>
<td>Christianson</td>
<td>Seeks Cal Poly’s participation in ACTION for Healthy Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>See additional sections added to Residential Communities element.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-08</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Basis for locating 136 beds - and is that a maximum? Why not elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The site was selected because it is adjacent to existing student housing, and the tree-lined swale to the south can serve as a buffer. The number of beds represents one estimate of how many units could be built on the site; however, the specific number of students housed will depend on building type and will be determined by more detailed feasibility analysis.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-04</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td>Support for residence halls just south of Yosemite</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type:**
- **A** = Agency
- **P** = Public
- **O** = Organization
- **CP** = Cal Poly Affiliated

**Note:** Page 0 = no text reference
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-04</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Support for relocating housing previously shown in Feed mill area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-22</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Continuing concerns about student housing north of Brizolara Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-09</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Basis for 136 beds - precedents for future development in area?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>The revised map shows the limits of the area designated for student housing in the Master Plan.</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-04</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Wonders whether people care about proposed student housing locations</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Numerous comments received from both campus and community members</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-10</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Visual and noise impacts of new student housing</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Text addition, noting importance of noise, light and visual impacts</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-15</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 2. Follow City policies and standards for off-campus housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>See text in Environmental Consequences discussion</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-15</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concerns about impacts of housing west of Highway 1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>CSU policy does not permit campuses to provide housing for organizations with selective membership</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-16</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 3. Seek CSU policy change to allow fraternity housing on campus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>CSU policy does not permit campuses to provide housing for organizations with selective membership</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-10</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 9. Cite Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Text clarification indicates that Heery Plan was used for Sports Complex, but its other recommendations are superceded by the campus Master Plan</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-33</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Clarify references to Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan, especially with respect to possible relocation of Mustang Stadium</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Text clarification indicates that Heery Plan was used for Sports Complex, but its other recommendations are superceded by the campus Master Plan</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-08</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Outdoor Fields condition is out of date</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-11</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Clarify references to Heery Sports Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Text clarification in introduction to Recreation element indicates that Heery Plan was used for Sports Complex, but its other recommendations are superceded by the campus Master Plan</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-34</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Clarify status of Mustang Stadium, including potential for remodeling rather than relocation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Text removed here; clarified later in Recreation element</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-08</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Allow for expansion of recreation at current location &amp; new residential areas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Considered as reuse of Mott Gym</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:
A = Agency
P = Public
O = Organization
CP = Cal Poly Affiliated
Note Page 0 = no text reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-10</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Replace recreation fields with any Sports Complex changes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Addressed by Continuity principle</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-12</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Allow for expansion of recreation at current location &amp; new residential areas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Addressed by Proximity principle</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-09</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 8. Cite Jones and Stokes sound study</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Jones and Stokes sound study now cited in text and in environmental impact analysis as well</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-08</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Allow for expansion of recreation at current location &amp; new residential areas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Addressed as part of informal outdoor and indoor recreation</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-12</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Questions need for additional sports facilities; calls for more analysis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-02</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Suggests specific language to mitigate impacts in sports complex area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Text addition, consistent with expectations in environmental impact analysis</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-04</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Reference 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Jones and Stokes sound study now cited in text and in environmental impact analysis as well</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-12</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Add specific language to clarify mitigation of light and glare impacts on residential areas and open space</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>See additional text</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-06</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Add commitment to mitigation of light and glare</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-16</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Support for mitigation of impacts of future sports facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-17</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Reference 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Jones and Stokes sound study now cited in text and in environmental impact analysis as well</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-18</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Reference 1997 Jones and Stokes sound study</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Jones and Stokes sound study now cited in text and in environmental impact analysis as well</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-34</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Clarify status of Mustang Stadium, including potential for remodeling rather than relocating</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Text has been changed; refer to Alternatives Section</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-36</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Will ARDFA be displaced?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-03</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Asks that Heery plan not be used as a basis for any future football stadium location/design</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>The Master Plan used the Heery Plan analysis to assess potential sites. However, if and when the</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stadium might be relocated additional site, design and impact studies will be conducted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-05</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Consider possible future football stadium as new project because not just relocation of same size facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>If and when the stadium might be relocated additional site, design and impact studies will be</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-11</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Address feasibility of remodeling Mustang stadium (compare light and glare impacts)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Text has been changed; refer to Alternatives Section</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-19</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Need to mitigate any light and glare impacts of practice field</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>See language in Environmental Consequences discussion</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-11</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>ASI role in development &amp; management of recreation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-01</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Needs discussion on available water resources</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Text change; refer to public services section of the EIR</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-13</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Clarify discussion of recycling</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-37</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Critique of environmental analysis of move of Corporation Yards to Old Poultry Unit area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Clarification of text</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-15</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Suggests making TES a landmark</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Addition to Invisibility principle in Public Facilities and Utilities element allows for “environmental aesthetic that balances beauty and function”</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-19</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Support for principles in Public Facilities and Utilities element; urges implementation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16-01</td>
<td>Holan</td>
<td>Wants sustainable practices in development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>See Design requirements</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-02</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Concern with energy and resource use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-03</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Concern with life cycle analysis for buildings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46-01</td>
<td>Okano</td>
<td>Wants housing built with sustainability in mind</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>See Design requirements</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-18</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggested additions to infrastructure capacity and distribution section</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location - rather later in Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-18</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggested additions to infrastructure capacity and distribution section</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location - rather later in Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-18</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggested additions to infrastructure capacity and distribution section</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location - rather later in Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-18</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggested additions to infrastructure capacity and distribution section</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Wording not suitable in this location - rather later in Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53-03</td>
<td>Heatherington</td>
<td>Use infill sites for housing</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Discuss infill option</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-02</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>More specific discussion on p. 153</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-03</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Add provisions regarding energy and resource use to building design and renovation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>More specific discussion on p. 154</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-03</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Add provisions regarding energy and resource use to building design and renovation</td>
<td>P 154</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Land Use and Public Facilities and Utilities elements</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-04</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P 149</td>
<td>More specific discussion on p. 153</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-02</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Addition to Solid Waste and Recycling section</td>
<td>P 150</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-04</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Impact of fuel prices on operations</td>
<td>P 158</td>
<td>Text addition regarding dependence on fossil fuels</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-11</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Consider integration of energy and resource recovery facility with agricultural facilities</td>
<td>P 89</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-12</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Consider integration of energy and resource recovery facility with student housing in Brizzolara Creek area</td>
<td>P 97</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-16</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Consider water recovery and recycling as part of Brizzolara Creek enhancement</td>
<td>P 129</td>
<td>See new integrated discussion at end of Public Facilities and Utilities element</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-07</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concerned with traffic impacts and mitigation</td>
<td>P 155</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-01</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Concern about safety at Stenner Creek Entrance</td>
<td>P 156</td>
<td>Issue recognized in Circulation element; any proposed development on Cheda Ranch will address access issues</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-10</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Stenner Creek Road intersection (identified on p. 50) should be discussed on page 46</td>
<td>P 50</td>
<td>Discussed later in Circulation element</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-10</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Stenner Creek Road intersection (identified on p. 50) should be discussed on page 46</td>
<td>P 156</td>
<td>Discussed in Circulation element</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-14</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for Circulation principles</td>
<td>P 157</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-01</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for University's commitment to public transportation</td>
<td>P 158</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-04</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Bicycle access on service roads</td>
<td>P 159</td>
<td>Text addition, p. 158</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-01</td>
<td>Kriansdorf</td>
<td>Supports reduction of reliance on automobile</td>
<td>P 157</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-10</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Review LOS discussion with respect to pedestrians</td>
<td>E 268</td>
<td>See response for clarification</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-20</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Add ADA considerations to pedestrian orientation</td>
<td>P 159</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-05</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Modify language consistent with EIR re: California Blvd entrance</td>
<td>P 162</td>
<td>Text change</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-05</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>RR Ped-Bike trail</td>
<td>P 163</td>
<td>Text addition, p. 162</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-08</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Consider traffic calming on east Perimeter</td>
<td>P 163</td>
<td>Text addition; see also, p. 159</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-35</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Add “controls to inhibit at-grade pedestrian crossing” along railroad right of way</td>
<td>P 164</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-36</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>“Americans with Disabilities Act”</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Text correction</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-37</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Site pedestrian path along Brizzolara Creek outside riparian corridor; minimize creek crossings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-20</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Add ADA considerations to pedestrian circulation design</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Text addition and clarification</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-15</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Consider electric bicycle use and storage</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14-01</td>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td>Wants more accommodations for bicycles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Detailed bicycle planning to be included in implementation</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33-07</td>
<td>Bartholomy</td>
<td>Suggests expanding bicycle use, including solar and electric energy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-01</td>
<td>Steinmaus</td>
<td>States a hinderance for riding bicycles</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Detailed bicycle planning to be included in implementation</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-38</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Support for electric or low-emissions vehicles for shuttle service</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-06</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Transit improvements incorporating state-of-the-art technology</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Text additions, pp. 168 and 179</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-07</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Campus Shuttle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Text additions</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-39</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Roadway section does not show pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Text correction</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-08</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Support California Blvd. extension with bike lanes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-01</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Concern about vehicle-pedestrian conflicts on Via Carta at and north of Highland Drive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Consider ideas as part of implementation</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-02</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Proposes additional road crossing Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Consider ideas as part of implementation</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41-01</td>
<td>Robertshaw</td>
<td>Close the road next to the Campus market</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-09</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Intersection designs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25-03</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Suggests intersection redesign options</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Consider ideas as part of implementation</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42-01</td>
<td>Karminaka</td>
<td>Concerns for the instructional core vehicle access, too many conflicts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>See Circulation element</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-16</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Strong support for coordination with local transit providers and continued bus subsidy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-01</td>
<td>Wil.more</td>
<td>Support for circulation and parking proposals</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>No response required; See Circulation, Alternative Transportation and Parking elements</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-01</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Need to correct bus routes on Exhibit 5.22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-14</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 1. Bolder commitment to alternative transportation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>See note at end of Alternative Transportation element</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-17</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Add Support as a principle for alternative transportation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>See added Principle to Alternative Transportation element</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-02</td>
<td>Newland</td>
<td>Financial incentives to use transit services</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>See also p. 178-179</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-02</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Innovative Transit Financing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>No response required, see also page 179</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Financial Feasibility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Further analysis of incentives to use alternative transportation will be part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-02</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Need secure funding for local bus service</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Cal Poly is exploring alternative sources of funding to contribute to public transportation</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-40</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Confirm feasibility of reduction in parking demand</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Text has been clarified in Plan</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Trip reduction assumptions and Alternative Transportation - concern that modal split objectives may not be met</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>The circulation analysis in the DEIR illustrates the combination of policies and incentives that can achieve the parking reduction goal. Table added to Master Plan text in Parking element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-09</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Work with City, County, SLOCOG on short and long-range transit plans for Cal Poly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-18</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Concern with air quality associated with parking structures</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Addressed in Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-03</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Vehicle trip reduction</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>No response required, see also page 179</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-11</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Vague Plan Components</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>The circulation analysis in the DEIR illustrates the combination of policies and incentives that can achieve the parking reduction goal. Table added to Master Plan text in Parking element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-12</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Parking Fees</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15-02</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Concern about need for transit services to discourage cars</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Alternative Transportation element calls for coordinated transportation with City and County</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-03</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Need measurable modal split objectives</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>The circulation analysis in the DEIR illustrates the combination of policies and incentives that can achieve the parking reduction goal. Table added to Master Plan text in Parking element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-04</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Potential for Cal Poly leadership in regional light rail</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-05</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Consider higher parking fees; permit restrictions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-06</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Increase public transit access</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-07</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Consider light rail terminals at Cal Poly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28-01</td>
<td>Lang</td>
<td>Concerns for student transportation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation chapter</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-03</td>
<td>Steinmaus</td>
<td>Parking issues on campus; supports shuttle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>See Circulation element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-03</td>
<td>Steinmaus</td>
<td>Parking issues on campus; supports shuttle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>See Circulation element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-03</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Why more parking instead of mass transit?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation element</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-10</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Amend Environmental Consequences box to include risk of severe consequences if trip reduction plans fail</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-02</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Need to make mitigation of traffic impacts contingent on public transit subsidy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>See Text clarification</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Need to make mitigation of traffic impacts contingent on public transit subsidy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>See Text clarification</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-16</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Clarify statement about vehicle trip reduction</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-13</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Parking Location</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-19</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 6. Give high priority to parking studies and mitigation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Parking Management is already identified as one of the important Focused Studies needed to implement the Master Plan. Indeed, work is already underway to explore alternative sources of financial support for alternative transportation.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-14</td>
<td>DeCarli</td>
<td>Parking Structure Locations - need project EIR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>No response required</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13-01</td>
<td>Muhlen</td>
<td>Location of the third parking structure</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Master Plan shows alternative locations considered; no parking structure site on ITRC</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-09</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Move parking structure #3 west of railroad</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Most land is prime agricultural land along Highland Drive and critical to Outdoor Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-20</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Need to mitigate any light and glare impacts of future parking structures</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14-03</td>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td>Consider parking beneath housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16-02</td>
<td>Holan</td>
<td>Suggest underground parking</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18-02</td>
<td>Gifford</td>
<td>Build taller structures to save land</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22-01</td>
<td>Piirto</td>
<td>Concerns for the logging unit future</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>The locations have been refined to show that they will not occur on any present or future NRM facilities.</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-06</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td>Suggests more parking structures</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>See Constraints and Opportunities analysis</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-17</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Inconsistent designation of development suitability in area near Stenner Creek Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Legend and designations on Exhibit 4.11 have been clarified</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions regarding &quot;remote parking&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Map clarification</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter number</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment on Master Plan &amp; DEIR (October 2000)</td>
<td>Plan or DEIR (Oct. 2000)</td>
<td>Modifications to Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32-01</td>
<td>Pillsbury</td>
<td>Concern about proposed remote parking lot near Stenner Creek</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>Additional text added for clarification 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32-02</td>
<td>Pillsbury</td>
<td>Concerns for the future of the Christmas tree farm and logging unit</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>Additional text added for clarification 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-21</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Concern about conversion of agricultural lands</td>
<td>E 281</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53-02</td>
<td>Heatherington</td>
<td>Combine parking beneath residential structures</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>Text addition 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-11</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 10. Document parking space reduction</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>See new table added to Parking element 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-40</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Confirm feasibility of reduction in parking demand</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>Cal Poly concurs that reduction parking demand depends upon the success of its policies and incentives 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-11</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Support for reduction in parking demand</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>No response required 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-03</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Why more parking instead of mass transit?</td>
<td>P 185</td>
<td>See plans for reduction in parking demand 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-07</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td>Concern about students needing to drive off campus for retail services</td>
<td>P 189</td>
<td>See Support Services element 199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-06</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Clubs/organizations need multipurpose rooms</td>
<td>P 190</td>
<td>Text addition 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50-06</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Add discussion of planning for support services</td>
<td>P 190</td>
<td>Text addition 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-06</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 5. Concern about conflict/competition between on and off campus retail</td>
<td>P 189</td>
<td>The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown. 202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-24</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 10. Clarify “commercial component” in campus core and Goldtree area</td>
<td>P 189</td>
<td>The range of retail businesses and other activities in the campus core would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown. At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. 202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-31</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Trade-offs between providing commercial services for students, faculty and staff on and off campus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>The range of retail businesses and other activities would remain specialized and not constitute a full urban commercial center – and thus not compete directly with San Luis Obispo’s downtown.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-05</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Clubs/organizations need formal &amp; informal space</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-07</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Acknowledge alternative child care locations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-05</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>Support for services and facilities on campus for student residents</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No response required; See also pp. 127, 179, 189</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-06</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>Request for consideration of “privatization” of housing and commercial services on campus</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>As planning for an increased range and volume of services occurs, the campus will need to determine which it should offer directly and which might be provided through franchise or “privatization.”</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-17</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Clarify discussion of Ancillary Activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-14</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Impacts of development near Slack and Grand</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>See Environmental Consequences analysis. Also, revised map shows buffer adjacent to neighborhood.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-21</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concern about impact of ancillary activities in general</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-39</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Be consistent in use of terms for Main Campus and ranches</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-04</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>Support for ancillary and conference facilities</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>No response required; see pp. 194-195</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-28</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Clarify Visitor Center site and conference facility expectations at Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Map change shows more limited area, adds buffer; see also text changes on p. 195</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:  
A = Agency  
P = Public  
O = Organization  
CP = Cal Poly Affiliated  
Note Page 0 = no text reference  
Page 23 of 30  
L. Dalton C. Clark  
3/4/01  
MatrixC.xls
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Concern that development of ancillary activities in the Goldtree area may compete with off-campus activities and generate impacts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. Ancillary activities not would create significant peak traffic demand. They would also be contained within facilities so concerns about aesthetics, light and glare would need to be addressed during site and building design and development.</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-03</td>
<td>Kranzdorf</td>
<td>Clarify Visitor Center site and conference facility expectations at Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-06</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Objects to conclusion that loss of valley grasslands would not be significant</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-13</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Clarify future use of Cheda Ranch, in view of Goldtree discussions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-05</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Clarify Visitor Center site and conference facility expectations at Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Text addition clarifies nature of conference facilities, not intended to include overnight accommodations</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-05</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>wonders whether people care about ancillary activities</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Numerous comments received from campus and community</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-22</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concern about commercial component of ancillary activities that might draw non-student clientele</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>The nature of conference and applied research activities is quite different from cultural and sporting events, or even daily class schedules. Thus, neither of these ancillary activities would create the same level of peak traffic demand. They would also be contained within facilities so concerns about aesthetics, light and glare would need to be addressed during site and building design and development.</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-11</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Concern about proposed Visitor Center and ancillary activities near Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Map change shows more limited area; adds buffer</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-11</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Concern about impacts in Grand and Slack area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-06</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Traffic impacts of Visitor Center on Grand Avenue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Access will be from Grand Ave. Site planning studies will address circulation and access.</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-10</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Request for recognition of neighborhood impact at Grand Ave. and Slack Street</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-23</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concern about magnitude of impacts of ancillary activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Further development in the Goldtree area will involve more detailed studies of impacts</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58-24</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>Concern about visibility of Goldtree site</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Further development in the Goldtree area will involve more detailed studies of impacts</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-12</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 11. Clarify future uses in Goldtree area; concern with compatibility with off-campus resources</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Concern that development of ancillary activities in the Goldtree area may compete with off-campus activities and generate impacts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>At Goldtree an applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community. Thus, local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. Ancillary activities not would create significant peak traffic demand. They would also be contained within facilities so concerns about aesthetics, light and glare would need to be addressed during site and building design and development.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-42</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Critique of environmental analysis of Goldtree area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Remote parking options will not be located in such a way as to impact the area.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-19</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Questions research park location, analysis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-18</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Add traffic and wildlife analysis for Cheda/Goldtree</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-19</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Concerns about access to Goldtree area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Site planning and feasibility analysis will provide more detailed evaluation of access options</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47-01</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Concerns for increased enrollment and unique environment of SLO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:
A = Agency
P = Public
O = Organization
CP = Cal Poly Affiliated
Note Page 0 = no text reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Noise and Aesthetics</td>
<td>E 212</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Noise, Mitigation</td>
<td>E 210</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Mitigation</td>
<td>E 211</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Aesthetics, Residual Impact</td>
<td>E 212</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-41</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Summary Environmental Impacts Table, Public Services, Mitigation</td>
<td>E 213</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-17</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Need to address water quality/run-off from Sports Complex</td>
<td>P 139</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56-02</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Water quality impacts from Sports complex</td>
<td>E 232</td>
<td>Water quality impacts are addressed by Sports Complex EIR</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-44</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions cumulative impact analysis</td>
<td>E 281</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37-01</td>
<td>Gambs</td>
<td>Contributions to wildlife portion of DEIR</td>
<td>E 234</td>
<td>Incorporated in DEIR</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-04</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>Goldtree listed as 180 acres</td>
<td>E 326</td>
<td>Reference to Goldtree in this context is to area surveyed by biologists.</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-08</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 7. Re-evaluate siting of student housing, esp. near Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19-01</td>
<td>Gifford</td>
<td>Does not want development near Poly Canyon</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23-05</td>
<td>Kransdorf</td>
<td>Concern about housing near Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-05</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Strong concern about housing north of Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-07</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Concern about impacts on Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 257</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-22</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Continuing concerns about impacts of student housing north of Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-01</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Concerned about housing near Poly Canyon</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44-02</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Claims no EIR on development near Poly Canyon</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51-01</td>
<td>Beccia</td>
<td>Concerns on the placement of residences north of Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53-01</td>
<td>Heatherington</td>
<td>Concerns regarding housing at the mouth of Poly Canyon near Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27-01</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Concerns for animals in proposed housing site</td>
<td>E 258</td>
<td>DEIR addresses impacts</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34-10</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Concern about impacts in Goldtree area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-17</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Questions determination of less than significant impact, re: human use, loss of grassland, prime agricultural land</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-43</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions regarding soil analysis and significance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-45</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Critique of lack of involvement of agricultural specialists in analysis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Reference to Goldtree in this context is to area surveyed by biologists. No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-05</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to DEIR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Text modification made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-01</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Concerns about intersection data at California and Foothill</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Revised ATE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-03</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Concerns about transit analysis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>See response for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24-11</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Review LOS calculations with respect to increases in background traffic</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Text change for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-02</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Trip reduction assumptions and Alternative Transportation - quantify modal split objectives</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>See detailed response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-07</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Trip reduction assumptions and Alternative Transportation - discrepancies between plan, traffic study and DEIR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>See plan clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-08</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Mitigation monitoring needed to achieve modal split objectives</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>See detailed response 5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08-03</td>
<td>Newland</td>
<td>Traffic signal at California and 101</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-04</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Need to add vehicle and stationary sources</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-03</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Address impact of additional boilers</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Concern with asbestos during demolition and renovation activities</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-06</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Concern with air quality associated with parking structures</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57-03</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>Suggests plan involves “explosive growth”</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>See discussion in EIR comparing proposed growth for Cal Poly with San Luis Obispo area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-08</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Noise and light mitigation must be monitored</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Refer to response; no text change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-16</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Noise and light mitigation must be monitored</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Additional environmental review will be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-07</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Address feasibility of remodeling Mustang stadium (compare noise impacts)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Text has been changed; refer to Alternatives Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-09</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>See Jones and Stokes and other studies for alternative noise mitigation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>The Jones and Stokes study has been cited in the bibliography. A summary of its findings have been incorporated into the discussion of the Mustang Stadium relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-06</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Need more effective mitigation for noise</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>The Jones and Stokes study has been cited in the bibliography. A summary of its findings have been incorporated into the discussion of the Mustang Stadium relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-20</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 7. Clarify language in EIR regarding light and glare</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>See RQN correspondence from December 4 and June 6, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-13</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Need more effective mitigation for light and glare - Class II finding not acceptable based on proposed mitigation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Additional mitigation has been added to EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-15</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Apply similar mitigation measures for light and glare if basketball arena is built</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>See clarification in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-14</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Suggestions for alternative, more effective mitigation of light and glare</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Additional mitigation has been added to EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-01</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Information lacking from table regarding wells</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Text change; refer to public services section of the EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-42</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Need to clarify availability of water</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>See modifications in EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39-01</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Concerns about the Water Supply for Cal Poly</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Text has been amended to clarify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-05</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to DEIR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>See modifications in EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-02</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Wants development and implementation of water demand management program</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>A water demand management program is included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04-03</td>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Proposes the need to prepare a drought contingency plan as a proposed mitigation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>A drought contingency program is included as mitigation for project impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-09</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Dust control under APCD jurisdiction</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>No change required in text; refer to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-08</td>
<td>Lajoie</td>
<td>Recommends mitigation measures for fossil fueled equipment during construction</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Text has been changed accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56-01</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Concerns for enrollment impacts on the environment of the San Luis Obispo area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>See DEIR discussion of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-05</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to DEIR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>See modifications in EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-01</td>
<td>Sutliff</td>
<td>Request for list of all additional studies and actions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>See Chapter 7, updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-03</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
<td>Land and financing options for student, faculty and staff housing</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>See also pp. 134, 331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:
A = Agency
P = Public
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CP = Cal Poly Affiliated
Note Page 0 = no text reference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>02-02</td>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>Recommends &quot;realistic and sincere implementation&quot;</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-25</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 11. Provide for additional environmental review for future projects</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Chapter 7 describes how future projects will be reviewed within the context of the program EIR for the Master Plan.</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05-04</td>
<td>McCluskey</td>
<td>Need project EIRs for parking structures, intersections, etc.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Chapter 7 describes how future projects will be reviewed within the context of the program EIR for the Master Plan.</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-18</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Previous 5. Commitment to unified analysis and planning with City</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan includes provision for consultation with elected officials and local and regional agencies</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-10</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Add working with neighbors as a component of noise mitigation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>See p. 348?</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-17</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Add working with neighbors as a component of light and glare mitigation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Note University consultation with neighbors</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-02</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Request for more notice, consideration of neighbors by Cal Poly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan provides for early meetings with neighbors so as to design projects to relieve potential impacts.</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-13</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Notification of neighbors regarding any development, EIRs, etc. near Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan provides for early meetings with neighbors so as to design projects to relieve potential impacts. Chapter 7 also addresses future environmental review.</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-14</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Request for City/Cal Poly MOU to avoid concerns of unilateral actions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>As part of the Communication and Consultation section of Chapter 7, the Master Plan includes provision for consultation with elected officials and local and regional agencies</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-13</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 12. Include plan amendment process with provision for community notification, involvement and consultation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7.</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-42</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Strengthen discussion of process, particularly for plan amendment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7.</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43-02</td>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Need section on how plan will be updated</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>A section on plan monitoring, review and revision has been added to Chapter 7.</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type:
A = Agency  
P = Public  
O = Organization  
CP = Cal Poly Affiliated

Note Page 0 = no text reference

Page 29 of 30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-43</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Review list of implementation guidelines, standards, and studies for completeness</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Chapter 7 has been revised to include a more comprehensive list of implementation studies</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-05</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Suggestion to assess sustainability of existing conditions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>This suggestion is being added to the list of implementation studies (Chapter 7)</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35-01</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Reference UU Master Plan process and results</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-20</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Clarify map legend</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03-01</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>General 1. A. Reduce size of ancillary activity area at Grand and Slack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Map change shows more limited area; adds buffer</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-02</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions about soil classification and analysis of areas suitable for ancillary activities and remote parking, particularly on Cheda ranch</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Maps of the areas suggested for ancillary facilities and remote parking have been added in Chapter 4, Existing Conditions, showing that these proposed sites are not on prime (class I) soils.</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-01</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Concern about suitability of Cheda Ranch area for ancillary activities and/or remote parking</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Discussed in more detail Existing Conditions chapter and in Parking and Ancillary Activities and Facilities elements</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55-03</td>
<td>Elfrink</td>
<td>Development potential at Slack and Grand</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Map change shows more limited area; adds buffer</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-01</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Add &quot;prime&quot; to agricultural land designation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-01</td>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen commitment to sustainability planning and building practices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59-01</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Editing suggestions to strengthen consciousness of resource requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>Text addition</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-03</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Questions designation of applied research park site</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Text clarification</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36-02</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>What does &quot;modest-sized&quot; research park mean?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Analysis for the DEIR considered a possible development of about 400,000 square feet of building plus parking.</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29-36</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>Designate proposed field house with a letter and on legend</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>Map change</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

This table contains the responses to the June, 2000 Master. It is sorted by the page references to the responses – last column, “Page in Plan/DERIR (Oct. 2000).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Kennedy, Robert E.</td>
<td>Cal Poly - President emeritus</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>CSU and community contexts</td>
<td>See Introduction, Guiding Framework, and Long-Range Enrollment chapters</td>
<td>Ch. 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Cover letter for staff report and residents' letters; concern about commitment to implementation</td>
<td>See principles and implementation sections</td>
<td>15; Ch. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Aborne, Sam and General</td>
<td>ASI President</td>
<td>12-Aug</td>
<td>Concern that plan depends on changes in student behavior</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Particularly with respect to alternative transportation, the Master Plan considers both policies and incentives to change behavior</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LA</td>
<td>25-May</td>
<td>Need to credit other sources, e.g. LA GIS Lab</td>
<td>See acknowledgements</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Herron, Dan</td>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Add summary of impacts</td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td>x-xi; 204-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Illustration should be reviewed and modified</td>
<td>xi, 107f</td>
<td>Diagrammatic illustration changed in response to multiple suggestions</td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dollar, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Set high goals for Plan implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>See aspirations and principles associated with Cal Poly mission.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LA</td>
<td>10-Apr</td>
<td>Several suggestions for changes to principles.</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>4, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marx, Steven</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, English</td>
<td>1-Jun</td>
<td>Encourage &quot;sustainable campus&quot;</td>
<td>14, 55</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>4, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Concern with sustainability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional principle identifies environmental responsibility associated with Cal Poly mission</td>
<td>4, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RQN</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Recommendation for proactive, rather than reactive response by Cal Poly to neighborhood concerns.</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>The development of the campus Master Plan and Implementation represents a proactive process by Cal Poly</td>
<td>5-9; 15; 16-19; and Ch. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More detail regarding principles</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Guiding Framework intended to be general; see later chapters for detail.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senate resolutions</td>
<td>Cal Poly - Academic Senate</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Academic quality concerns</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academic quality addressed in principles and academic plans for enrollment growth</td>
<td>1-2, 11, 32-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- **A** = Addressed
- **P** = Partially addressed
- **I** = To be addressed during implementation
- **C** = Considered, but not acted on
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senate resolutions</td>
<td>Cal Poly - Academic Senate</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Operating budget and growth concerns; resolution calls for making enrollment growth contingent on receiving budget commitments first</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget issues addressed in principles and implementation chapter</td>
<td>11; 15; 330-31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slem, Chuck</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, Psych</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Concerned with enrollment increase, academic quality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academic quality addressed in principles and academic plans for enrollment growth</td>
<td>1-2, 11, 32-38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Suggestions to reconsider programmatic emphasis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-38</td>
<td>Academic program mix (polytechnic emphasis) is central to Cal Poly mission.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Wording request to clarify responsibility for mitigation &quot;on and off campus.&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Master Plan mitigates impacts; reduces housing shortage; addresses neighborhood issues, but cannot promise to &quot;eliminate&quot; impacts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hall, Russell</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concerned there is no willingness to identify &quot;impact zones&quot; or establish Co-Lead Agency</td>
<td>13, 192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No change - Campus responsibility governed by CEQA and CSU</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestion for stronger wording on alternative transportation; expand self-mitigation to services and resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No change to principles, due to detail in later chapters</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bianchi, Shirley</td>
<td>SLO County Supervisor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>RQN issues, Mustang Stadium, Goldtree</td>
<td>13 and elsewhere</td>
<td>See responses to RQN concerns.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pinard, Peg</td>
<td>SLO County Supervisor</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>RQN issues</td>
<td>13 and elsewhere</td>
<td>See responses to RQN concerns.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tingle, Bryce</td>
<td>SLO County Staff</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Too generic in approach to issues; Include all recommended principles in an appendix.</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>Principles recommended by 1990 task forces available on website</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collins, Curtis</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Not convinced that Cal Poly needs to grow.</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>Ch. 3</td>
<td>Chapter 3 explains the demand and campus responsibility for educating additional students</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report; Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6/6 and 4/21</td>
<td>Suggestions to study degree length; consider different calendars, etc.; clarify enrollment data</td>
<td>23, 27</td>
<td>See enrollment scenarios for options that do not require increases in physical capacity; also, see revised enrollment tables, DEIR addresses resource and service capacity.</td>
<td>24-28; 29-31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Herron, Dan</td>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Clarify enrollment numbers; clarify how scenarios used</td>
<td>v, 26-29</td>
<td>See revised enrollment tables and discussion of use of enrollment scenarios</td>
<td>24; 29-31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
A = Addressed
P = Partially addressed
I = To be addressed during implementation
C = Considered, but not acted on
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### Summary of Comments Received on May 2000 Preliminary Draft Master Plan, and Response in October 2000 Master Plan and DEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>&quot;Cal Poly should provide housing on campus for as much of the existing shortage as possible&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>800 beds to be built by 2002 reduce housing shortage and Master Plan student housing program accommodates all new undergraduates</td>
<td>13, 30, 124</td>
<td>Student housing projects are planned to be completed ahead of enrollment growth.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>More detail regarding existing conditions; esp. constraints and opportunities analysis</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>See revised wording.</td>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>Chapter 4 represents a summary. See later elements and DEIR for more detail.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, Segal neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Development on west side of campus can impact use of Ferrini Open Space on Bishop's Peak; should identify noise &amp; light as impacts to Bishop's Peak area; support Neighborhood Task Force recommendations</td>
<td>35, 49</td>
<td>Existing Conditions chapter provides general overview; additional details on plan components in Ch. 5. See also discussion of environmental setting in Ch. 6, DEIR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested addition of Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Additional wording added.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested additions to traffic issues</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Additional wording added.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Mapping of potential neighborhood conflict with Monterey Heights, east of Grand Ave.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>See commitment to mitigation in principles and provisions for mitigation in DEIR</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Comment recognized; map shows general areas of conflict rather than specific blocks or streets</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about light and glare; noise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>13; 288-292; 293-97</td>
<td>Constraints and Opportunities analysis presents issues at general level.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about buffer for neighborhood.</td>
<td>48-50</td>
<td>Informal recreation on west side of Slack street adds to green space adjacent to residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>140-42</td>
<td>Master Plan proposes no new development adjacent to residential neighborhoods except for Visitor Center near Slack Street.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about Goldtree area; ancillary activities in general</td>
<td>48-50, 180</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR.</td>
<td>59; 193-97</td>
<td>Existing Conditions chapter provides general overview.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>More detail in Land Use element</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Land Use element intended as overview.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Concern with scale of housing (or other development) west of Highway 1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td>293-97</td>
<td>Density, massing and design details will be worked out with the City.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale Cal Poly - CAED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about ecological integrity and continuity of wildlife habitats and corridors</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Covered in Natural Environment principles.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td> </td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Collins, Tarren Sierra Club</td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>More detailed mapping and inventory</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>DEIR contains more detailed inventory of plant communities in areas proposed for new development</td>
<td>Appendix B to DEIR</td>
<td>Other areas will be mapped more fully during Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- **A** - Addressed
- **P** - Partially addressed
- **I** - To be addressed during implementation
- **C** - Considered, but not acted on

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, &amp; Segal</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Expand discussion of Morros as setting for SLO and campus</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Additional wording added. See also, DEIR.</td>
<td>76; 219</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Dollar, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Be steward of open lands – concerned about “P”; allow public access on Cal Ply lands; clean up Architectural Village.</td>
<td>68-74</td>
<td>See Natural Environment and Outdoor Teaching and Learning elements</td>
<td>76-85; 96-99</td>
<td>The “P” will be addressed in master plan implementation.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Collins, Tarren</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>Oppose housing near Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Brizzolara Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81; 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSM, Bio Sci</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Biological resources of Brizzolara Creek</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Brizzolara Creek enhancement area; moves student housing. See DEIR, too.</td>
<td>81; 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Marx, Steven</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, English</td>
<td>7-Jun</td>
<td>Housing in floodplain (H-3 and H-4) is mistake. Need to apply Nat. Env. Principles.</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Brizzolara Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81; 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Corridor protection for Poly Canyon and Brizzolara Creek; restore Feedmill area</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Revised plan establishes Brizzolara Creek enhancement area; moves student housing</td>
<td>81; 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Concern with watershed protection</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested expansion of BMPs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Additional reference to BMPs in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element</td>
<td>85; 94-99</td>
<td>To be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Scotto, Ken</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR LUC</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Show Pavilion on all maps; feedlot to be incorporated in BCEC; horseshoeing facility not mentioned; identify nexus of how Pavilion will replace access provided by Bull Test; need map with proposed agricultural corridor; concern regarding new housing proximity to EHS unit; fence students out of grazing fields; dorm lights on livestock; show Farm Operations as moving to Future Corporation Yards</td>
<td>75-80; 83-85</td>
<td>Maps altered; descriptions in Outdoor Teaching and Learning element modified.</td>
<td>96-99; 84-96 and multiple exhibits</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Expand examples of how outdoor teaching and learning activities are integrated into campus</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- **A** = Addressed
- **P** = Partially addressed
- **I** = To be addressed during implementation
- **C** = Considered, but not acted on

L. Dalton

11/14/00

MPComments11.xls
**Summary of Comments Received on May 2000 Preliminary Draft Master Plan, and Response in October 2000 Master Plan and DEIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>CIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites for specific academic programs, disciplines or colleges</td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>The Master Plan designates general areas for development rather than sites for specific programs.</td>
<td>94-95; 101-2</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northwest area</td>
<td>94-95; 101-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Encouragement of visual diversity as well as continuity</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wording modified</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northwest area</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Interest in possible historic buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>See discussion of areas within campus instructional core; and DEIR in particular.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Design of northeast area, including replacement of Bldg. 6 is part of implementation, with involvement of users</td>
<td>106-7; 113-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>UU Master Plan</td>
<td>Cal Poly - ASI</td>
<td>18-May</td>
<td>Activities and design considerations in UU/Centennial Green area</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>See changes and additions to Campus Instructional Core element</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northwest area</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Davis, Hiram</td>
<td>Cal Poly - Library</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Current library space is inadequate; do not decentralize library activities; need support of traditional print resources; library staff would be more effective if all resources housed in single area</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Building massing studies show potential for greater building heights and gain of open space</td>
<td>104-114</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northwest area</td>
<td>106-7; 113-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Concern about heights in center of campus</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Infill and renovation are covered in the Master Plan, but not shown in detail in the maps</td>
<td>110-11</td>
<td>Library expansion and redesign intended as part of northwest area</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, LAC</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Retain Bradley Park-SW quadrant; assess staging of landscape improvements; supports finding good Poly Grove solutions.</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Details of landscape guidelines and design of Bradley Park area as part of implementation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Design of northeast area, including replacement of Bldg. 6 is part of implementation, with involvement of users</td>
<td>115, 120-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Levenson, Harvey</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, GRC</td>
<td>3-May</td>
<td>Are we upgrading Graphic communication building facilities?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Infill and renovation are covered in the Master Plan, but not shown in detail in the maps</td>
<td>115, 120-23</td>
<td>Details of landscape guidelines and design of Bradley Park area as part of implementation</td>
<td>115, 120-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Solomon, Ken</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR, BRAE</td>
<td>26-May</td>
<td>Concern about layout of new building for Bioresource and Ag. Engineering.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Details at program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>95, 99-100</td>
<td>Design of northeast area, including replacement of Bldg. 6 is part of implementation, with involvement of users</td>
<td>107; 112-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Tryon, Bette</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, Psych</td>
<td>9-Jun</td>
<td>Child Development program would like to be in Plan with lab, offices &amp; pre-school lab</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Details at program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>See activities in campus centers and residential centers</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Lajoie, Barry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestions for services on campus to reduce need for off-campus trips</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Details at program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>See activities in campus centers and residential centers</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Allan, Preston</td>
<td>Cal Poly - SA, Housing</td>
<td>4-Apr</td>
<td>Wording and factual changes on housing section</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>104-8, 191-92</td>
<td>Details at program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>104-8, 191-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Note importance of student competition with non-student households</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Details at program level not shown in Master Plan</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>See activities in campus centers and residential centers</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
- **A** = Addressed
- **P** = Partially addressed
- **I** = To be addressed during implementation
- **C** = Considered, but not acted on

L. Dalton
11/14/00

MPComments11.xls
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Dollar, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Add even more housing~50% of students</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Master Plan calls for housing approximately one-third of undergraduate students on campus.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Question about the likelihood that students will want to live on campus</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Market studies have shown that students should be interested in apartment-style housing.</td>
<td>126-34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSM, Bio Sci</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Housing units H-3 &amp; H-4 major disturbance to riparian corridor; so eliminate; build H-5, H-6 &amp; H-7 first; build housing near Slack and Grand to north side of drainage; perhaps use H-8 &amp; H-9 for student housing; hold H-1 and H-2 in abeyance and avoid if possible (could be a grassland mitigation site)</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>Master Plan changes include rearrangement of student residential communities, particularly to allow for Brizzolara Creek Enhancement Project. See DEIR, too.</td>
<td>81; 97; 128-32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Collins, Curtis</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about housing in southwest corner of campus</td>
<td>118-19</td>
<td>Revised Master Plan creates a full residential community in this area</td>
<td>132-34</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about student residences near Grand and Slack</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>See modified proposal for H-6 residential area, separated from Slack Street; and DEIR</td>
<td>130; 132</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Simon, Richard neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about residences west of Highway 1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>See discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>134-36</td>
<td>Provision of faculty and staff housing follows a principle of the master plan to address community impacts.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Faculty/staff housing sites</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>See discussion of faculty and staff housing; and DEIR</td>
<td>130; 132</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Fraternity locations</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>As stated in the preliminary draft of the Master Plan, Cal Poly is limited by CSU policy.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, &amp; Segal</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Suggested wording change</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Master Plan language change not seen as necessary.</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, &amp; Segal</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about noise related to sports facilities</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>See additional wording; and DEIR discussion of noise issues and mitigation</td>
<td>143-45; 288-99</td>
<td>Need to cite Jones and Stokes 1997 sound study more explicitly</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about noise related to sports facilities</td>
<td>130-31</td>
<td>See additional wording; and DEIR discussion of noise issues and mitigation</td>
<td>143-45; 288-99</td>
<td>Need to cite Jones and Stokes 1997 sound study more explicitly</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about possible relocation of Mustang Stadium</td>
<td>130-31</td>
<td>See DEIR</td>
<td>143-44; 290</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Dollar, Don</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Allow public access on Cal Poly land</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>See provision for trails</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFU</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Encouragement of use of recycled water</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Included in plan components</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Request for policy about commuting and parking</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>See Circulation, Parking and Alternative Transportation elements</td>
<td>158; 178; 182-83</td>
<td>The Land Use element provides an overview, leading to detail in the subsequent elements.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paulsen, Jacquie</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td>Corrections on circulation and alternative transportation sections.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Collins, Curtis</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>5/4 and 6/12</td>
<td>Circulation and parking impacts in Alta Vista area</td>
<td>140-41</td>
<td>155–68; 176-79</td>
<td>Alternative Transportation programs are designed to reduce traffic circulation and parking requirements</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>California-Foothill land use and traffic issues</td>
<td>140-41</td>
<td>155-56; 162</td>
<td>Details will be developed during implementation - particularly design of parking structure and new student housing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Clarification of bike connections and routes</td>
<td>141, 162</td>
<td>Wording modified</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Alternative traffic calming; question about feasibility and usefulness of grade-separated pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>148-50</td>
<td>162-65</td>
<td>Suggestions to be considered during implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lajoie, Barry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Accommodate electric bicycles</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Bicycle circulation needs further development</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Goldenberg, Stuart</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSM, Math</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Bicycles - need to have adequate Class II around Highland and Perimeter, and route joining the roads west of business building &amp; a route like Via Carla but wider.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kelly-Sneed, Kieran</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, ARCE student</td>
<td>9-May</td>
<td>Allow bicycles on inner Perimeter and Dexter (anywhere state vehicles are allowed)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code:**
A = Addressed
P = Partially addressed
I = To be addressed during implementation
C = Considered, but not acted on

L. Dalton
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Steinmaus, Scott</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR, Crop Sci</td>
<td>17-May</td>
<td>Supports bike paths and vehicle reduction</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of Implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aeilts, Tony</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Bicycle issues - task force initiated</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Some adjustments made in revised Master Plan</td>
<td>165-67</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of Implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paulsen, Jacquie</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td>Service access should include buses, shuttles, etc.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wording added</td>
<td>168, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Risser, Joe</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Risk Mgt</td>
<td>22-May</td>
<td>Ensure service routes are clearly marked for emergency use (concerned about making them look too pedestrian); access to campus is inadequate for emergency vehicles; need adequate access for delivery vehicles; evacuation plan</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>117-18, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter and N. Perimeter to through traffic as well as other circulation changes</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rinzler, Paul</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CLA, Music</td>
<td>12-May</td>
<td>Concern of impacts from Perimeter being pedestrian only</td>
<td>105, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td>118, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter to through traffic</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paulsen, Jacquie</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service access on campus</td>
<td>144, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td>117-18, 174</td>
<td>Access will be provided as part of implementation plan for closing S. Perimeter and N. Perimeter to through traffic as well as other circulation changes</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Walter, Virginia</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR, EHS</td>
<td>12-May</td>
<td>Residence halls are too close to EHS production unit; roadway too close</td>
<td>146, 151</td>
<td>Circulation to residential complexes north of Brizzolara Creek realigned.</td>
<td>161; 166</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hannings, Dave</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR, EHS</td>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>Serious concern about roads accessing residential sites H-1 &amp; H-2 going by EHS</td>
<td>146, 151</td>
<td>Circulation to residential complexes north of Brizzolara Creek realigned.</td>
<td>161; 166</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Scotto, Ken</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAGR LUC</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Need transportation plan for farm roads outside of core; show blend of roads/trails in traffic plan; consider additional bridge over Brizzolara for parking structure; Concerns about parking structure, Via Carta circulation</td>
<td>146, 157, 167</td>
<td>Circulation to extended campus added to plan components</td>
<td>94; 174</td>
<td>Detailed circulation plans to be part of master plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Lajoie, Barry</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Support for trip reduction, including student housing on campus; concern with financial support for public transit ridership by Cal Poly students</td>
<td>153, 161</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Commitment expressed in Master Plan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
- A = Addressed
- P = Partially addressed
- I = To be addressed during implementation
- C = Considered, but not acted on

L. Dalton
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Herron, Dan</td>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Clarify parking strategy; looking for operational details of alternative transportation; supports freshmen and geographic controls.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>178-80; 185-86</td>
<td>Additional detail will be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Campbell, Cindy</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD, Univ. Police</td>
<td>5-Apr</td>
<td>Several suggested wording changes and corrections to text; eliminate intersection designs that rely on U. Police for management during events; separate operational plan for alternative transportation;</td>
<td>162, 170</td>
<td>Changes made in Preliminary draft</td>
<td>Further operational changes to be part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Comment on different methods for determining modal split</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Master Plan uses past data; agreement that campus and city should coordinate future studies</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Suggestions for trip reduction.</td>
<td>143, 159, 162</td>
<td>178-80; 285</td>
<td>See Alternative Transportation element as well as DEIR</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>SLO APCD</td>
<td>20-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about air quality around parking structures</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>280-87</td>
<td>More parking analysis will be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Lajoie, Barry</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD</td>
<td>14-Apr</td>
<td>Parking analysis and student driving behavior</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185-86</td>
<td>Plan did not add the requested data directly.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>SLO Staff Report</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>6-Jun</td>
<td>Parking ratios and restrictions</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185-86</td>
<td>Additional services will be considered as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Aborne, Sam and General ASI President</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td>Sites for support services</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>xiii, 192</td>
<td>General services will be incorporated in larger structures, so they do not show independently on maps.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sanville, Terry</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>21-Apr</td>
<td>Concern about support services for residential communities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>104-15, 127, 187-92</td>
<td>Additional planning for &quot;living/learning&quot; needs will occur as residential communities are designed.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Schwartz, Debora</td>
<td>Cal Poly - English</td>
<td>7-Aug</td>
<td>Concern about child care needs of present and future faculty</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>xiii, 187-92</td>
<td>Additional services will be considered as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Stover, Vickie</td>
<td>Cal Poly - AFD</td>
<td>5-May</td>
<td>Need more specific proposal for Visitor Information Center at Slack and Grand</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>xiii, 194-95</td>
<td>Visitor Center shown in more detail in Master Plan maps and text</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department; Ashley, Phil</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CSM, Bio Sci</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Goldtree – deep valley soils, foraging habitat - site needs careful evaluation</td>
<td>71, 116</td>
<td>See additional wording and DEIR, Appendix C.</td>
<td>195-97</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concern about potential development with commercial component</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>The Master Plan does not propose ancillary activies with a commercial component</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>RQN neighbors</td>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about Goldtree area; ancillary activities in general</td>
<td>48-50, 180</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR.</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, &amp; Segal neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Concerns about Goldtree area; west side of campus</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>See additional details on plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR.</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Bianchi, Shirley SLO County Supervisor</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Goldtree concerns</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>See additional details about plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Goldtree concerns</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>See additional details about plan components in Ch. 5 and DEIR</td>
<td>193-97</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schwartz, Ken City Council member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about both negative and positive impact of Cal Poly</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>See additional wording</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monday club notes</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10-May</td>
<td>Phasing, budget issues</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>See clarification in Guiding Framework, as well as Ch. 7</td>
<td>15; 330-31</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stem, Chuck Cal Poly - CLA, Psych</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Concerned with funding management of construction and change; insure up-front funding; develop a Management of Change Process.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>329-36</td>
<td>Implementation and phasing should add consideration of change processes</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frankel, Ruggles, Saunders, &amp; Segal neighbors</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Desire for Cal Poly to follow through on commitment to early involvement of neighbors</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Commitment made as part of master plan process</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sutliff, Dale Cal Poly - CAED, LA</td>
<td>25-May</td>
<td>Call for broad and frequent communication and consultation</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>334-36</td>
<td>Details to be developed as part of Implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tingle, Bryce SLO County staff</td>
<td>13-Jun</td>
<td>Intergovernmental recommendations lacking</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Intergovernmental issues covered further in implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ketcham, Gary Cal Poly - CAGR</td>
<td>8-Jun</td>
<td>Plan should have a comprehensive Farm and Ranch Maintenance Program covering costs, boundary fencing, farm roads, and communication within CAGR.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>335-36</td>
<td>Land management practices to be developed as part of Master Plan implementation</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:
A = Addressed
P = Partially addressed
I = To be addressed during implementation
C = Considered, but not acted on

L. Dalton 11/14/00
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Judd, Eugene - cover for student letters, CE 222</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CENG, CE students</td>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>Public transportation should be addressed clearly - light rail, bus terminals &amp; shuttle; location of Parking Structure 3 should be thought about; attached several papers for CE 222.</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Ideas considered in discussions of Master Plan alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Env Engineering - Transp Eng students</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CENG, CE students</td>
<td>1-Jun</td>
<td>Several student letters packaged following similar format for Plan review; numerous comments on proposals for transportation and circulation and alternative transportation.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ideas considered in discussions of Master Plan alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>CRP 353</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, CRP students</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
<td>Wide range of analysis and suggestions comprising an “alternative” master plan developed by the third year lab in City and Regional Planning over the 1999-2000 academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas considered in discussions of Master Plan alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFU</td>
<td>CRP 438</td>
<td>Cal Poly - CAED, CRP students</td>
<td>Winter 2000</td>
<td>Class report titled “Environmental Quality Control: A Protocol for Pollution Prevention”; issues include waste management, hazardous waste and transportation, environmental audit recommended</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Ideas considered in discussions of Master Plan alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>