The attached resolutions were adopted by the Board of Trustees at its meeting of March 20-21, 2001, held in the University Student Union of California State University, Long Beach, 1212 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, California
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the following trustees are elected to constitute the board’s Committee on Committees for the 2001-2002 term:

Martha C. Fallgatter, Chair
William D. Campbell
Debra Farar
Dee Dee Myers
Stanley Wang
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, as follows:

Whenever an award of punitive damages is entered by a judge or jury against any California State University employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees, an investigation shall be conducted into the facts and circumstances giving rise to the claim and the evidence presented at the trial of the action, and a report shall be prepared for the Board. Any Board member who is the object of such an investigation shall not participate in the subsequent decision-making about his or her personal circumstances. The Board shall then reach its own conclusion as to whether all of the following circumstances pertain:

1. The judgment is based on an act or omission of the employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees acting within the course and scope of his or her employment or other function within the California State University.

2. At the time of the act giving rise to the liability, the employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees acted, or failed to act, in good faith, without actual malice and in the apparent best interests of the California State University.

3. Payment of the claim or judgment would be in the best interests of the California State University.

Where all of the above criteria are met, the Board shall either apply to the Legislature for approval of payment of the punitive award in accord with Government Code section 825(b), or use its best efforts to identify a non-state source of funds appropriate to the circumstances presented, including funds held by the various legally separate auxiliary organizations within the CSU, and to encourage payment from those non-state fund sources as an appropriate service to the mission of the CSU.
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the trustees support the construction of The Save Mart Center at California State University, Fresno and authorize the campus in consultation with the Chancellor's Office to execute agreements necessary to implement the development plan for the project.
Executive Compensation (RUFP 03-01-02)

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that Dr. William B. Eisenhardt shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of $185,004 effective July 1, 2001, the date of his appointment as president of the California Maritime Academy and he shall be required to occupy the official CMA presidential residence (Residence #2) as a condition of employment; and that Dr. Richard R. Rush shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of $200,004 and a housing allowance set at the annual rate of $28,752, June 1, 2001 or soon thereafter, effective with his appointment as president of the California State University, Channel Islands.

CSU Health Care Reimbursement Account Plan (RUFP 03-01-03)

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the CSU Health Care Reimbursement Account Plan be made available to executives of the California State University effective June 1, 2001.
RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, that those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the programs will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, that degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.
Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded (RCPBG 03-01-03)

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University that the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $500,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the San Francisco State University, Residence Dining Center Addition.

Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded (RCPBG 03-01-04)

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

1. The 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $5.2 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Center for Animal and Veterinary Science Education, Phase Ia project as Priority 27.

2. CSPU Pomona will include the balance of funding required for Phase Ia in a future capital outlay budget request based on campus priorities.

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University (RCPBG 03-01-05)

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

1. The FEIR and the Addendum to the FEIR (collectively “the FEIR”) for the SDSU campus master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of that project, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, and that project consists of the following project components: (1) two academic/research buildings, a performing arts complex, a science research building, a physical plant and an addition to the North Life Sciences Building; and (2) a faculty office/classroom/gallery building and parking structure, an addition to the communication building, a new campus childcare center, an addition to the International Student Center and a central park.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000051026) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.
3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which require that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding).

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are incorporated by reference; and the findings of fact and the related mitigation measures are incorporated by reference.

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

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

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

   A. The DEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California, 90802, and San Diego State University, Office of Facilities Planning and Management, Administration
8. The board certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision.

9. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

10. The SDSU campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved.

11. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect SDSU campus master plan revision.

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (RCPBG 03-01-06)

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

1. The FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed campus master plan, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, including the component construction projects as identified on Page 230, Project Description, of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000081102) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which require that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding).
4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.

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

6. The FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the Cal Poly campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines.

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

   A. The DEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210 and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Department of Facilities Planning and Management, 1 Grand Avenue, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

8. The board certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision, including its component construction projects.

9. The board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the campus master plan revision,
including the component construction projects identified in the FEIR, and that the resolutions and approvals being provided by the board apply to the construction of these component projects. The board shall consider the FEIR in connection with any approvals of the component projects.

10. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

11. The Cal Poly campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved with the goal of serving 17,500 full-time equivalent students.

12. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect to the Cal Poly campus master plan revision.

Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 Through 2006/07 (RCPBG 03-01-07)

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

1. The Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07 totaling $3,552,135,000 and $1,697,373,000 respectively are approved.

2. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.

3. The chancellor is directed to return to the Board of Trustees for approval of the final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07, including the 2002/03-action year request, no later than the November 13-14, 2001 board meeting.
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Building Renovation/Addition has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

4. The schematic plans for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Renovation/Addition are approved at a project cost of $7,249,000 at CCCI 3909.
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2001-02 Legislative Report No. 2 is adopted.
COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Naming of Facility – San José State University (RIA 03-01-06)

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the new athletic conditioning, strength-building and rehabilitation facility at San José State University be named the Koret Athletic Training Center.
AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 8:35 a.m., Wednesday, March 21, 2001
CSULB, University Student Union, Multipurpose Room ABC

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Frederick W. Pierce, IV
Ali C. Razi

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of January 24, 2001

1. Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, Action
2. Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded, Action

Discussion Items

3. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University, Action
4. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Action
5. Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, Information
6. Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 Through 2006/07, Action
7. Approval of Schematic Plans, Action

For Cal Poly Master Plan click HERE
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

January 24, 2001

Members Present

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of Board, ex officio
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio

Members Absent

Murray L. Galinson

Other Trustees Present

Daniel Cartwright
Martha C. Fallgatter
Debra S. Farar
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Neel I. Murarka
Dee Dee Myers

Chancellor’s Office Staff

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel

Chair Wang greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 8:47 a.m.
Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 8, 2000, were approved as submitted.

Annual Report on Completed California State University Capital Outlay Projects

Mr. Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, indicated that this is the second annual report to be presented to the Board that includes performance data on all the completed capital outlay projects between October 1, 1999, and September 30, 2000, regardless of the fund source.

With the use of a handout and a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan stated this report is a compilation of the ten state-funded capital outlay projects totalling approximately $92.4 million and eleven nonstate funded projects totalling approximately $88.3 million. With the exception of the Maritime Academy’s new lab and library renovation, he noted that all of the state-funded projects involved either renovation or infrastructure type of work. Historically, these are the most difficult in terms of imposed constraints and staying within budget and the time frames. Therefore, the report summary must be viewed in this context. The nonstate funded projects addressed all new building programs.

In reviewing the state-funded projects, Mr. Drohan noted that the errors and omissions change order performance data was higher than the industry standard of approximately three percent, which was attributable to one project—the CSU Channel Islands renovation of the existing California mission-style facilities that was completed in 1999 for the start of fall classes. This project was on a fast track and much of the normal up-front testing to determine the condition of the facilities could not be accomplished. This resulted in an inordinate number of change orders that dealt with unforeseen conditions. He stated that good bids were submitted for the project allowing the campus to stay close to budget, while showing a particularly high percentage in the errors and omission column of the report.

Another note of interest that Mr. Drohan mentioned was the fact that only one construction claim was filed for all 21 state and nonstate funded projects. His department’s definition of a construction claim is one that is initiated by the contractor and goes to at least the Construction Claims Board for review and possibly beyond that point. There were claims filed with these projects, but the progressive and active management of the construction process both at the campuses and with the construction managers in the Department of Capital Planning, Design and Construction, enabled us to settle all of them during and through the construction closeout period.

In referencing the information on the screen, Trustee Pierce inquired as to whether change orders were included in the total-cost-of-completed-projects figure shown at the top of the slide. Mr. Drohan stated that the top figure is the total budget number that includes design, change-order work, and construction costs.
The performance report for nonstate-funded projects showed a higher average of staying within budget. Mr. Drohan said that the campuses have more flexibility in augmenting and adjusting the budgets on the nonstate-funded projects, particularly donor-funded projects.

In looking at the state-funded projects slide, the example cited was the seismic upgrade at the California Maritime Academy. This project was completed below budget due to the active management of the design process which resulted in a different and more cost-effective design solution, thus allowing the savings to be used for other projects and extending the use of limited state resources.

In closing, Mr. Drohan mentioned that his staff is now using an automated data base system that will facilitate the production of the mid-year report to the trustees, will allow for more sophistication in analysing the various types of delivery methods, and permit an expansion of the data base for next year’s report in order to provide more information. Mr. Drohan stated that his staff has achieved a lot in producing this report and acknowledged that the campuses are doing a good job in the management of the capital outlay process.

Trustee Razi requested that he receive a copy of the detailed version of the report so that he will be able to study the report more thoroughly on a campus-by-campus basis.

Trustee Pierce stated that he was also wanted a copy of the detailed version and is especially interested in looking at the contractor performance data.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Business Officer Richard P. West complimented Mr. Drohan, his staff, and the campuses in the outstanding work they have done in managing the construction of these projects. The different dynamics in the marketplace and the pressure involved in getting the projects completed is immense. He said that the state-funded projects are even more difficult because we cannot expand the scope or the amount of dollars invested, therefore the campuses have to use bid alternates to stay within budget and scope. This type of accomplishment is due to a strong management team.

Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor’s Budget

Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the handout and stated that all campus projects are the same as previously agreed to and prioritized. He noted that the CSU’s five-year capital outlay program exceeds 2½ billion dollars and the proposed funding will fall far short of meeting our needs. Mr. Drohan emphasized the importance of demonstrating our capital outlay needs in Sacramento and seeking a reliable source of funding to implement those needs.

Trustee Cartwright inquired if staff anticipates any changes in the budget to deal with the current energy crisis and the governor’s executive order on green buildings.
Mr. Drohan replied that Chancellor Reed would be giving an update to the trustees later in the day regarding the energy issues. Also, he stated that Mr. Bob Schulz, chief of architecture, capital planning, design and construction, has been very active in working with the Department of the State Architect in developing some standards on the green building subject. At the same time, Mr. Drohan mentioned that Ms. Elvyra San Juan, chief of facilities management, and he were discussing with the Department of Finance the possibility of adjusting our unit costs to take into consideration some of these systems that would exceed Title 24 requirements and provide for enhanced life-cycle operational costs.

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of the schematic plans for California State University, Channel Islands—East Campus Residential Development Phase I Faculty and Staff Housing and California State University, Northridge—Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics.

Mr. Richard West prefaced the presentation of this item by saying that usually when a schematic item is presented to the Board, the design item is presented to the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds and the financing package is presented to the Committee on Finance. For the CSU Channel Islands residential development project, the financing package will be presented to the Finance Committee at its March 2001 meeting.

Mr. West reminded the committee members that a site authority board governs the non-academic space at Channel Islands. The board is made up of nominated members of the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU administrators, and local government representatives and has seen the designs and financial picture of this proposal. Early in the takeover of the Camarillo State Hospital, Mr. West stated that the CSU proposed that a major portion of the sale of the residences would be applied to financing the renovation of the academic space of the facility. The first couple of years have been difficult financially. No income will be realized until the third or fourth year of operation, which will be 2002 and the opening of the campus. As faculty and staff are hired, an important element of this campus community will be to have housing available.

In viewing two slides, Mr. West summarized the projected net present value to be generated over a 40-year period from various types of income (rental, sales and property taxes) that will amount to approximately $300 million. The funds will be applied to various debt services, cost of construction and modification of space, as well as the operating expenses associated with maintaining the rental facilities. Mr. West pointed out that this projected income does not mean that the campus is not going to need some investment of capital resources from the state in the early years of operation. More details on the financial plan will be presented at the March meeting.

Trustee Razi stated that he thought the Channel Islands project was a joint venture that included a developer as well as the Joint Power Authority.
Mr. West responded that Trustee Razi is correct. Originally Catellus was the developer, and in the spring 2000, the CSU assumed responsibility for this part of the venture. Staff hired the firm of Brookfield to oversee the development on a fee basis, but they are not at risk. The CSU has assumed the management of the development risk.

Trustee Razi inquired if the developer is involved in the design to reduce cost as well as estimating the cost.

Mr. Drohan answered that Brookfield is currently reviewing the architect’s schematic plans and upon completion and the inclusion of value engineering, both parties will agree on the cost. This is an ongoing process.

Trustee Razi expressed his concern for staff to make sure that the cost does not suddenly go up and absorb all of the funds designated for education.

Trustee Goldwhite applauded staff in the planning of affordable faculty/staff housing. He asked if there is a plan to provide at least office space, if not housing, for those faculty members who are hired in the early stages.

Mr. Drohan said that a couple of strategies are being considered to assure that temporary facilities are available.

With the use of a computerized presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the CSU Northridge Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics project as printed in the agenda. He indicated that the appropriate CEQA documents have been filed on this project and no adverse comments had been received.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-24-01).

Certify a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Internet Switching Center Phase I at California State University, Hayward

Mr. Drohan stated that this item follows the Finance Committee’s action on the previous day. After a review of the item, Mr. Drohan noted that the appropriate CEQA documents had been filed and no adverse comments were received.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-24-02).

Mr. Drohan introduced Mr. Mark Gutheinz, Chief of Plant, Energy and Utilities, as Capital Planning, Design and Construction’s newest staff member.
In reference to the state’s energy crisis, Trustee Pesqueira asked that staff prepare for the board a matrix of how each CSU campus will manage its electrical needs over a long-term period of time.

Mr. Drohan responded that such a report would be presented at the Board’s May 2001 meeting.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to add one project to the 2000/01 nonstate funded capital outlay program.

San Francisco State University
Residence Dining Center Addition \textbf{PWCE} \$500,000

Background and Scope

San Francisco State University would like to proceed with the design and construction of an addition to the residence dining center. The existing 31,083 gross square foot (GSF) dining hall is a rectangular two-level structure. It consists of approximately 16,658 GSF of dining and conference area on the ground floor, and approximately 14,425 GSF of basement area. A sunken terrace at the entrance to the dining center is currently used as an outside eating area and for special events during good weather. The dining center was designed to serve the 824 dormitory residents in Mary Ward and Mary Park Halls. The Village at Centennial Square will add 760 beds creating an increased demand to provide meal service to campus residents. The proposed project will accommodate this demand by enclosing the sunken terrace and connecting it to the main dining area. Interior work includes ceiling and lighting systems; wall and floor finishes; and electrical, plumbing, mechanical and telecommunications systems. The addition will comply with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act. Other elements of the project include conference and special events space, exterior site development and landscaping. The proposed project is on the master plan and will be funded by the Service Provider for the San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

\textbf{RESOLVED}, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University that the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include \$500,000 for preliminary
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item proposes to amend the 2000/01 state funded capital outlay program to add a new project as Priority 27 on the trustees’ priority list.

Background and Scope

The 2000/01 support budget included $2 million to fund PWCE for the CSPU Pomona, Center for Animal and Veterinary Science Education, Phase Ia capital outlay project. Phase Ia consists of 12,000 gross square feet of space for pathology and necropsy laboratories, lab support space, and lecture classrooms at an estimated cost of $5.2 million. The total estimated cost for Phases Ia, Ib, and II is $47.4 million with components including a clinical and research facility, large animal production facilities, a waste management facility, a feed mill facility, a meat science and production laboratory, and site improvements. The multi-building complex will support the educational and research mission of the College of Agriculture’s Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences for 168 full-time equivalent students.

While the $2 million budgeted is insufficient to fund Phase Ia, we are requesting approval to establish the project in the trustees’ 2000/01 program. Discussions will continue with the Department of Finance regarding changing the scope of the budget act language to enable the CSU to expend the $2 million on preliminary plans for the entire project (Phases I and II).

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $5.2 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Center for Animal and Veterinary Science Education, Phase Ia project as Priority 27.

2. CSPU Pomona will include the balance of funding required for Phase Ia in a future capital outlay budget request based on campus priorities.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

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

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approval of a Campus Master Plan Revision

Attachment A to the item is the proposed campus master plan dated March 2001 and Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated May 1999.

Included in the agenda mailing are the FEIR, an Addendum to the FEIR, and the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations with the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

There are no significant remaining contested issues based on CSU responses to the comments received in the public review period. San Diego State University (SDSU) and the City Redevelopment Agency will implement mitigation measures for the College Community Redevelopment project that will address all potential significant issues identified in the Draft EIR (DEIR).

Background

The existing SDSU campus master plan provides for 25,000 full-time equivalent students. The proposed campus master plan revision continues to provide for 25,000 FTES while improving, enhancing and rehabilitating campus facilities. The primary goal of the proposal is to create a template of uniform planning for future campus development. The project components have been designed in a manner that is consistent with the November 1997 SDSU Physical Master Plan, Phase 1, Existing Conditions, which states a need for new campus facilities and sets forth
guidelines for campus landscaping, lighting, visual quality, gateways, open areas and other campus features. The existing master plan focuses on campus boundaries, parking facilities, athletic facilities, pedestrian malls, and existing and future campus buildings and structures.

**Campus Master Plan**

The proposed campus master plan revision includes redevelopment of several classroom, office, research and student facilities, and provides for the development of several new buildings, a physical plant and corporation/maintenance yard, parking structure and central campus park area. The project was divided into two groups of "project components" for purposes of the environmental analysis. One group was identified and analyzed on a program level and the other was analyzed on a project level. The program level components consist of two academic/research buildings, a performing arts complex, a science research building, a physical plant, and an addition to the north life sciences building. The project level components consist of a faculty office/classroom/gallery and parking structure, an addition to the communication building, a new campus childcare center, an addition to the International Student Center and a central park. As discussed in greater detail below, since completion of the FEIR, a project-level environmental analysis is provided in an Addendum to the FEIR.

**Proposed Project Components**

Attachment A identifies each of the proposed new facilities using “PGM” in rectangles for program components and “PJT” in ovals for the project level components as indicated below:

**Program Level Components**
- PGM-1N: Site for new Academic/Research Building A
- PGM-1S: Site for new Academic/Research Building B
- PGM-2: Site for new Performing Arts Complex
- PGM-3: Site for new Science Research Building (this will require the demolition of the Industrial Technology Building 9)
- PGM-4: Site for new Physical Plant
- PGM-5: Site for North Life Sciences Addition (this will add a five-floor addition to the existing Life Sciences North Building 35 and displace a temporary campus office facility 817)

**Project Level Components**
- PJT-1: Site for new Faculty Office/Classroom/Gallery/Parking Structure 8 (this will require the demolition of the existing Family Studies and Consumer Science Building 7 while relocating the Campus Childcare Center 85 as PJT-3)
PJT-2: Site for School of Communication Addition
PJT-3: Site for new Campus Childcare Center
PJT-4: Site for International Student Center Addition (this will add 12,000 square feet to the existing International Student Center 74)
PJT-5: Site for new Central Park (development of this park will include demolition of the Education Building 6)

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed campus master plan revision adds state funded improvements estimated at $127 million and nonstate improvements estimated at approximately $10 million totaling an estimated $137 million in current dollars.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A comprehensive FEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for certification as part of this agenda item. A Notice of Preparation/Initial Study was prepared in May 2000 for the proposed campus master plan revision and circulated to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and individuals for their input. The campus held a public information meeting on May 18, 2000 to obtain public input on the proposed project and the DEIR. This DEIR review period began on September 13, 2000 and ended on October 30, 2000. The campus also held a September 28, 2000 public information meeting for public input on the DEIR. The FEIR incorporates both the comments received on the DEIR, and the written responses to those comments. Significant issues derived from those comments are included in this item under issues identified through public participation.

The DEIR addressed potential impacts associated with the SDSU campus master plan revision. The DEIR identified the following resources with potentially significant impacts for which mitigation measures are included in the FEIR:

- Geotechnical and Soil Resources
- Water Quality/Hydrology
- Biological Resources
- Visual Quality
- Traffic/Access/Parking
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
A complete listing and discussion of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures are included in the FEIR describing the procedures that will be used to implement the mitigation measures.

Subsequent to completion of the FEIR, a project-level environmental analysis was prepared for project component PGM-1N, the existing Academic/Research Building with two additional future buildings. That additional analysis is provided in an Addendum to the FEIR. The additional analysis warranted some changes to the FEIR to account for the detailed analysis of the PGM-1N component. However, the analysis did not involve substantial changes to the proposed campus master plan revision requiring a major revision to the FEIR. Neither did it result in new information which indicated: (i) the existence of significant effects not discussed in the FEIR; (ii) that significant effects previously discussed will be substantially more severe than shown in the FEIR; (iii) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project; or (iv) that mitigations measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines, the project-level analysis of component PGM-1N was appropriately addressed in the Addendum to the FEIR.

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

Public comments were received from the City of San Diego. Those comments and CSU responses to the comments are provided in the FEIR. The comment letters raised the following significant issues:

- Traffic and Access
- Biological Resource
- Water Quality/Hydrology

Responses have been prepared to address the concerns raised and to indicate where and how the EIR addresses these specific issues. Where appropriate, changes made in the DEIR in response to these comments are indicated in the response and the actual EIR revisions are contained in the FEIR. Findings of fact, the specific mitigation measures and the appropriate statement of overriding consideration for impacts that cannot be mitigated are included in a separate document in the agenda mailing. A summary of the responses to these comments follows:

1. Traffic and Access. Some comments questioned the traffic impacts caused by increased trips at the intersection of College Avenue and "Z" Street in terms of intersection capacity. The comments also suggested that the mitigation proposed to reduce those impacts to a level below significance must be implemented in conjunction with development of the campus master plan project.
CSU Response: Traffic mitigation measures approved for a previously adopted FEIR prepared for the College Community Redevelopment project, under the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego, require the widening of College Avenue to six lanes and the installation of a new traffic signal to permit left turn access to the SDSU parking structure east of College Avenue. The university's traffic consultant has noted that the city’s traffic engineering design requirements make it highly unlikely that a traffic signal could be located at this location because of its proximity to the major intersection of College Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive. Additionally, the physical constraints on College Avenue preclude widening to permit a turn lane at this location. This leads to the logical conclusion that the signal would be installed at the “Z” Street intersection located approximately 300 feet to the south, which is the first intersection that could be widened to permit left turns. Left turns for the parking structure could also be accommodated at the "Z" Street intersection. The proposed project does not include a traffic signal at College Avenue and "Z" Street to accommodate the new inbound left turn trips during the morning and evening peak hours because the project-related traffic impacts would be mitigated through the widening of College Avenue and the addition of the new traffic signal in the vicinity of "Z" Street under the College Community Redevelopment project FEIR mitigation program. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation in the FEIR for the College Community Redevelopment project, the proposed SDSU project's traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

With regard to mitigation of the proposed project's traffic impacts, CEQA requires that a project include all feasible mitigation measures, which may reduce the project's environmental impacts. If the lead agency for a given project has no legal authority to fund or otherwise implement, independent of CEQA, the measures required to mitigate a particular environmental impact, then the measures are not considered feasible and not required under CEQA. CSU has no authority or funding to require the construction of off-site traffic improvements. Therefore, the mitigation measures proposed to reduce the project's traffic impacts at the intersection of College Avenue and "Z" Street are not feasible under CEQA. Consequently, those measures cannot be implemented in conjunction with development of the campus master plan revision.

Under CEQA, when mitigation of a significant environmental impact is not feasible, the lead agency may address such impacts with "overriding considerations." CSU has considered the possibility that the master plan project may be completed prior to completion of the necessary traffic improvements in connection with the College Community Redevelopment project. Should such circumstances occur, CSU has identified numerous overriding considerations, supported by substantial evidence, which outweigh the project's significant traffic impacts. Those overriding considerations are set forth in the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

2. Biological Resource. Some comments suggested that the DEIR should have analyzed the proposed project's impacts on biological resources within certain geographic areas collectively
designated as a multiple habitat planning area in the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Plan.

**CSU Response:** The DEIR includes measures for avoiding potential impacts to biological resources in proximity to the project component sites. The DEIR states that the limits of grading should be staked, fencing should be erected and a qualified biologist should be retained to monitor construction activities at the component sites with a potential to affect adjacent biological resources. The DEIR states that, if construction is conducted during breeding season, a breeding bird survey should be conducted to ensure that there are no state- or federally-listed endangered species in the vicinity. If a listed bird species is found within 500 feet of the construction site, the DEIR recommends that construction activities should be deferred until the end of the breeding season. The DEIR also states that Best Management Practices should be implemented to control erosion, runoff, dust, noise and any other potentially harmful indirect biological impacts during construction. Based on the design and location of the project components, as well as the foregoing mitigation measures and other measures related to noise, lighting and drainage, the proposed project is consistent with the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Plan Land Use Adjacency Guidelines pertaining to drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive and brush management.

3. **Water Quality/Hydrology.** Some comments suggested that the DEIR should have analyzed the proposed project's potential to cause water quality impacts on the multiple habitat planning area.

**CSU Response:** The DEIR contains measures recommended to mitigate the proposed project potential water quality impacts. Those measures include: (i) removal of demolition and excavated material from the project site to prevent potential surface and groundwater contamination; (ii) elimination of standing water during construction; (iii) proper storage of on-site hazardous materials; (iv) compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements; (v) control of storm water runoff to prevent erosion; (vi) control of storm water runoff within the SDSU campus during construction; and (vii) proper disposal of on-site waste materials. The DEIR also recommends appropriate modification of the existing storm drain system as necessary to accommodate expected increases in peak runoff quantities. Based on the design and location of the project components, as well as the foregoing mitigation measures, the proposed project is consistent with the San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Plan Land Use Adjacency Guidelines pertaining to drainage and toxics.

**Alternatives**

The alternatives section of the FEIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the proposed project. The alternatives shown
below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project in the FEIR. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified and considered in the FEIR. The alternatives analyzed in the FEIR included:

**Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.** This alternative is required by CEQA, and it compares the present existing condition of the project site against the significant effects that would result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Alternative 2: A-PJT-1 Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Faculty Office/Classroom/Gallery/Parking Structure 8 component PJT-1 on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility in Parking Lot W.

**Alternative 3: A-PJT-2 Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Communication Building Additions component PJT-2 on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility on the plaza north of the existing Communication Building.

**Alternative 4: A-PJT-3a Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Campus Childcare Center component PJT-3 on the site designated for that building under the proposed project against the construction of the building on the site of campus Parking Lot A.

**Alternative 5: A-PJT-3b Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Campus Childcare Center component PJT-3 on the site designated for that building under the proposed project against the construction of the building on the site of campus Parking Lot G.

**alternative 6: A-PJT-3c Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Campus Childcare Center component PJT-3 on the site designated for that building under the proposed project against the construction of the building on the site of campus Parking Lot V and the International Student Center.

**Alternative 7: A-PJT-4a Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed International Student Center Addition component PJT-4 on the site designated for that building under the proposed project against the construction of the building on the site of campus Parking Lot A.

**Alternative 8: A-PJT-4b Alternative.** This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed International Student Center Addition component PJT-4 on the site designated for that building under the proposed project against the construction of the building on the site of campus Parking Lot W.
Please see the alternatives section of the FEIR for a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives were rejected as infeasible, and the proposed project was found to be preferable to the rejected alternatives. Please see the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for further information regarding the project alternatives.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The FEIR and the Addendum to the FEIR (collectively “the FEIR”) for the SDSU campus master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of that project, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, and that project consists of the following project components: (1) two academic/research buildings, a performing arts complex, a science research building, a physical plant and an addition to the North Life Sciences Building; and (2) a faculty office/classroom/gallery building and parking structure, an addition to the communication building, a new campus childcare center, an addition to the International Student Center and a central park.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000051026) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are incorporated by reference; and the findings of fact and the related mitigation measures are incorporated by reference.

5. The board’s findings include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.
6. The FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the SDSU campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines.

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

A. The DEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

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

8. The board certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision.

9. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).
10. The SDSU campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved.

11. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect SDSU campus master plan revision.
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
Proposed March 2001

FACILITY LEGEND: EXISTING FACILITY/ Proposed Facility

1. ART - SOUTH
2. HEPNER HALL
3. CHEMISTRY - GEOLOGY
3A. CHEMISTRY - GEOLOGY
5. ENGINEERING LABORATORY
7. FAMILY STUDIES
8. STORM HALL
10. LIFE SCIENCE - SOUTH
11. LITTLE THEATER
12. SPEECH & TELECOMMUNICATIONS
13. PHYSICS
14. PHYSICS - ASTRONOMY
15. ATHLETICS
16. PETERSON GYMNASIUM
17. PHYSICAL SCIENCES
18. NASATIR HALL
19. ENGINEERING
20. EXERCISE & NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES ANNEX
21. EXERCISE & NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES
22. CAM LAB (COMPUTER AIDED MECHANICS)
23. PHYSICAL PLANT/ BOILER SHOP
24. PHYSICAL PLANT
25. CEPHGENERATION PLANT
26. HARDY MEMORIAL TOWER
27. PROFESSIONAL STUDIES & FINE ARTS
28. COMMUNICATIONS CLINIC
29. STUDENT SERVICES - WEST
30. ADMINISTRATION
31. EAST COMMONS
32. WEST COMMONS
33. Residential Dining
34. WEST COMMONS
35. LIFE SCIENCE - NORTH
36. THEARE ARTS
37. BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & MATHEMATICS
38. NORTH EDUCATION
39. FACULTY/ STAFF CENTER
40. HOUSING & RESIDENTIAL LIFE
41. SCRIPPS COTTAGE
42. STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES
43. PHYSICAL PLANT/ CHILL PLANT
45. AZTEC SHOPS/ BOOKSTORE
46. MAYA HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)
47. OLMEXA HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)
48. TARAS HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)
49. TOLTEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)
50. ZAPOTEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)
52. AZTEC CENTER
53. MUSIC
54. LOVE LIBRARY
55. PARKING STRUCTURE I
56. ART - NORTH
58. ADAMSHUMANITIES
59. STUDENT SERVICES - EAST
60. SCIENCE LABORATORY
67. Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame
68. ARENA MEETING CENTER
69. AZTEC RECREATION CENTER
70. COX ARENA at AZTEC BOWL
70A. ARENA TICKET OFFICE
71. OPEN AIR THEATER
71A. OPEN AIR THEATER HOSPITALITY HOUSE
72. KPBS RADIO/ TV
72A. GATEWAY CENTER/ EXTENDED STUDIES
73. RACQUETBALL COURTS
74. INTERNATIONAL STUDIO CENTER
75. FOOTBALL COACHES OFFICES/ WEIGHT TRAINING FACILITY
76. LLA/ CENTENNIAL HALL
77. TONY GHYNN STADIUM
78. Softball Center
79. PARKING STRUCTURE 2
80. PARKING STRUCTURE 5
81. Parking Structure 7/ Tennis Courts
82. PARKING STRUCTURE 4
83. ATHLETICS OFFICES
84. ATHLETICS TRAINING FACILITY
86. a quedex
87. Tennis Center
90. Social Science, Faculty Office,
91. TENOCHCA HALL
91A. TULA HALL
92. Art Gallery
93. CHAPULTEPEC HALL
93A. CHOLULA HALL
93B. MONTY'S MARKET
94. Residential Suites, West
95. Residential Suites, East
96. Parking Structures
97. REHABILITATION CENTER
98. BUSINESS SERVICES
99. PARKING STRUCTURE 3
100. VILLA ALVARADO HALL
101. MAINTENANCE GARAGE
102. Coporation/Chill Plant
104. Academic/Research Bldg. A 1
105. Academic/Research Bldg. A 2
106. Academic/Research Bldg. A 3
107. Academic/Research Bldg. B 1
109. Campus Childcare Center
111. Performing Arts Complex
112. RESOURCE CONSERVATION
113. WASTE FACILITY
114. Science Research Building
115. Physical Plant
116. School of Communication Addition
117. School of Communication Addition
118. School of Communication Addition
119. Engineering Building Addition
201. PHYSICAL PLANT SHOPS
208. BETTY'S HOTDOGGER
209. INFORMATION BOOTH (PARKING)
240. TRANSIT CENTER
302. FIELD EQUIPMENT STORAGE
303. GROUNDS STORAGE
310. EH/ STORAGE SHED
311. SUBSTATION D
312. SUBSTATION B
313. SUBSTATION A
314. SHIPPING/ RECEIVING/ MAIL/ CENTRAL STORES
817. DEAN OF SCIENCE EXTENSION
### SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
Approved May 1999

**FACILITY LEGEND:** EXISTING FACILITY/ Proposed Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ART - SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>HEPNER HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY - GEOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY - GEOLOGY ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ENGINEERING LABORATORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>FAMILY STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>LIFE SCIENCE - SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>LITTLE THEATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SPEECH &amp; TELECOMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>PHYSICS - ASTRONOMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>NASATIR HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>EXERCISE &amp; NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>CAM LAB (COMPUTER AIDED MECHANICS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PLANT/BOILER SHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PLANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>COGENERATION PLANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>HARDY MEMORIAL TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STUDIES &amp; FINE ARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS CLINIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES - WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>EAST COMMONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>WEST COMMONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>LIFE SCIENCE - NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>THEATRE ARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION &amp; MATHEMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>NORTH EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>FACULTY/ STAFF CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>HOUSING &amp; RESIDENTIAL LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ART - NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>ARTS - NORTHEAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>ARTS - SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>ARTS - WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ARTS - NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>SCRIPPS COTTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PLANT/ CHILL PLANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>AZTEC SHOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>MAYA HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>OLMEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>TARASTEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>TOLTEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>ZAPOTEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>TEMPLE DEL SOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50A.</td>
<td>ZURA HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>AZTEC CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>LOVE LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>ART - NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>ADAMS HUMANITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES - EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>SCIENCE LABORATORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>A thletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>ARENA MEETING CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>AZTEC RECREATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>COX ARENA at AZTEC BOWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>ARENA TICKET OFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>OPEN AIR THEATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>OPEN AIR THEATER HOSPITALITY HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>KPRR/ RADIO TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>GATEWAY CENTER/ EXTENDED STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>RACQUETBALL COURTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>FOOTBALL COACHES OFFICES/ WEIGHT TRAINING FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>LLA/ CENTENNIAL HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>TONY GWYNN STADIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Softball Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 7/Tennis Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>ATHLETICS OFFICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>ATHLETICS TRAINING FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>CHILD CARE FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Aquaplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Tennis Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>TENOCHCA HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>TULA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>CHAPULTEPEC HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>CHOLULA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>MONTY'S MARKET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Residential Suites, West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Residential Suites, East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Parking Structure 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>REHABILITATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>BUSINESS SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>VILLA ALVARADO HALL (COEDUCATIONAL RESIDENCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE GARAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Transportation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>RESOURCE CONSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>WASTE FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Engineering Building Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>PARKING STRUCTURE 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PLANT SHOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>BETTY'S HOTDOGGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>INFORMATION BOOTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>FIELD EQUIPMENT STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>GROUNDS STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>EHS STORAGE SHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>SUBSTATION D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>SUBSTATION B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>SUBSTATION A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>SHIPMENTS RECEIVING/ MAIL/CENTRAL STORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>DEAN OF SCIENCE EXTENSION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approval of a Campus Master Plan Revision to Increase the Master Plan Enrollment Ceiling from 15,000 to 17,500 Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

Proposed project components include additional instructional space, housing facilities, applied research space and parking structures. Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan dated March 2001 and Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated January 2000.

Included in the agenda mailing are the FEIR and the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations with the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

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

1. Regional Circulation Issues. Some comments indicated that CSU should address off-campus roadway issues that will be affected by campus development.

CSU Response: Cal Poly has identified master plan impacts at certain locations of the roadway infrastructure as significant. It has identified a program of improvements to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation to the extent feasible to reduce project traffic impacts to less than significant levels. However, implementation and monitoring of the traffic mitigation within the jurisdiction of other public agencies, including the City of San Luis Obispo and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), are the responsibility of these public agencies vested...
with the authority, responsibility, and revenue sources to implement roadway infrastructure improvements.

2. **“Goldtree” Research Park Development Issues.** The City of San Luis Obispo indicated concerns about future development of the “Goldtree” site located west of the main campus.

*CSU Response:* An applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community at Goldtree. The site is relatively low-value grazing land, has low visibility from Highway 1, is adjacent to the City’s wastewater treatment plant, and near the California Men’s Colony. Additional environmental analysis will be undertaken when the project plan for the site has been developed.

3. **Housing Development near Brizzolara Creek.** There were many concerned comments about the proximity of student housing complexes proposed near Brizzolara Creek.

*CSU Response:* The master plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the two housing complexes 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.

4. **Loss of Foraging Habitat.** Concerns were raised regarding development in certain locations on campus and the gradual and cumulative loss of deep valley soil grass habitat that is important for raptor and other animals.

*CSU 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 the California Native Plant Society. Therefore, the loss of this vegetative community is not considered a significant impact. The biological analysis indicates that there is adequate foraging habitat on surrounding campus lands for sensitive bird species, and that development of the site would not result in loss of nesting or other habitat for such species.

5. **Impacts to Adjacent Neighborhoods.** Many comments were received about possible impacts to adjoining neighborhoods from light and noise.

*CSU Response:* Cal Poly has modified its plan to include mitigation measures that will reduce the likelihood of impacts. Directives are established for lighting placement and design. Noise, especially from any developed or relocated sports facility, will be analyzed as part of the facility design and mitigated through speaker disbursement and location.

6. **Alternative Transportation.** Several comments were received about the university’s program for alternative transportation, with special emphasis on maintaining the bus subsidy.
CSU Response: Cal Poly’s primary approach to addressing alternative transportation for the master plan is to house all new enrollment on campus, thereby reducing the need for automobile transportation by students. In addition, Cal Poly will institute a number of measures to reduce traffic and demand for parking, including restrictions on freshmen parking, geographic controls and other measures. Cal Poly will continue to subsidize the bus passes at least to current levels.

Volume II of the FEIR contains all of the public comments received as well as detailed responses.

Background

The Board of Trustees’ CSU Growth Plan directed that proposals be developed for modification of physical master plan ceilings at five campuses including Cal Poly. The Cal Poly master plan revision represents the culmination of a four-year planning process. The plan will guide the future development of the university entering the 21st century up to a 17,500 FTES academic cap from the current 15,000 FTES. The master plan provides a framework for the university’s decisions concerning allocation and management of resources, capital outlay programs and construction planning for facilities and improvements needed to accommodate 17,500 FTES.

Specifically, the master plan provides strategies to achieve the university’s mission:

- Polytechnic
- “Learn by doing”
- Primarily undergraduate
- Student-centered community
- State-of-the-art education (programs, practice, pedagogy and services)
- Social and intellectual diversity
- Statewide service area
- Technological currency

Campus Master Plan

The campus 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 academic year FTES and 2,500 summer FTES. The plan 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 are designed to increase summer enrollment, apply technology, facilitate student progress, and increase college year enrollment by about nine percent without increasing fall headcount. The physical development of the plan focuses on land use and circulation issues associated with
increasing enrollment during the academic year, as this scenario involves the most extensive change on campus. Enrollment growth projections translate into a fall headcount of approximately 20,900 students and about 3,200 regular faculty and staff (17 percent over present capacity) to be accomplished in phases over approximately twenty years. Because demographers expect the demand for higher education to increase rapidly through about 2010, the earlier phases of the plan may need to accommodate more enrollment than later phases. The campus 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. A central feature of the plan involves creating new student residential communities accommodating approximately 3,000 additional students and provision of faculty and staff housing. 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.

University Land Uses

The campus master plan takes a broad approach to the analysis of the most suitable future use of all university land in San Luis Obispo County, including management practices to protect the university’s unique natural environment. The master plan team has applied principles from campus and community task forces that met during spring 1999 to designate future land uses and develop the following physical plan elements:

Natural Environment. Environmentally sensitive areas and assets are designated as an overlay determined by physical and biological features of the land. Principles focus 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 must remain integrated with the campus.

Campus Instructional Core. Additional enrollment requires about 250,000 square feet of new instructional space in the campus core. Principles focus on creating a compact, “student-friendly, learner-centered” area with more open space and better pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

Residential Communities. New student housing complexes are conceived as living/learning communities, directly accessible to the campus instructional core. New undergraduate student housing for 3,000 students on campus will reduce community impacts of enrollment growth.

Recreation. Flexible outdoor recreational fields and indoor facilities will serve the changing student population.
Circulation, Alternative Transportation and Parking. Circulation systems provide improved access to the campus and movement within it. The campus master plan encourages alternative forms of transportation to reduce congestion and parking. Internal circulation focuses on “user-friendly” pedestrian access and increasing vehicle access efficiency. Parking is consolidated and ratios are decreased.

Public Facilities and Utilities. Essential support facilities can 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 must 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 Services. A number of activities that serve the broader community, as well as Cal Poly, are complementary to the university’s instructional mission. However, not all of these facilities need to be provided within the campus instructional core.

Proposed Revisions

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

Hexagon 1: Foundation Administration Addition
Hexagon 2: Engineering III
Hexagon 3: Davidson Music Center Addition
Hexagon 4: Activities Center
Hexagon 5: University Police
Hexagon 6: Foundation Warehouse Expansion
Hexagon 7: New Corporation Yard
Hexagon 8: New Farm Shop/Transportation Services
Hexagon 9: Alumni Center/Professional Development Conference Center
Hexagon 10: Chorro Creek Bull Test
Hexagon 11: Parking Structure 2
Hexagon 12: Parking Structure 3
Hexagon 13: Children’s Center Addition
Hexagon 14: Visitor Center
Hexagon 15: Goldtree Research Park
Hexagon 16: Faculty/Staff Housing South
Hexagon 17: New Feed Mill
Hexagon 18: Agriculture Pavilion
Hexagon 19: Athletic Field House
Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed campus master plan revision adds state funded improvements at approximately $550 million and nonstate funded improvements at $300 million for an estimated cost of $850 million in current dollars.
Integration of the Plan and CEQA

At the outset, the university chose to integrate environmental analysis into the development of the campus master plan. During the development of the plan, analysis of environmental constraints and opportunities informed the plan-making process. Resulting findings guided and to some extent limited the alternatives considered under the plan. For example, prime agricultural lands were identified early in the planning process so that no development would be proposed in those areas. Land use, housing and transportation policies were designed to reduce the likelihood of impacts from the many proposals considered. Recent experience with other campus projects, as well as input from Master Plan Task Forces, reminded the master plan team of sensitivities in adjoining neighborhoods.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A comprehensive FEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for certification as part of this agenda item. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study were prepared in August 2000 for the proposed campus master plan (i.e., the proposed project). The NOP/Initial Study was circulated to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and individuals in order to receive input on the scope of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) analysis. The campus also held numerous public information meetings to obtain public input on the campus master plan and scope of the DEIR analysis. The campus held public meetings to obtain public comment on the DEIR on November 15 and 16, 2000. The DEIR was circulated for public comment from October 10, 2000 through December 8, 2000.

The DEIR addressed potential impacts associated with the Cal Poly campus master plan. The DEIR identified the following resource with unavoidable significant impacts for which mitigation measures are included and for which the resolution includes the required overriding considerations:

Air Quality – Construction and Operational

The DEIR identified the following resources with potentially significant impacts for which mitigation measures are included that reduce impacts to levels below significant:

- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Biological Resources
- Agriculture
- Cultural and Historic Resources
- Circulation
A complete listing and discussion of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures are included in the FEIR describing the procedures that will be used to implement the mitigation measures.

**Issues Identified Through Public Participation**

Public comments were received from forty-two individuals on the DEIR. Seventeen letters from public agencies or organizations were submitted commenting on the DEIR, including the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, City of San Luis Obispo, Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Transportation, and San Luis Obispo Council of Governments. The following issues were raised:

1. Regional Circulation Issues
2. “Goldtree” Research Park Development
3. Housing Development near Brizzolara Creek
4. Loss of Foraging Habitat
5. Impacts to Adjacent Neighborhoods
6. Alternative Transportation

Responses have been prepared to address the concerns raised and to indicate where and how the EIR and campus master plan address environmental issues. Where appropriate, changes made in the DEIR in response to these comments are indicated in the response and the actual EIR revisions are contained in Section 6.0 of the campus master plan. Findings of fact and the specific mitigation measures and the statement of overriding consideration for impacts that cannot be mitigated are included in a separate document in the agenda mailing. A summary of the responses to these comments follows:

1. **Regional Circulation Issues.** Some comments indicated that CSU should address off-campus roadway issues that will be affected by campus development.

   **CSU Response:** Cal Poly has identified master plan impacts at certain locations of the roadway infrastructure as significant, and has identified a program of improvements to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation, to the extent feasible, to reduce project traffic impacts to less than significant levels. Cal Poly will work with its neighboring jurisdictions to identify improvements to regional circulation. However, monitoring and implementation of the mitigation for locations within the jurisdiction of other public agencies, including the City of San Luis Obispo and
Caltrans, are the responsibility of these public agencies that are vested with the authority, responsibility, and revenue sources to implement roadway infrastructure improvements. Allocation of funds received by regional and local agencies for roadway improvements within their jurisdictions in order to meet recognized needs is solely within the authority and purview of these agencies.

2. “Goldtree” Research Park Development. The City of San Luis Obispo indicated concerns about future development of the “Goldtree” site located west of the main campus.

CSU Response: An applied research park would be developed in partnership with the local community at Goldtree. Local businesses would have an opportunity to be considered as vendors and service providers as well as occupants of the applied research park. The site is 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. Housing Development near Brizzolara Creek. Many comments concerned the proximity of student housing complexes proposed near Brizzolara Creek.

CSU Response: The master plan team made extensive efforts to relocate the two housing complexes 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.

4. Loss of Foraging Habitat. Concerns were raised regarding development in certain locations on campus and the gradual and cumulative loss of deep valley soil grass habitat that is important for raptor and other animals.

CSU Response: The grasslands 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 and federal level, or by the California Native Plant Society. 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, CSU 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. Cal Poly finds 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.

5. Impacts to Adjacent Neighborhoods. Many comments raised concerns about possible impacts to adjoining neighborhoods from light and noise.
CSU Response: Cal Poly has modified its plan and EIR to include mitigation measures that will reduce the likelihood of impacts. Directives are established for lighting placement and design. Noise, especially from any developed or relocated sports facility, will be analyzed as part of the facility design and mitigated through speaker disbursement and location.

6. Alternative Transportation. Several comments were received about the university’s program for alternative transportation with special emphasis on maintaining the bus subsidy.

CSU Response: Cal Poly’s foremost approach to addressing alternative transportation is to house all new enrollments on campus, thereby reducing the need for automobile transportation by students. In addition, Cal Poly will institute a number of measures to reduce traffic and demand for parking, including restrictions on freshmen parking, geographic controls and other measures. Cal Poly will continue to subsidize the bus passes at least to current levels.

Alternatives

The FEIR alternatives section has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the proposed project, including revisions to the Cal Poly campus master plan as indicated on Attachment A. The alternatives shown below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project in the FEIR and the ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified and considered in the FEIR.

Alternative 1: No Project alternative required by CEQA considers no new development on campus and continuation of the campus under the current master plan.

Alternative 2: Alternative Enrollment Scenarios that consider different approaches to increasing the education potential of the university without necessarily increasing enrollment.

Alternative 3: Alternatives to Plan Components considers modifications to several of the larger components of the master plan, including alternatives to on-campus housing, remodeling Mustang Stadium, and alternative parking approaches.

NOTE: A number of alternative locations and approaches were considered for all components of the master plan. These were often eliminated early because of the constraints analysis prepared prior to developing the master plan. These alternatives are often described in marginal notes throughout the master plan.

For a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed project, please see page 332 of the FEIR. The alternatives to the proposed project were rejected as infeasible or less environmentally sound, and the proposed project was found to be preferable to the rejected alternatives. For
specific findings regarding the infeasibility of the rejected alternatives please see the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed campus master plan, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, including the component construction projects as identified on Page 230, Project Description, of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000081102) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.

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

6. The FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the Cal Poly campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines.

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the
proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

A. The DEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210 and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Department of Facilities Planning and Management, 1 Grand Avenue, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

8. The board certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision, including its component construction projects.

9. The board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the campus master plan revision, including the component construction projects identified in the FEIR, and that the resolutions and approvals being provided by the board apply to the construction of these component projects. The board shall consider the FEIR in connection with any approvals of the component projects.

10. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).
11. The Cal Poly campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved with the goal of serving 17,500 full-time equivalent students.

12. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect to the Cal Poly campus master plan revision.
FACILITY LEGEND: EXISTING FACILITY/PROPOSED FACILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Proposed Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Albert B. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research Development Center</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alumni and Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Architecture &amp; Environmental Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Housing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Clyde P. Fisher Science Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Advanced Technology Laboratories</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Walter F. Dexter Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Engineering III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Agricultural Engineering Shop</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Robert E. Mott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Farm Shop</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Physical Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alan A. Erhart Agriculture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Physical Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Air Conditioning</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Laboratory Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Administration Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frank E. Pilling Building</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>University Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>University Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Beef Unit</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Activities Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Crops Unit</td>
<td>43A</td>
<td>University Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dining Complex</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Natatorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Engineering East</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Faculty Offices North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>Engineering East</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Environmental Horticulture Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>President's Residence Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Science North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bee Cattle Evaluation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Feed Mill</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Swine Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Faculty Offices East</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Welding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Crandall Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mustang Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Julian A. MCPhee University Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Activities Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Facility Services /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>OLD POWER PLANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>RODEO ARENA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>ROSE FLOAT SHOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>HOUSING WAREHOUSE /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>HILLCREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>FOUNDATION WAREHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82C</td>
<td>New Corporation Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82D</td>
<td>Foundation Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82E</td>
<td>New Farm Shop / Transportation Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>COTTAGE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>COTTAGE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>COTTAGE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>POLY GROVE REST ROOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>HOBBY GARAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>SHASTA HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>DIABLO HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>PALOMAR HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>WHITNEY HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>LASSEN HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>TRINITY HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>SANTA LUCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>MUIR HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>SEQUOIA HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>FREMONT HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>TENAYA HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Alumni Center/Professional Development Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>VISTA GRANDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SIERRA MADRE HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>YOSEMITE HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CHASE HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>JESPERSEN HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>HERON HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117T</td>
<td>CAD RESEARCH CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MODOC HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>CHEDA RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>PARKER RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>PETERSON RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>SERRANO RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>CHORRO CREEK RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126D</td>
<td>Chorro Creek Bull Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>ESCUELA RANCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>PARSON'S RESIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>AVILA RESIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>GRAND AVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Parking Structure 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Parking Structure 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>CHILDREN'S CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133F</td>
<td>Children's Center Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>VISITOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134A</td>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE INSTRUCTIONAL CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Goldtree Research Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Housing Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Housing South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>New Feed Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>SPORTS COMPLEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Agriculture Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Athletic Field House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Athletic Field Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Student Housing 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Student Housing 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Student Housing 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Student Housing 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Student Housing 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Student Housing 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Student Housing 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>The Center for Science and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Centennial Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
Approved January 2000

**FACILITY LEGEND:** EXISTING FACILITY/Proposed Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>FACULTY OFFICES</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>TRINITY HALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>SCIENCE NORTH</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>SANTA LUCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GRAPHIC ARTS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>SHEEP UNIT</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>MUIR HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HEALTH CENTER</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>BEEF CATTLE</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>SEQUOIA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>ALUMNI HOUSE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>EVALUATION CENTER</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>FREMONT HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CENTER</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>HOUSING OFFICE</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>SWINE UNIT</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>TENAYA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>HORSESHOEING</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>VETERINARY HOSPITAL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Alumni Center/Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>WELDING</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>VISTA GRANDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Housing Center</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>CRANDALL GYMNASIUM</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>RESTAURANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 PERFORMING ARTS CENTER</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>HORSE UNIT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>MUSTANG STADIUM</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>SIERRA MADRE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CENTER</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>CLYDE P. FISHER</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>FACILITY SERVICES / RECEIVING WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>GYMNASIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Advanced Technology Laboratories</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>WALTER F. DEXTER</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bookstore Annex / Northwest Annex</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>JULIAN A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 BIORESOURCE AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ROBERT E. KENNEDY LIBRARY MANUFACTURING AND HOME ECONOMICS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Student Housing Complex</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>MCPEE CHASE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 FARM SHOP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>SCIENCE HALL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>FACILITY SERVICES / RECEIVING WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY UNION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 ALAN A. ERHART AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>ROBERT E. MOSS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>MODOC HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>PHYSICAL RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>FACILITY SERVICES / RECEIVING WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>PARSON'S RANCH RESIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 AIR CONDITIONING</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY MUSTANG SUBSTATION OLD POWER PLANT</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Parking Structure I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 ENGINEERING</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MEAT UNIT (ABATTOIR)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>RODEO ARENA ROSE FLOAT LAB HOUSING WAREHOUSE HILLCREST</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Parking Structure II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 FRANK E. PILLING BUILDING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>ROBERT E. MOSS</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>FACILITY SERVICES / RECEIVING WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>CHILDREN'S CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 FOUNDATION</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>ROSE FLOAT LAB HOUSING WAREHOUSE HILLCREST</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 CROPS UNIT</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Rodeo Arena Rose Float Lab Housing Warehouse Hillcrest</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE 1 (@ POLY GROVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 DAIRY SCIENCE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE 2 (@ WATER RESERVOIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18A DAIRY PRODUCTS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SHASTA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY CENTER</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>DIABLO HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 UNIVERSITY DINING COMPLEX</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>PALOMAR HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 ENGINEERING EAST</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>WHITNEY HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20A ENGINEERING EAST FACULTY OFFICES</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>LASSEN HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 ENGINEERING WEST</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>TRINITY HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 ENGLISH</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>SANTA LUCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 FEED MILL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>MUIR HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 FOOD PROCESSING</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>SEQUOIA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 FACULTY OFFICES</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>FREMONT HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 GRAPHIC ARTS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>TENAYA HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 HEALTH CENTER</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Alumni Center/Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 ALUMNI HOUSE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>VISTA GRANDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 HOUSING OFFICE</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>SIERRA MADRE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 HORSESHOEING UNIT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>YOSEMITE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>CHASE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 PERFORMING ARTS CENTER</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>JESSENE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 CLYDE P. FISHER</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>HERON HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 WALTER F. DEXTER</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>117T</td>
<td>CAD RESEARCH CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>MODOC HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>PARSON'S RANCH RESIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Parking Structure I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Student Services Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>CHILDREN'S CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE 1 (@ POLY GROVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 ROBERT E. MOTT BUILDING</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>MUSTANG SUBSTATION NEW POWER PLANT</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE 2 (@ WATER RESERVOIR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
203  WATER
   RESERVOIR
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    202)
204  WATER
   RESERVOIR
   2 (UPHILL FROM
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Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents a comparison between the CSU 2001/02 state funded capital outlay program request and the funding level recommended by the Legislative Analyst’s Office.

Background

The California State University’s proposed 2001/02 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2001/02 through 2005/06 were presented at the September 2000 Board of Trustees’ meeting. Although the 2001/02 state funded request identified campus needs totaling $555.8 million, the trustees approved a priority list totaling $207 million based on the anticipated funding level from the 1998 four-year general obligation bond measure (Proposition 1A). The trustees also requested that the chancellor explore with the governor and legislature possibilities of funding the entire $555.8 million program.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office will publish the Analysis of the 2001/02 Budget Bill in February 2001. The governor’s budget maintained the $207 million CSU request with a few adjustments to the program, which were reported to the board at the January meeting. A handout will be presented comparing the trustees’ budget request, the governor’s proposed budget, and the recommendations by the Legislative Analyst’s Office.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 Through 2006/07

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests the Board of Trustees’ approval of the preliminary state and nonstate funded five-year capital improvement program 2002/03 through 2006/07.

Background

The Board of Trustees adopted the categories and criteria to be used in setting project priorities for the CSU state funded five-year capital improvement program at the January 2001 meeting. The draft Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program was presented at the February 2001 Executive Council meeting. The Chancellor’s Office has now revised the program based on additional review and discussion with the campuses.

State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03-2006/07

The CSU state funded capital outlay program for 2002/03 identifies campus needs totaling $429.3 million and a five-year plan totaling $3.6 billion.

As reported to the board at the November 2000 meeting, the program’s schedule and format has been developed in accordance with new legislation requiring a five-year statewide infrastructure plan (AB 1743). We are seeking the board’s approval of the preliminary program in order to submit our project requests to the Department of Finance for consideration in the development of the statewide five-year plan. Once the administration defines a projected funding level based on statewide needs and estimated resources, we will return to the board for approval of the final five-year plan including the 2002/03-action year request. CSU priorities include the completion of previously funded projects, telecommunication infrastructure, seismic strengthening, renovation of older facilities, and growth for campus enrollments. Additional refinements to project scope and budget will occur prior to requesting final board approval. The projects are indexed at the July 2001 Engineering News-Record California
Building Construction Cost Index (CCCI 4019) pending the Department of General Services’ CCCI projection for July 2002.

Funding for the program is dependent upon voter approval of a future general obligation bond measure.

The nonstate program identifies a $1.7 billion five-year plan that will be funded through campus auxiliary organizations, public/public and public/private partnerships, donations, and the student union, housing and parking programs. The latter three programs rely on user fees to repay bonds issued by the Board of Trustees.

**Action**

Approval by the board is requested for the preliminary state funded five-year capital improvement program 2002/03 through 2006/07 for $3,552,135,000. The program is being distributed under separate cover of this agenda item. In order to keep funding options open, the resolution directs staff to negotiate with the Governor’s Office during the budget process to maximize funding opportunities for the campuses. Approval is also sought for the preliminary five-year nonstate funded capital improvement program in the amount of $1,697,373,000. A summary of both programs follows:

### Preliminary State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program at CCCI 4019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies</td>
<td>111,969</td>
<td>36,517</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB. Modernization /Renovation</td>
<td>150,194</td>
<td>993,868</td>
<td>503,661</td>
<td>212,568</td>
<td>317,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. New Facilities/ Infrastructure</td>
<td>167,163</td>
<td>538,770</td>
<td>226,490</td>
<td>145,009</td>
<td>73,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>429,326</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,569,155</strong></td>
<td><strong>755,151</strong></td>
<td><strong>382,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>415,926</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preliminary State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary (In Thousands of Dollars)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB. Modernization /Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07 totaling $3,552,135,000 and $1,697,373,000 respectively are approved.

2. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.

3. The chancellor is directed to return to the Board of Trustees for approval of the final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07, including the 2002/03-action year request, no later than the November 13-14, 2001 board meeting.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

Schematic plans for the California Maritime Academy, engineering building renovation/addition will be presented for approval. The project architect is TLCD Architecture.

Background and Scope

The California Maritime Academy became a part of the CSU in July 1995. Several campus infrastructure/facility improvement projects have been completed since that time. The engineering building renovation/addition provides two basic uses: light labs/lecture space and heavy labs. The proposed project renovates 12,705 assignable square feet (ASF) of existing space addressing the building systems, code deficiencies for fire/life safety, and requirements of the American with Disabilities Act. It also accommodates programmatic needs as a secondary effect to the laboratory/library addition. New space totaling 9,215 ASF is for growth in the marine transportation program, and replacement space for two engineering programs providing faculty offices, laboratories and lecture facilities for 233 full-time equivalent students (FTES). Brick and cement plaster are two of the major exterior building materials. The east elevation facing the recently completed lab building integrates the use of brick wainscot with a cement plaster body and a parapet capped with a 6” stainless steel flashing that will visually tie the two buildings together. Type III construction (masonry, steel and wood) is required for the heavy lab areas. The office and lecture areas will be a combination of wood framed shear walls, metal studs at non-bearing walls and wood joists for the roof-framing members.

Timing (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Drawings</td>
<td>April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>November 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion</td>
<td>September 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>September 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area 29,133 square feet
Assignable Building Area - New 9,215 square foot.
Renovated Area 12,705 square foot
Assignable Building Area - Total 21,920 square foot
Efficiency 75 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index CCCI 3909

Building Cost including Group 1 Equipment ($163 per gross square foot) $4,739,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown</th>
<th>($ per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation)</td>
<td>$20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)</td>
<td>$47.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions)</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)</td>
<td>$51.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other Building Construction</td>
<td>$19.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Development (includes Landscaping) 284,000

Construction Cost $5,023,000

Fees and Contingency 1,189,000

Total Project Costs ($213 per gross square foot) $6,212,000

Group II Equipment 1,037,000

Grand Total $7,249,000

Cost Comparison

This project’s $163 per GSF is comparable to the Pomona engineering labs replacement project approved by the board in September 1996 at $157 per GSF when adjusted to CCCI 3909.

Funding Data

Funding for the project includes $6,886,000 from state funds and $363,000 from private donor funds totaling $7,249,000.
California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study was prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 8, 2001. The 30-day public review period ends on March 12, 2001. Any adverse comments received during the review period will be reported at the meeting, and a copy of the Negative Declaration will be available.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Building Renovation/Addition has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

4. The schematic plans for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Renovation/Addition are approved at a project cost of $7,249,000 at CCCI 3909.
AGENDA

TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

California State University
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

May 16, 10:00 a.m.

Presiding: Laurence K. Gould, Chair

Call To Order and Roll Call

Chair’s Report

Chancellor’s Report

Report of the CSU Alumni Council: President: Larry Adamson

Report of the California State Student Association: Shaun Lumachi

Report of California Postsecondary Education Commission: Ralph Pesqueira

Approval of Minutes of Board of Trustees’ Meeting of March 21, 2001

Board Items
1. Recognition of the Women’s Basketball Team at California State Polytechnic University Pomona, Information
2. Recognition of the Men’s Soccer Team at California State University, Dominguez Hills, Information

Report of Committees

Committee of the Whole: Chair—Larry Gould

Committee on Educational Policy: Chair – Dee Dee Myers

Committee on Organization and Rules: Chair—Roberta Achtenberg
   1. Schedule of Board of Trustees’ Meetings, 2002

Committee on Audit: Chair – Frederick W. Pierce, IV
Committee on Finance:  *Chair – William Hauck*

2. Approval for the Issuance of Debt Instruments Supported by the Sonoma State University Parking System Revenue Bonds, Series A, and Related Matters
3. Proposed Dissolution of Auxiliary Organization at California State University, Stanislaus-Stockton
4. Approval for the Issuance of the Debt Instruments supported by bonds of the California State University Housing Revenue Bond System for an Apartment Complex at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and Related Matters

Committee on Governmental Relations:  *Chair – Martha Fallgatter*

1. 2001/2002 Legislative Report No. 3

Committee on Institutional Advancement:  *Acting Chair – Roberta Achtenberg*

1. Naming of Academic Program--California State University, Fresno
2. Naming of Academic Program---California State University, Fresno

Committee on Collective Bargaining:  *Chair – Ralph Pesqueira*

Committee on Campus Planning, Building and Grounds:  *Chair – Stanley Wang*

3. Approval of an Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the International Polytechnic High School at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
4. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amend Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the National Training Center/Sports Complex at California State University, Dominguez Hills

Old Business

New Business

Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2001/2002
Election of Members to Standing Committees of the Board of Trustees for 2001/2002
Election of Members to the California Postsecondary Education Commission

Public Comment

Adjournment
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Trustees of The California State University
California State University, Long Beach
University Student Union, Multipurpose Room ABC
1215 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, California

March 21, 2001

Trustees Present
Laurence K. Gould Jr., Chair
Daniel Cartwright
Martha C. Fallgatter
Debra S. Farar
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Neel I. Murarka
Dee Dee Myers, Vice Chair
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Ali Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Anthony M. Vitti
Stanley T. Wang

Trustees Absent
Cruz Bustamante, Lt. Governor
Gray Davis, Governor
Delaine Eastin, Superintendent of Public Education
Robert Hertzberg, Speaker of the Assembly
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Bob Foster
Ralph Pesqueira

Chancellor’s Office Staff
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Freda H. Otto, Administrative Officer in Charge, University Advancement
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

Chair Gould called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m.
Chair’s Report

Chair Gould thanked President Maxson and his colleagues for their tremendous job of hosting the Board of Trustees at Cal State Long Beach.

Chair Gould noted the importance of faculty in the CSU, and about the effort that the CSU is placing on creating conditions to attract and retain high quality faculty in the future.

Chair Gould spoke about the issue of affordable housing for faculty at CSU and the continuing effort to urge legislators and the Governor to approve CSU’s request for $5 million to establish an employee housing assistance program.

Chair Gould noted the CSU’s work to secure solid benefits for all of its employees by getting legislation passed that allows the Board of Trustees to address this issue. He reported that CSU is the first public university in California to offer benefits to domestic partners of CSU employees.

Chair Gould spoke of CSU’s efforts to improve facilities though working with private donors as well as state supported construction and maintenance.

The Chair noted the work of each of the University Presidents as well as other staff members who help to secure large gifts such as the $15 million gift from Paul Orfalea, the founder of Kinko’s, to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

The Chair reported that the CSU has received a total of $457 million in grants and contracts from public and private organizations an increase of 90 percent and during the past year alone,

Chair Gould noted that the growth in student population of 30,000 has helped the CSU to keep its commitment to accessibility and affordability. He also noted that student fees have gone down making them one of the lowest of any four-year public university system in the country.

Chair Gould recognized CSU students for the national recognition they have brought to the CSU because of their community service.

Chair Gould spoke of the CSU’s continuing commitment and partnership with K-12 schools. This outreach project has been so successful that Gov. Davis has proposed to double this effort this year.

Chair Gould recognized Chancellor Reed, Executive Vice Chancellors West and Spence and their entire team for creating the UC/CSU partnership with Governor Davis that envisions a continuous, stable funding base for this university.

Chair Gould recognized Trustee Ali Razi who is finishing his term on the board. He thanked him for his dedication and commitment to the mission of the CSU and especially to the Trustee Scholarship.
Chair Gould also recognized Trustee Hauck whose term on the board has expired as well. However he noted Trustee Hauck’s willingness to be reappointed for another term, and remarked that he will support Trustee Hauck’s reappointment.

**Chancellor’s Report**

Chancellor Reed thanked Long Beach State for hosting the meeting. The Chancellor gave special thanks to the staff at Long Beach for their work in hosting a successful meeting.

Chancellor Reed welcomed the faculty, staff, and students who were able to sit in on the meeting.

The Chancellor joined Chairman Gould in his appreciation for Trustees Razi and Hauck.

Chancellor Reed thanked the trustees for their outstanding work in finding two new presidents. He stated that Dick Rush and Bill Eisenhardt are nationally respected leaders who will bring experience and enthusiasm to their new positions at CSU Channel Islands and the Maritime Academy.

The Chancellor reported that The CSU has testified about its 2001/02 budget before the Senate and Assembly budget subcommittees and is waiting to hear what will happen with the May Revise. The Chancellor reiterated the CSU’s commitment to push very hard for a total compensation pool of 6 percent. He also noted that the CSU is looking for an additional $12 million for student services.

Chancellor Reed reported that Proposition 1A, which was a reliable capital outlay funding source runs out next year. He stated that the CSU is requesting authorization for a new four-year bond in 2002.

The Chancellor spoke about the continuing concern about energy costs, particularly the rise in natural gas prices and the increasing stress that it will put on the budget. These and other energy issues could have a major effect on current and future budgets.

Chancellor Reed noted Dr. Spence’s presentation on the education doctorate. The Chancellor believes that the CSU can offer the access, affordability, and high-quality expertise that no other college or university in the state can offer.

The Chancellor reported on the Governor’s Teaching Fellows program, and expressed his pride that CSU was chosen to administer the program.

Chancellor Reed made several announcements including that President Lyons received the Franklin H. Williams Award from the Peace Corps; that CSU Dominguez Hills received the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) award for promoting diversity in teacher education; that CSU, Sacramento was chosen, for the second time, to host the U.S. Track and Field Olympic Trials for the 2004 Olympics; and
that the CSU Northridge Matadors and the Fresno State Bulldogs had reached the NCAA Division I basketball championships.

Chair Gould and President Baker joined Chancellor Reed at the podium to recognize Cal Poly San Luis Obispo on its 100 years of academic excellence in serving the state of California.

**Report of the CSU Alumni Council**

Larry Adamson, president, reported for the Alumni Council

**Report from the California State Student Association**

Shaun Lumachi, chair, reported for the CSSA.

**Report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission**

Chair Gould referred the trustees to the report contained in their packets.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Board of Trustees’ meeting of January 24, 2001 were approved as submitted

**Agenda Items for the Board of Trustees**

Chair Gould reported there was one item for consideration for the Board of Trustees

**Election of Five Members to Committee on Committees for 2001/2002 (RBOT 03-01-04)**

Chair Gould called for the motion; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the following trustees are elected to constitute the board’s Committee on Committees for the 2001-2002 term:

- Martha C. Fallgatter, Chair
- William D. Campbell
- Debra Farar
- Dee Dee Myers
- Stanley Wang
Reports of Committees

Report from the Committee of the Whole

Trustee Gould reported that the committee heard one action item.

Amended Policy on Punitive Damages (RCOW 03-01-01)

Trustee Gould moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, as follows:

Whenever an award of punitive damages is entered by a judge or jury against any California State University employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees, an investigation shall be conducted into the facts and circumstances giving rise to the claim and the evidence presented at the trial of the action, and a report shall be prepared for the Board. Any Board member who is the object of such an investigation shall not participate in the subsequent decision-making about his or her personal circumstances. The Board shall then reach its own conclusion as to whether all of the following circumstances pertain:

1. The judgment is based on an act or omission of the employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees acting within the course and scope of his or her employment or other function within the California State University.

2. At the time of the act giving rise to the liability, the employee, former employee, agent, or member of the Board of Trustees acted, or failed to act, in good faith, without actual malice and in the apparent best interests of the California State University.

3. Payment of the claim or judgment would be in the best interests of the California State University.

Where all of the above criteria are met, the Board shall either apply to the Legislature for approval of payment of the punitive award in accord with Government Code section 825(b), or use its best efforts to identify a non-state source of funds appropriate to the circumstances presented, including funds held by the various legally separate auxiliary organizations within the CSU, and to encourage payment from those non-state fund sources as an appropriate service to the mission of the CSU.
Committee on Finance

Trustee Hauck reported that the committee heard six information items and the one action item.

**Auxiliary Organization Tax Exempt Financing at California State University, Fresno for the Save Mart Center (RFIN 03-01-09)**

Trustee Hauck moved the resolution: there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the trustees support the construction of The Save Mart Center at California State University, Fresno and authorize the campus in consultation with the Chancellor's Office to execute agreements necessary to implement the development plan for the project.

Committee on Organization and Rules

Trustee Farar reported that the committee heard one information item.

Committee On University And Faculty Personnel

Trustee Pierce reported that the committee heard two action items.

**Executive Compensation (RUFP 03-01-02)**

Trustee Pierce moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED,** by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that Dr. William B. Eisenhardt shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of $185,004 effective July 1, 2001, the date of his appointment as president of the California Maritime Academy and he shall be required to occupy the official CMA presidential residence (Residence #2) as a condition of employment; and that Dr. Richard R. Rush shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of $200,004 and a housing allowance set at the annual rate of $28,752, June 1, 2001 or soon thereafter, effective with his appointment as president of the California State University, Channel Islands.
CSU Health Care Reimbursement Account Plan (RUFP 03-01-03)

Trustee Pierce moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the CSU Health Care Reimbursement Account Plan be made available to executives of the California State University effective June 1, 2001.

Committee On Collective Bargaining

Trustee Fallgatter reported that the committee took the following actions: Adopted the CSU initial proposals for bargaining with the Union of American Physicians and Dentists, the State Employees Trades Council, and the International Union of Operating Engineers; and ratified the tentative agreements with all CSU unions to provide healthcare reimbursement accounts.

Committee On Audit

Trustee Pierce reported that the committee heard one discussion item.

Committee On Educational Policy

Trustee Myers reported that the committee acted on an item dealing with honorary degrees in closed session. Trustee Myers also reported that the committee heard one information item, and one action item.

Academic Planning and Program Review (REP 03-01-01)

Trustee Myers moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, that those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities,
and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the
programs will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, that degree programs not included in the Academic Plans
are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each
instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot
programs.

Committee On Campus Planning, Buildings And Grounds

Trustee Wang reported that the committee heard one information item, and six action
items.

Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded (RCPBG 03-01-03)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University
that the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to
include $500,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction,
and equipment for the San Francisco State University, Residence Dining
Center Addition.

Amend the 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded (RCPBG 03-01-04)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

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

1. The 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to
include $5.2 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction,
and equipment for the California State Polytechnic
University, Pomona, Center for Animal and Veterinary Science
Education, Phase Ia project as Priority 27.

2. CSPU Pomona will include the balance of funding required for Phase
Ia in a future capital outlay budget request based on campus priorities.
Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University (RCPBG 03-01-05)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

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

that:

1. The FEIR and the Addendum to the FEIR (collectively “the FEIR”) for the SDSU campus master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of that project, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, and that project consists of the following project components: (1) two academic/research buildings, a performing arts complex, a science research building, a physical plant and an addition to the North Life Sciences Building; and (2) a faculty office/classroom/gallery building and parking structure, an addition to the communication building, a new campus childcare center, an addition to the International Student Center and a central park.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000051026) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are incorporated by reference; and the findings of fact and the related mitigation measures are incorporated by reference.

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

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

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

A. The DEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

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

8. The board certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision.

9. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

10. The SDSU campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved.

11. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect SDSU campus master plan revision.
the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

4. The schematic plans for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Renovation/Addition are approved at a project cost of $7,249,000 at CCCI 3909.

Committee On Governmental Relations

Trustee Fallgatter reported that the committee heard and approved one action item.

2001-2002 Legislative Report No. 2 (RGR 03-01-03)

Trustee Fallgatter moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees moved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2001-02 Legislative Report No. 2 is adopted.

Committee on Institutional Advancement

Trustee Razi reported that the committee approved one item on the calendar and heard one information item and one action item.

Naming of Facility – San José State University (RIA 03-01-06)

Trustee Razi moved the resolution; there was as second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the new athletic conditioning, strength-building and rehabilitation facility at San José State University be named the Koret Athletic Training Center.
Communications and Correspondence

Old Business

New Business

Public Comments

The board heard comments from the following individuals who requested to speak before the board:

1. Charles Goetzel, President of the Academic Professionals of California.
3. Dr. Rita R. Boggs, Carson, CA resident
4. Royce Love, Carson, CA resident
5. Rev. Patrick McPolin, Casa Claret
6. Susan Meisenhelder, CFA President
7. Harry Barron, Carson, CA resident
8. Tony Brock, Safe Passage Tennis Program
9. Margo Kasdan, CFA Association Vice President
10. Mike Raspberry, Carson, CA resident
11. Dr. Rudy Vanterpool, CSUDH Professor
12. Rick Price, University Heights Homeowners’ Association, Carson, CA
13. Thomas Clayton, Carson, CA resident
14. Ardrall Johnson, Carson CA resident
15. Stuart Pardau, Esq. Representing Carson Harbor Village
16. H.R. Norwood, Carson, CA resident
17. Ledgis Williams, Carson, CA resident
18. Robert Lesley, Carson, CA resident
19. Rova Williams, Carson, CA resident
20. Ms. Cindy Grager, Carson, CA resident
21. Walter “Ray” Winbush, Carson, CA resident
22. Halleemon Anderson, ASI President, CSUDH

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.
Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (RCPBG 03-01-06)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

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

1. The FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed campus master plan, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, including the component construction projects as identified on Page 230, Project Description, of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000081102) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.

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

6. The FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the Cal Poly campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines.

7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan.
revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

A. The DEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision;

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

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

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

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210 and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Department of Facilities Planning and Management, 1 Grand Avenue, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

8. The board certifies the FEIR for the Cal Poly campus master plan revision, including its component construction projects.

9. The board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the campus master plan revision, including the component construction projects identified in the FEIR, and that the resolutions and approvals being provided by the board apply to the construction of these component projects. The board shall consider the FEIR in connection with any approvals of the component projects.

10. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which is under separate cover for Agenda Item 4 of the March 20-21, 2001 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).
11. The Cal Poly campus master plan revision, dated March 2001, is hereby approved with the goal of serving 17,500 full-time equivalent students.

12. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination with respect to the Cal Poly campus master plan revision.

Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 Through 2006/07 (RCPBG 03-01-07)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

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

1. The Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07 totaling $3,552,135,000 and $1,697,373,000 respectively are approved.

2. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.

3. The chancellor is directed to return to the Board of Trustees for approval of the final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2002/03 through 2006/07, including the 2002/03-action year request, no later than the November 13-14, 2001 board meeting.

Approval of Schematic Plans (RCPBG 03-01-08)

Trustee Wang moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution.

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

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California Maritime Academy, Engineering Building Renovation/Addition has been prepared in accordance with
Every year we like to hold a Board of Trustees meeting on a California State University campus. Last year we were at San Jose. Next year we'll be at Sacramento. This year we're at Long Beach. GO BEACH!

Haven't President Maxson and all of his colleagues done a tremendous job of hosting us at this meeting? Thanks to all of you.

Because we have so many members of the California State University community in attendance, today I want to focus on the nature of this university, on some of the challenges facing California State University, and on how we've met some of those challenges in the past and plan to deal with others in the future.

First of all, there's no doubt about it. California State University is simply America's finest university. With our unwavering commitment to access, affordability and high quality, we have a mission and a record to match any other university - bar none. I am so proud of the California State University. And each and every one of you has a right to be proud of everything you do to ensure the successes of California State University.

The California State University faculty is the heart and soul of this institution. Every one of my colleagues on this Board knows that, and we value our faculty tremendously. California State University’s faculty is teaching the next generation of California's leaders, and for that we - and all of California - are greatly indebted to you.

California State University has taken, and is taking, many steps to put in place conditions that will retain our excellent faculty and will help attract high quality faculty to replace those who are retiring - one of the great challenges facing the university. We have made a priority of increasing salaries. California State University asked for and received a 6% compensation increase for faculty this year, and we have requested another 6% increase for the next fiscal year. If we receive the six percent this year, it will bring the total increase over the past five years to nearly 31%. In the past three years alone, the California State University faculty salary gap has been reduced by about half, to 3.9 percent.

Two weeks ago at California State University’s annual Legislative Day in Sacramento, the number one message we gave to Legislators was how important it is for California State University to receive the additional two percent compensation increase for faculty and staff over...
and above the four percent increase already recommended by Gov. Davis. I think that message went through loud and clear. We are committed to increasing faculty and staff salaries, and I want to commend publicly Trustee Vitti for all of his leadership in this effort. He has been steadfast and a stalwart.

We know that affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing our current and future faculty and staff members. At Cal State Channel Islands I sit on the site authority that is building housing that will be sold and rented and affordable prices. We will use the availability of this affordable housing to attract high quality faculty to this campus. Trustee Farar and I just returned from a visit to California State University Monterey Bay. There we saw a superb program of affordable housing for faculty, staff and students. No doubt, the affordable housing on that campus attracts quality faculty to teach at Monterey Bay. During yesterday’s discussions we heard about Cal State Fullerton’s successful plans to build 86 new homes in Buena Park for university employees. That’s just the beginning. Cal State Fullerton is cooperating with several other local cities to build affordable housing for faculty and staff, and we hope those plans come to fruition. We’re trying to replicate these and other efforts as best we can on all of our campuses. We have asked all of our campus presidents to reexamine the local housing situation and assess what the university can do to help. In Sacramento, we will continue to urge our legislators and the governor to approve California State University’s request for $5 million to establish an employee housing assistance program.

We strive to provide our faculty, staff and students with better support and facilities. In our libraries all the campuses now bid together to subscribe to the periodicals students and faculty use most. This joint approach has saved us money and frees up other dollars to obtain other books and journals for students and scholars. Many of California State University’s physical facilities are aging. We have finally turned the corner on deferred maintenance and are augmenting state construction funds with support from private donors.

California State University has received record amounts of external support in the last two years. Our presidents and advancement personnel work day and night and during the majority of their mealtimes every week garnering this support. But we all know that advancement is not the province of University Advancement or the presidents alone. Faculty and staff members are also great contributors to our fundraising efforts.

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo just received a $15 million gift—the largest gift in California State University history—from Kinko’s founder Paul Orfalea. Mr. Orfalea, who is not an alumnus, became interested in the university after striking up a conversation with Tom Dalton, a senior research associate in the College of Liberal Arts, when they were both at a local car dealership. After this staff member told him about Cal Poly, Mr. Orfalea was intrigued and wanted to learn more. He visited the campus, talked with faculty, students, and administrators and then decided
to make a major contribution to the university. But his initial contact came through a staff member. Many foundations make grants to universities not simply because of the institution itself but because of the presence of outstanding faculty members. Let me give just one example. The internationally famous Robert Wood Johnson Foundation just gave $12-1/2 million to San Diego State University, and it did so because Professor James Sallis is at that campus. He will use that grant to develop a healthy living program. This external support is extremely important for the California State University.

Since I became a trustee in 1996, California State University has grown by more than 30,000 students. We have kept our doors open and we are now serving all of those students. We are keeping California State University’s commitment to accessibility. At the same time, we are also keeping our commitment to affordability. In fact, California State University’s system-wide student fees are 10 percent lower than they were in 1996. At $1,428 per academic year, California State University has the one of the lowest system-wide fees of any four-year public university in the country. In addition, California now offers what is probably the best financial aid program of any in the country--the new Cal Grant program. California State University - and especially our Chancellor and his staff - played an essential role in the negotiations that led to the final passage of this program, and we can be proud of that.

Our students are always a great source of pride for this university, and this year our students brought national recognition to California State University because of their community service. More than 135,000 students throughout the California State University system perform a total of 33.6 million hours of community service every year. At a minimum wage rate, that equals $193 million of service.

Everyone in this room shares California State University’s commitment to access, affordability and high quality. From the Chancellor to the custodian, we all share a love for the mission of this university. Faculty makes this mission come alive every day as they teach. California State University’s accessibility and affordability make the mission real for our students. The worth of the mission is expressed by so many alumni who have told me, "Larry, California State University made college accessible for me - and gave me a superb education." And no one holds the mission of this university dearer than the Trustees.

Indulge me a moment or two. Today marks the last meeting for two of our trustees under their current terms. One is Trustee Ali Razi. Trustee Razi has declined to submit his name to the Governor for possible reappointment, but I want to tell you about this gentleman. When he was first asked by the Governor to be a Trustee, he said he didn't want to serve on the Board unless he was sure that mission was important. He investigated and now he is always the first to say that California State University is so important because it's mission is so important. And when he got on the Board, he found out that the funds for Trustee scholarship had run out. So he rolled
up his sleeves, twisted all of our arms and raised the funds so that we could not only continue the
awards but double the number of scholarships. Ali, thank you for everything you do.

And the other Trustee whose term is expiring is Bill Hauck. Bill is a living, breathing California State University success story. A San Jose State grad who was essentially held Shaun Lumachi’s current position some time ago, Bill now is tremendously admired in Sacramento as head of the California Business Roundtable and he is always tremendously helpful in our dealings with the Legislature. I understand that Bill has indicated to the Governor that he would be willing to continue serving on this Board, and as I have said to you before, I’m ready to support or oppose your reappointment - whatever will help you most.

California State University functions so well as a system because we have so many capable individuals who all work together for the benefit of the university. I am honored to be a part of this institution, and I thank every one of you for all you do to make this America’s finest university.
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Thank you Chairman Gould. I appreciate that report and your kind words.

I also want to thank Long Beach State for hosting us this morning. Bob – please give special thanks to all of your staff that worked so hard to host a successful meeting here on campus.

To the faculty, staff, and students who are able to join us today – welcome.

I also want to join Chairman Gould in his appreciation for Trustees Razi and Hauck. Ali, You have served us well and we are grateful for your generosity and commitment. Your help with the Trustees’ Scholarship has inspired all of us.

Bill, we have been honored by your service and we hope that we will be seeing you here again.

I want to thank our trustees for the outstanding work they did in finding us two new presidents. Dick Rush and Bill Eisenhardt are nationally respected leaders who will bring experience and enthusiasm to their new positions at CSU Channel Islands and the Maritime Academy. We look forward to welcoming them to the CSU family.

The CSU has testified about its 2001/02 budget before the Senate and Assembly budget subcommittees. We are waiting to hear what will happen with the May Revise.

We are continuing to push very hard for an additional 2 percent increase for faculty and staff compensation (above the 4 percent proposed by Gov. Davis) to bring our total compensation pool to 6 percent. We’re also looking for an additional $12 million for student services.

Proposition 1A, which was a reliable capital outlay funding source for four years, runs out next year. We are requesting authorization for a new four-year bond in 2002 – ideally on the March 2002 ballot. We are looking for a bond that would provide the CSU with at least $330 million each year – a total of $4 billion to serve the three higher education segments for four years. This bond will help us with badly needed renovations, repairs, and new construction.

We are still concerned about the future of our energy costs. You may have seen some news articles about our contract with Enron Energy Services. We have a good relationship with Enron, and Enron and their corporate leadership have committed, as far as the cost of electric power to us, through the term of the contract of March 2002. But we have a disagreement about direct access, which includes their meter on our campuses. We are going to continue to work
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that through. The UC is very concerned about their future energy costs if they lose the direct access. We are working to ensure that Enron honors its commitment to the fourth year of its contract.

Also, we continue to be concerned about the rise in natural gas prices. Potentially this is going to eat away at our budget faster than anything else. We have asked the governor and legislature for a total of $41.1 million to recognize increased natural gas prices for the current year and for 2001/02. These and other energy issues could have a major effect on current and future budgets.

As you heard in Dave Spence’s presentation, the CSU has launched an effort to secure the right to grant an education doctorate (Ed.D.). We know that California needs more Ed.D.s in its K-12 schools, community colleges, and university schools of education. Our state’s existing private and public programs tend to be costly, inaccessible to working students, and lacking in diversity. We believe that the CSU can offer the access, affordability, and high-quality expertise that no other college or university in the state can offer.

Last Friday in San Jose we joined Gov. Davis in honoring the first Governor’s Teaching Fellows. This program offers $20,000 fellowships to students to pursue a teaching credential, as long as they teach for four years in a low-performing school. The CSU was proud to be chosen to administer this program. We selected 250 fellows this year. From now on we will choose 1,000 fellows per year.

I want to thank President Welty and his staff for their work on the event center in Fresno.

Congratulations to President Lyons for receiving the Franklin H. Williams Award from the Peace Corps. The award is given to those who served admirably in the Peace Corps and then went on to serve their communities. Dr. Lyons served in the Peace Corps in Ecuador in the late 1960s.

Congratulations to CSU Dominguez Hills for receiving an award from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) for promoting diversity in teacher education.

Congratulations to Sacramento State for being chosen to host the U.S. Track and Field Olympic Trials for a second time. They will host the trials for the 2004 Olympics.

Congratulations to the CSU Northridge Matadors and the Fresno State Bulldogs for reaching the NCAA Division I basketball championships. These teams represented us well on the national stage – at the “big dance.”

Next, I would like to ask Chairman Gould and President Baker to join me up at the podium. Over the past 100 years, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo has served the state of California and its
students with academic excellence. Cal Poly has earned a national reputation as a university that offers outstanding academic programs at an affordable price. Through its teaching, research, and outreach to the community, Cal Poly exemplifies the best that the CSU has to offer. President Baker, on behalf of the California State University, I would like to congratulate you and your university on its 100th anniversary. We wish you many more years of success.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.
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Recognition of the Women’s Basketball Team at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Presentation By

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Bob H. Suzuki
President
California State Polytechnic University Pomona

Summary

During the current academic year, the women’s basketball team at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona won the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II tournament. This is their fourth national title and the first since 1986. Members of the team will be recognized.
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Recognition of the Men’s Soccer Team at California State University Dominguez Hills

Presentation By

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

James E. Lyons, Sr.
President
California State University Dominguez Hills

Summary

During the current academic year, the men’s soccer team at California State University, Dominguez Hills won the Division II, National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament. Members of the team will be recognized.
APPENDIX E
Mitigation Monitoring Program
Master Plan Update Final EIR
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires all state and local agencies to establish monitoring or reporting programs whenever approval of a project relies upon a mitigated negative declaration or an environmental impact report (EIR). The monitoring or reporting program must ensure implementation of the measures being imposed to mitigate or avoid the significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the mitigated negative declaration or EIR.

The mitigation monitoring program (MMP) is required for all mitigation measures adopted by California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly) as conditions of the project. Should Cal Poly adopt the Final EIR (FEIR), Cal Poly would agree to adopt all mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for the Master Plan Update and the mitigation measures shall be required to avoid potentially significant adverse environmental impacts.

A memorandum will be prepared at the specified phase of construction or planning which will state that each of the listed mitigation measures has been satisfactorily completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>When to Implement</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Agency</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide. Mitigation measures would need to be developed on</td>
<td>Planning of</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the basis of site-specific study of the landslide. The</td>
<td>H-4, H-6 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general degree of required mitigation would depend on the</td>
<td>Grand/Slack ancillary facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>findings, which could range from: 1) finding that the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing landslide is relatively stable and therefore no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant mitigation is needed; to 2) the existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landslide is marginally stable and will require extensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strengthening and/or subsurface drainage improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provide adequate factors of safety for design and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction. This EIR therefore recommends that such a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study be performed to estimate the factor of safety of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing landslide for existing static and earthquake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loading conditions, and to evaluate what impact the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site improvements could have on the stability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the landslide. The study will specify mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for any site improvements that are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldtree. A site-specific spring botanical survey will be</td>
<td>Planning/</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed prior to construction. Areas supporting sensitive</td>
<td>design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant species shall be avoided; disturbed populations will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be replanted in a suitable area at a ratio deemed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate by a qualified biologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage plan. Prior to construction of the Bull Test</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility, a construction and operational drainage plan will</td>
<td>/operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be drafted with contingencies for storm event and system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of Cattle Access. Cattle will not be allowed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>When to Implement</td>
<td>Responsible Person/Agency</td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir maintenance should be scheduled outside of the breeding and nesting periods of sensitive species that may inhabit the area, and should be approved by jurisdictional agencies where appropriate.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Prior to initiation of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future development at the Design Village shall be restricted to areas not limited by serpentine soils, Army Corps jurisdictional wetlands greater that 1/10th of an acre in size, and other areas populated by sensitive plant species, unless impacts to plants can be mitigated by replanting and /or relocation. Prior to construction, a site-specific biological and jurisdictional wetlands delineation shall be prepared.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Restriction. The northern and eastern portions of the H-1 and H-2 projects will be designed to prevent direct pedestrian access to the native grassland and biological preserve. In general, access to buildings and recreation areas will be oriented towards the main campus and away from sensitive areas to the north and east. Pedestrian traffic in the area of Brizzolara Creek will be designed in accordance with the “Goals and Guidelines for the Cal Poly Creek Management and Enhancement Plan” included as Appendix F. Signs will be posted to indicate the sensitivity of the areas.</td>
<td>Planning/design</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Population Restoration. Suitable areas exist on campus for replanting of <em>Calochortus obispoensis</em>. Any populations or individuals of <em>Calochortus obispoensis</em> disturbed by the construction of the H-1 and H-2 housing projects will be replanted in suitable areas at ratios deemed suitable by a qualified biologist.</td>
<td>Planning/design</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highland Drive realignment shall be designed with drainage systems sensitive to the creek corridor. Drainage shall incorporate silt and grease traps and/or vegetative buffer strips to prevent pollution and sedimentation of the creek. Landscaping shall consider native vegetation compatible with the riparian area where it is appropriate. Inlets that drain to the creek will be marked accordingly.</td>
<td>Planning/design</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Resources**

| Buildings deemed potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP will be studied to determine their significance. If they are determined to be significant, Cal Poly will undertake proper documentation of the resources. Determination of historical significance shall be made on any campus structure older than 50 years prior to removal or substantial remodeling. | Planning/design | Cal Poly | Completion |
| Prior to design, Phase II archaeological studies will be completed at known sites; determination of significance will be made, and appropriate mitigation measures followed, as suggested by the archaeologist. | Planning/design | Cal Poly | Completion |
| Where soil surfaces are undeveloped and visible and where no previous survey has been completed, Phase I archaeological surveys will take place prior to construction. | Construction | Cal Poly | Completion |

**Circulation**

<p>| Mount Bishop Road/Highland Drive. This location will need to have all-way stop control removed at some time prior to the full implementation of the Master Plan. | Planning/design | Cal Poly | Completion |
| California Boulevard/Highland Drive. The extension of California Blvd. to Highland would result in a new at-grade three-way intersection. Monitoring the intersection will be required; however, it seems likely that a signal will be needed. | Planning/design | Cal Poly | Completion |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>When to Implement</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Agency</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Carta/Highland Drive. Via Carta north of its intersection with Highland Drive will need to be widened to accommodate vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The intersection should be monitored to see if signalization is necessary.</td>
<td>Prior to build-out of the Master Plan</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University will need to implement a campus shuttle or other alternative transportation modes to accomplish parking reduction goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following mitigation measures has been added to reinforce the need for improved transit and reduced parking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly will institute the following measures, or measures achieving equivalent results, in order to meet its stated policy of 2,000 parking space reduction, in addition to improving circulation on local streets: freshman restrictions, Bike/pedestrian enhancement, geographic controls, continued bus subsidy, car/vanpools, faculty/staff incentives, parking fee increases, entertainment/services on campus, on-campus shuttle, modified enrollment scenarios, city transit improvements, and remote parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Boulevard/Taft Street. The peak hour traffic forecasts meet warrants for consideration of traffic signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Boulevard/U.S. 101 north bound ramps. The peak hour traffic forecasts meet warrants for consideration of traffic signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional mitigation are required for traffic-related impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary source emissions. Cal Poly shall implement the following or similar APCD-approved energy-reducing measures to reduce stationary source emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shade tree planting along the southern exposures of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building orientation to take advantage of natural light and heating and cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design. The structures shall be designed with multiple exits in order to reduce the time required to vacate the cars. Walls should be generally open allowing for free passage of outside air through the structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking payment options. Prepayment of parking fees should be considered to prevent vehicle queuing when leaving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of exit time. The University shall incorporate management strategies contained in Section 2 of the Cal Poly Parking and Commuter Services Event Parking Management Plan (Draft) for the structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

Prior to construction, specific air quality models will be conducted for the off-campus housing projects.

Mustang Stadium. A specific noise analysis and mitigation plan will be developed for the Stadium when the relocation is proposed. Design recommendations at this time include the following:

- Public Address System. In general, speakers should be oriented towards the interior of the stadium and/or directed downward. More speakers with a smaller output dispersed throughout the stadium would have less external noise than a few, louder speakers.

- Building Orientation. The stadium should be designed to be oriented away from sensitive receptors. Design should minimize noise directed towards these areas.

Off campus housing facilities north of Highland and at Highland and Highway 1 should be sited to minimize noise and should incorporate acoustic design intended to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels.

### Aesthetics

All exterior lighting associated with the proposed Master Plan shall be hooded. No unobstructed beam of light shall be directed toward sensitive uses (e.g., Brizzolara Creek, Drumm Reservoir, environmental and Horticultural Sciences (EHS), and neighborhoods). The use of reflective materials in all structures shall be minimized (e.g., metal roofing, expanses of reflective glass on west-facing walls).

Pertaining to lighting, the following recommendations are made:

- All lights must be shielded to avoid glare and light spill-over onto adjacent areas and onto public right-of-way areas;
- Landscape illumination should be done with low level, unobtrusive fixtures;
- Parking structure lighting shall be designed to provide the minimum safe lighting levels. Per IES standards, this is 6 foot-candles (fc) maintained throughout internal to the structure, and 1 fc minimum on the roof;
- The use of reflective materials on the exterior of all structures shall be minimized;
- Internal lightwells will be provided to maximize the amount of natural light;
- Light fixtures will include a vertical component to create an even distribution of light;
- Solid rails shall be included around the perimeter to block light spillage from headlights on cars within the structure; and
- All roof light fixtures shall be located on the interior columns to keep light from spilling out on to adjacent areas, and will include “cut-off” shields.
Mustang Stadium. If this project were to occur, final design should 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.

Further analysis of the lighting and glare impacts would be required as part of future environmental review for this project.

Highway 1 (Gateway to the City of San Luis Obispo)

City Consultation. Prior to design finalization, the University shall consult with the City regarding the visual impact of the proposed off-campus housing on the City gateway.

Compliance with County Guidelines. If the proposed facilities lie within 100 feet of Highway 1, the bull test and Goldtree facility will comply with County Guidelines for design near scenic highways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police. The University will provide for at least the equivalent of 3.3 additional police personnel to serve the anticipated growth. The University will work with the campus police to determine an adequate level of service ratio for the campus and will plan for provision of needed personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because future water demand will begin to tax the University's supply of Whale Rock water, the following programs should be instituted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Conservation Program. The University should develop a program designed to reduce overall water consumption on campus. The program will incorporate water-saving fixtures into new development, retrofit older facilities over time, and modify landscaping irrigation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drought contingency plan. As part of implementation of the Master Plan, the University will draft a drought contingency plan to address potential water shortages associated with extended drought conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Water Supply. The University should investigate the availability of additional water supplies over the next twenty-year horizon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics. Off-campus Projects. Construction at the Goldtree and off-campus housing facilities will locate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

stockpiling and staging areas shall be located out of view where feasible

Air Quality

DUST CONTROL

A. Employ measures to avoid the creation of dust and air pollution.
B. Unpaved areas shall be wetted down, to eliminate dust formation, a minimum of twice a day to reduce particulate matter. When wind velocity exceeds 15 mph, site shall be watered down more frequently.
C. Store all volatile liquids, including fuels or solvents in closed containers.
D. No open burning of debris, lumber or other scrap will be permitted.
E. Properly maintain equipment to reduce gaseous pollutant emissions.
F. Exposed areas, new driveways and sidewalks shall be seeded, treated with soil binders, or paved as soon as possible.
G. Cover stockpiles of soil, sand and other loose materials.
H. Cover trucks hauling soil, debris, sand or other loose materials.
I. Sweep project area streets at least once daily.
J. Appoint a dust control monitor to oversee and implement all measures listed in this Article.
K. The Contractor shall maintain continuous control of dust resulting from construction operations. Particular care must be paid to door openings to prevent construction dust and debris from entering the adjacent areas.
L. When wind conditions create considerable dust, such that a nuisance would generate complaints, the Contractor shall either suspend grading operations, and/or water the exposed areas.
M. Water down the project site, access routes, and lay down areas whenever generate dust becomes a nuisance.
N. The campus reserves the right to request watering of the site whenever dust complaints are received.
O. It shall be the University's sole discretion as to what constitutes a nuisance.

In addition to the measures listed above, CMCM recommends the following be added to standard construction contracts:

EQUIPMENT EMISSION CONTROL

To the extent feasible, the applicant shall utilize newer construction equipment (manufactured after 1990) that produces fewer emissions, especially for the highest emitting pieces of diesel-fired heavy equipment. In any case, all equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained. Additional measures that would reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to:

- Retarding fuel injection timing two degrees from the manufacturer's recommendation.
- Using high-pressure fuel injectors.
- The use of reformulated diesel fuel.
The use of Caterpillar pre-chamber, diesel-fired engines (or equivalent low NOx engine design) in heavy equipment used to construct the project to further reduce NOx emissions. 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.

**DUST CONTROL**

Dust generated by construction activities shall be kept to a minimum by full implementation of the following measures:

- During construction, the amount of disturbed area shall be minimized.
- Onsite vehicle speeds should be reduced to 15 mph or less;
- Exposed ground areas that are left exposed after project completion should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
- After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated immediately by watering or revegetating or spreading soil binders to minimize dust generation until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will be minimized;
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks associated with construction activities should be paved as soon as possible. In addition, building and other pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading, unless seeding or soil binders are used.

**Construction drainage plan.** Prior to construction, the contractor shall draft a drainage and activity plan to protect channels on the Goldtree, Grand/Slack, H-1, H-2 and H-3 housing sites, Highland Drive, Parking Structure III and the Brizolara Creek Enhancement Projects and their associated habitats. The plan will emphasize avoidance, and erosion and runoff control. The University will consult with appropriate jurisdictional agencies prior to activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>When to Implement</th>
<th>Responsible Person/ Agency</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The use of Caterpillar pre-chamber, diesel-fired engines (or equivalent low NOx engine design) in heavy equipment used to construct the project to further reduce NOx emissions. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust generated by construction activities shall be kept to a minimum by full implementation of the following measures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During construction, the amount of disturbed area shall be minimized. Onsite vehicle speeds should be reduced to 15 mph or less; Exposed ground areas that are left exposed after project completion should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established; After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated immediately by watering or revegetating or spreading soil binders to minimize dust generation until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will be minimized; All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks associated with construction activities should be paved as soon as possible. In addition, building and other pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading, unless seeding or soil binders are used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction drainage plan. Prior to construction, the contractor shall draft a drainage and activity plan to protect channels on the Goldtree, Grand/Slack, H-1, H-2 and H-3 housing sites, Highland Drive, Parking Structure III and the Brizolara Creek Enhancement Projects and their associated habitats. The plan will emphasize avoidance, and erosion and runoff control. The University will consult with appropriate jurisdictional agencies prior to activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand/Slack – northern drainage. The University will consult with the Army Corps of Engineers well in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>When to Implement</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Agency</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of construction to determine permitting requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

Biological Resources. Develop, for each enhancement project and other direct alteration, a set of performance standards, incorporating the following requirements:

- **Timing** – Highly invasive activities shall be scheduled to avoid breeding and nesting periods of sensitive species, including steelhead, and southwestern pond turtle
- **Erosion control** – Erosion of banks and streambed will be minimized through approved methods (per agencies listed above)
- **Revegetation** – Disturbed areas shall be revegetated with native species to provide nesting habitat, and connections to adjacent areas for migration

The University shall consult with appropriate jurisdictional agencies prior to activity.

### Noise

Cal Poly shall apply the following during construction:

**Cal Poly Standard Requirements**

| A. | The requirements of the Article are in addition to those of Article 4.02 of the Contract General Conditions. |
| B. | Maximum noise levels within 1,000 feet of any classroom, laboratory, residence, business, adjacent buildings, or other populated area; noise levels for trenchers, pavers, graders and trucks shall not exceed 90 dBA at 50 feet as measured under the noisiest operating conditions. For all other equipment, noise levels shall not exceed 85 dBA at 50 feet. |
| C. | Equipment: equip jackhammers with exhaust mufflers and steel muffling sleeves. Air compressors should be of a quiet type such as a "whisperized" compressor. Compressor hoods shall be closed while equipment is in operation. Use electrically powered rather than gasoline or diesel powered forklifts. Provide portable noise barriers around jack hammering, and barriers constructed of 3/4-inch plywood lined with 1-inch thick fiberglass on the work side. |
| D. | Operations: keep noisy equipment as far as possible from noise-sensitive site boundaries. Machines should not be left idling. Use electric power in lieu of internal combustion engine power wherever possible. Maintain equipment properly to reduce noise from excessive vibration, faulty mufflers, or other sources. All engines shall have properly functioning mufflers. |
| E. | Scheduling: schedule noisy operations so as to minimize their duration at any given location, and to minimize disruption to the adjoining users. Notify the Trustees and the Architect in advance of performing work creating unusual noise and schedule such work at times mutually agreeable. |
| F. | Do not play radios, tape recorders, televisions, and other similar items on the construction site. |
| G. | When work occurs in or near occupied buildings, the Contractor is cautioned to keep noise associated with any activities to a minimum. If excessively noisy operations that disrupt academic activities are anticipated, they must be scheduled after normal work hours. |
| H. | All work in the area of the residence halls will be restricted to 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days per week, throughout the year. No work will be allowed in the residence hall areas during the finals week. University |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When to Implement</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Agency</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Plan check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Plan Check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reserves the right to stop construction work, including but not limited to noisy work, during the following events: Commencement, Open house, Finals Week, residence hall move-in, or at other times that may be identified by the University. University reserves the right to stop noisy work at any time when said work disrupts classes.

In addition to these standard measures, the following measures are recommended:

- A haul route plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the University which designates haul routes as far as possible from sensitive receptors.
- Stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from occupied structures.
- Whenever practical, the noisiest construction operations shall be scheduled to occur together in the construction program to avoid continuous periods of noise generation. Scheduling of noisier construction activities shall also take advantage of summer sessions and other times when classes are not in session.
- Project construction activities that generate noise in excess of 60 dB at the project site boundary shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Pile Driver Use. If possible, the use of pile drivers shall be minimized in construction. Alternative techniques that produce less noise, such as drilled or bored piles, shall be considered.

Circulation Plan. Where vehicle and pedestrian routes and residential areas conflict with construction activities, a circulation plan will be developed, which will include warning signs and detours, as well as efforts to minimize noise in residential areas.