

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting:** 1:45 p.m., Tuesday, January 26, 1999  
Auditorium

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

#### Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 10, 1998

#### Discussion Items

1. Professional Appointments, *Information*
2. Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget, *Information*
3. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California State University, San Bernardino, *Action*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Northridge—Arts, Media, and Communication Building, *Action*

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

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

**November 10, 1998**

**Members Present**

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

**Members Absent**

Ronald L. Cedillos  
Bob Foster

**Other Trustees Present**

Martha C. Fallgatter  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Alice S. Petrossian

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor  
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director, Physical Planning and Development  
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

**Presidential Liaisons**

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

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Chair Razi and Senior Vice Chancellor Richard P. West announced that Patrick Drohan was the search committee's recommendation to fill the vacant senior director's position in the Capital Planning, Design and Construction Department. Mr. Drohan was welcomed in his new role.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the September 16, 1998, meeting were approved as submitted.

### **Amend the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

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

Senior Director Patrick Drohan clarified that the funding for project number three, California State University, Northridge University Club, on page 2 of the item, will be from the Auxiliary Corporation instead of the foundation.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-98-19).

### **Professional Appointments**

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-98-20).

### **Comparative Review of Costs of CSU Capital Outlay Projects**

Mr. Drohan opened the presentation by saying that this information item was a follow-up to a trustee inquiry at the January 1998 meeting of this committee regarding the CSU's per-square-foot construction costs. He said that this question is frequently asked of institutional administrators through their governing boards, legislators and legislative advisors across the nation. At the opposite end of this subject, staff also received questions from CSU administrators asking why our buildings are so inexpensive and unable to withstand the normal wear and tear that institutional facilities typically receive. A frequent point of reference in responding to questions related to building costs is the comparison of commercial and institutional developments. Mr. Drohan stated that there are some basic planning criteria that differentiate these two development categories. With the aid of a slide visual, he briefly reviewed the differences.

Mr. Drohan noted that a commercial development typically has a shorter useful life. Another component that differentiates commercial and institutional developments are that tenant improvements are passed on as a triple net-lease condition of leasing the facilities compared to complete build out under the basic construction contract for institutional facilities. Also the renovation cycles are much shorter. In comparison, the CSU's facility life span is in excess of 50 years (nearly 50 percent of our buildings are approaching or exceed a 50-year life), and our renovation cycle is much longer. Mr. Drohan pointed out that the program requirements for our facilities are more complex, e.g., greater structural spans that add cost to a project. The greater span allows for unrestricted column-free space. With our long 30- to 40-year renovation cycle, it is a necessary prerequisite that this type of space be provided to accommodate flexibility and the ability to respond

to changing program needs. Telecommunication infrastructure needs also differ between commercial and institutional developments.

Using the CSU Stanislaus Educational Services Building as an example, Mr. Drohan noted the facility was built out at a cost of \$160 per square foot. The differential involved in this cost was (1) the payment of prevailing wage required by California law (\$32 per square foot in this building), and (2) tenant improvements or interior build out of the space amounting to \$40 per square foot. Considering these two elements alone, the difference between a completely built-out institutional facility versus a commercial shell core is \$72 per square foot (\$159/sq. ft. vs. \$87/sq. ft.).

In reference to the CSU's buildings costs, Mr. Drohan reviewed a slide that compared a typical CSU teaching lab facility versus similar types nationally. While our costs are high at \$183 per square foot by some comparisons, they are below the national average of \$227 per square foot.

In trying to address issues pertaining to these cost differences and, in particular, life cycle cost elements, Mr. Drohan has established a systemwide task force to review the current cost guides. The task force, comprised of Capital Planning, Design and Construction staff members and campus executive deans, is charged with evaluating building systems and recommending possible unit cost adjustments with a focus on those elements that can have a favorable impact on the system's continuing deferred maintenance backlog.

Trustee Wang expressed appreciation to Mr. Drohan for his cost comparison presentation. With a caution that California's growth economy may not last, Mr. Wang requested that staff continue to look at creative ways in reducing costs.

Trustee Gray concurred with Trustee Wang stating that actually as the economy gets stronger and continues to show good strength, the comparison difference is less. When the economy is tight, everyone is looking for work, and the prevailing wage requirement is built into the project cost, then the real differences per square foot occur. Mr. Gray said that he does not foresee construction costs changing; therefore, the items such as efficiency and maintenance that Mr. Drohan mentioned will need to make up the difference in the short term.

Alumni trustee-elect Fred Pierce IV expressed interest in receiving feedback on some commercial institutional quality buildings constructed for an institutional life cycle. He stated that corporate America does this quite frequently at a lesser cost. Mr. Pierce believes that there are three contributing factors to why the CSU's costs are high. One is the way we define specification materials; two is the prevailing wage factor, which he understands; and three is the bidding process for our projects. In reference to the third factor, Mr. Pierce believes that this is the area that results in higher costs. If this factor has legislative parameters, staff might consider recommending changes requiring legislative action to give the CSU flexibility in terms of our construction costs.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

An audio visual presentation was used to briefly describe the item as printed in the agenda.

Mr. Drohan indicated that the appropriate CEQA documentation for the first three projects was prepared and approved by the Board of Trustees at a previous meeting. For project number four, a Negative Declaration was prepared with an initial study. He stated that no adverse public comments have been received.

Trustee Wang pointed out that the San Jose State University Child Development Center is one example where in the future the CSU should be looking to a private/public joint venture as a cost saving solution.

President Caret stated that his staff explored the use of a private developer but a deal could not be struck. San Jose State University is open to these kinds of relationships and will continue to look for them.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-98-21).

**Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision and Schematic Plans for the San Jose State University—Joint Library**

Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda handout.

Trustee Mitchell asked the status of the type of explosive to be used during construction.

Mr. Don Kassing, vice president for administration, San Jose State University, stated that the approach to the demolition of the building has not been determined as yet.

Trustee Goldwhite indicated that several faculty members regarding the Environmental Impact Report and their uneasiness with respect to this partnership had contacted him. Trustee Goldwhite asked President Caret to speak to the involvement of the on-campus government entities in the development of the plan.

President Caret stated that staff conducted almost two dozen forums with approximately 2,500 participants either with the university or the city. On campus, the Associated Students, Academic Senate, provost and president have sponsored a number of forums for students and faculty, as well as town meetings for various colleges. President Caret continued by saying that the Senate had reviewed the plans on two occasions, unanimously approved the plans as presented at that time, and instructed staff to move forward with the project. The Senate continues to review the plans. At this point, staff basically knows how the plan will operate, how it will be built, and is reviewing those documents with the various unions on campus. President Caret indicated that staff has definitely involved faculty and the faculty government, resulting in some supporters and nonsupporters of the project for various reasons.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-98-22).

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

**BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 1  
January 26-27, 1999

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

**Professional Appointments**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

In accordance with trustee policy, this information item reports on campus professional appointments for three major capital outlay projects.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1  
January 26-27, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### Professional Appointments

The following campuses wish to report on professional appointments made since the last board meeting:

1. California State University, Los Angeles  
Child Care Center Expansion  
*Project Architect: MS Architects/Mavridis and Associates*

A campus committee interviewed four architectural firms and selected MS Architects/Mavridis and Associates to design the child care center. This project will provide four additional classrooms and minor remodeling to the existing facilities. The additional space will increase the licensed capacity of the facility from 62 children to approximately 110 children.

2. California State University, Northridge  
University Club  
*Project Architect: Moule and Polyzoïdes*

A selection committee composed of facilities planning, university corporation and campus food services staff reviewed statements of qualifications submitted by seven architectural firms. Three finalists were interviewed and the Moule and Polyzoïdes firm was selected to design the university club. The project will replace the existing building that has code deficiencies and insufficient program space. The facility will serve various university functions, including outreach, development, conferences, and campus dining/catering.

3. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Collins Center for Hospitality Management, Phase II  
*Project Architect: Holmes and Narver/McClier*

A panel of campus personnel interviewed multiple firms and selected Holmes and Narver/McClier to design the Collins Center for Hospitality Management, Phase II project. The facility will be an education center that includes meeting/classrooms, conference/lecture room, instructional laboratory, student/faculty resource centers, faculty offices, and a student lounge.

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 2  
January 26-27, 1999

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

#### **Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget**

##### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

##### **Summary**

The California State University's proposed 1999/00 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 through 2003/04 were presented at the September 1998 meeting of the Board of Trustees. The state funded request for 1999/00 identified campus needs totaling \$347,797,000. The trustees approved the 1999/00 CSU priority list totaling \$214,898,000 based on the anticipated funding level in the proposed four-year general obligation bond measure. The voter approved bond measure passed on November 3, 1998, by a margin of 62.4 percent to 37.6 percent. The trustees also requested that the chancellor explore with the governor and legislature possibilities of funding the entire program totaling \$347,797,000. The priority list includes completion of previously funded projects, seismic safety, renovation and growth projects for campuses to meet enrollment demands. In addition, continuation of telecommunications infrastructure design is included in the program consistent with systemwide priorities.

The governor's proposed 1999/00 budget is scheduled to be published prior to the January 26-27, 1999, meeting of the Board of Trustees. A comparison between the CSU 1999/00 state funded capital outlay program request and the funding level included in the Governor's Budget will be distributed at the meeting.

## BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3  
January 26-27, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

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

##### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

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

###### *Brief*

This item requests Board of Trustees' certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approval of a revised campus master plan for California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). The purpose of the revision is to increase the master planned on-campus enrollment from 12,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) to 20,000 FTES to accommodate projected enrollment growth. The revised master plan specifies the enrollment and space programs proposed to support the educational mission of the university.

The FEIR analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed master plan in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Board of Trustees must certify the FEIR in order to approve the proposed revisions to the campus master plan.

This item includes the proposed campus master plan with the revisions indicated in hexagons (Attachment A) and the previously approved campus master plan dated May 1988 (Attachment B). The FEIR is included in the agenda mailing.

###### *Executive Summary*

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

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

**(1) Traffic and Noise Impacts of the Arena.** Some comments identified that the new arena with a maximum of 15,000 seats would have the potential to significantly impact Interstate 215 and the interchanges with University Parkway and Palm Avenue. The arena replaces what was originally proposed as an outdoor amphitheater, and eliminates significant noise impact concerns related to a large outdoor amphitheater.

**CSU Response:** The new arena is a long-range component of the campus master plan. It is anticipated to be one of the last elements in the growth of the campus. Estimation of traffic impact for that distant time period, given the conceptual nature of the new arena, is speculative. In addition, due to the trip generation characteristics of the arena, project generated trips would occur during off-peak or evening hours that are less congested than the typical morning and afternoon peak hours. Mitigation proposed at the interchanges at University Parkway and Palm Avenue, as part of the traffic impact analysis, should be adequate to accommodate such off-peak project trips.

2

CPB&G

Agenda Item 3

January 26-27, 1999

**(2) Regional Infrastructure Improvements and Financing.** Related to the traffic issue described above, local municipalities commented that CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off-campus roadway infrastructure mitigation costs that university development will affect.

**CSU Response:** Campus administrators have met with staff of local agencies in order to address these concerns. CSUSB has identified master plan impacts to roadway infrastructure capacity as significant and has identified the regional improvement program to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. However, implementation remains the responsibility of local agencies that have the authority, responsibility, and sources of revenue to implement the appropriate regional roadway infrastructure improvements.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

3  
Agenda Item 3  
January 26-27, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

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

##### **Background**

In November 1989, the Board of Trustees approved the CSU Growth Plan, which directed that proposals be developed for modification of physical master plan ceilings at five campuses including CSUSB. The need for the plan was in response to projected growth in California and CSU's existing mandate to provide educational opportunities to upper division community college transfers and the top one-third of the state's high school graduates. Enrollment at the San Bernardino campus experienced double digit increases per year during the late 1980s plus the last two years. It is anticipated that this level of enrollment growth will continue into the near future based on the projections prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the Inland Empire Economic Council.

CSUSB's current master plan provides for an on-campus enrollment of 12,000 FTES. This master planned enrollment capacity has been in place since July 1973. The Board of Trustees approved the last revision to the plan in May 1988. The purpose of this proposed revision is to increase the master planned capacity from 12,000 FTES to 20,000 FTES to accommodate the projected enrollment growth. Adjustments have been made to the designation, size, and location of proposed academic, administrative, and support facilities, including additional parking. The scope of the plan includes educational, residential, recreational, open and support space requirements, and a land use plan to guide siting of future development.

The following attachments are included in the item:

Attachment A illustrates the proposed 20,000 FTES campus master plan.

Attachment B illustrates the existing 12,000 FTES campus master plan.

Attachment C is the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Attachment D is the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

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

The proposed campus master plan revision adds five new academic buildings to meet the on-campus enrollment ceiling of 20,000 FTES.

The revision also adds seven nonstate buildings, 4,000 parking spaces, a 15-acre site for alternative student and faculty housing, a 5-acre site for an experimental school, and a 10-acre site for auxiliary programs.

##### **Proposed Revisions**

The current campus master plan provides for a number of future buildings and building additions. The proposed 20,000 FTES campus master plan would replace three obsolete initial buildings with

three new facilities and add new buildings to the current master plan. Each of the proposed new facilities is identified with a hexagon numbering system on Attachment A as follows:

A. Previously Approved Minor Master Plan Revisions:

Hexagon 1: Site for Extended Education Addition (#60)

Hexagon 2: Site for University Land Laboratory Preserve (#50)

B. *Future State Funded Facilities:*

Hexagon 3: Replace Initial Building #2 with new Administration Complex (#1)

Hexagon 4: Replace Initial Building #3 with new University Distance Learning Center (#3)

Hexagon 5: Replace Initial Building #1 with new Social & Behavioral Sciences Addition (#53)

Hexagon 6: A new Engineering Building (#54)

Hexagon 7: Revise the site locations for the School of Education Building (#38) and a new School of Education Addition (#57)

Hexagon 8: A School of Business and Public Administration Addition to the existing Jack H. Brown Hall (#58)

Hexagon 9: An addition to existing John M. Pfau Library (#61)

Hexagon 10: An addition to the existing Central Plant (#63)

C. *Future Nonstate Funded Facilities:*

Hexagon 11: An addition to the existing Children's Center (#46)

Hexagon 12: Removal of existing Temporary Modular Units (#201-#215)

Hexagon 13: A Student Union/Bookstore Addition (#52)

Hexagon 14: An Alumni Center (#59)

Hexagon 15: An Arena, with a maximum of 15,000 seats (#65)

Hexagon 16: A 15-acre site for alternative Student and Faculty Housing (#66)

Hexagon 17: A new Baseball Diamond Grandstand with a maximum of 2,000 seats (#67)

Hexagon 18: A new Running Track Grandstand with a maximum of 10,000 seats (#68)

Hexagon 19: A 5-acre site for an Experimental School (#69)

Hexagon 20: A new Information Services Building No. 3 at the northern entry to the campus (#70)

Hexagon 21: A 10-acre site Auxiliary Facilities (#71)

The plan also identifies three new surface parking lots (Parking Lots I, J, and K) for 4,000 additional spaces to serve the increased campus population.

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

The 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR (DEIR) began on September 12, 1996 and was extended for an additional 33 days to close on November 29, 1996. No public comments were received. The state agency review began on October 16, 1996. The following three public agencies submitted written comments on the DEIR:

California Department of Transportation District No. 8  
San Bernardino Associated Governments  
City of San Bernardino

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

- a. Traffic and noise impacts of the arena (formerly proposed as an amphitheater).**
- b. Regional infrastructure improvements and financing.**
- c. Solid waste disposal and recycling.**

Responses have been prepared to address the concerns raised and to indicate where and how the EIR addresses 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 C of the FEIR. Findings of fact and the specific mitigation measures and the appropriate statement of overriding consideration for impacts that cannot be mitigated are found in Attachments C and D of this item. A summary of the responses to these comments follows:

**a. Traffic and noise impacts of the new arena:** The new arena with a maximum of 15,000 seats has the potential to significantly impact Interstate 215 and the interchanges with University Parkway and Palm Avenue. Since a project of this nature typically creates off-peak demand, a separate traffic study should be prepared for this specific use, and consideration might be given to development of Traffic Management Plans to handle special event traffic.

**CSU Response:** The new arena is a long-range component of the CSUSB master plan. The time line for construction of the facility has not yet been established, but it is anticipated to be one of the last elements in the growth of the campus. It is likely that its construction would not occur for more than 15 years. Estimation of traffic impacts for that distant time period given the conceptual nature of the new arena is speculative. In addition, due to the trip generation characteristics of the arena, project-generated trips would occur during off-peak or evening hours that are less congested than the typical morning and afternoon peak hours. Mitigation proposed at the interchanges of University Parkway and Palm Avenue, as part of the traffic impact analysis, should be adequate to accommodate such off-peak project trips. At the time that the arena is actually proposed for development, a traffic study will be conducted (if necessary) to determine the potential effects.

In response to the concerns of potential noise impacts, the formerly proposed open-air amphitheater has now been changed into an enclosed arena. The impact of noise generated by the arena on the surrounding residential areas will be reduced to less than significant. However, a city recommended mitigation measure for a noise hotline to be established after the facility is developed has been added to the FEIR.

**b. Regional infrastructure improvements and financing:** Related to the traffic issue described above, many of the local municipalities commented that the CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off campus roadway infrastructure mitigation costs that university development will affect. Both the DEIR and FEIR explain the legislative requirements for utility infrastructure funding set forth in Government Code Section 54999. Campus administrators have met with the staff of local agencies in an attempt to address these issues.

**CSU Response:** CSUSB has identified master plan impacts to roadway infrastructure capacity as significant and has identified the regional improvement program to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level (mitigation identified in FEIR). However, implementation remains the responsibility of local agencies that have the authority, responsibility, and sources of revenue to implement the regional roadway infrastructure improvements. Without such mitigation, the impact remains significant and unavoidable (refer to Attachment C, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations).

**c. Solid waste disposal and recycling:** The DEIR does not project future waste generation to result from either the expanded student population or the special events. Mitigation measures will include development of a campus-wide Integrated Waste Management Plan to include source reduction and recycling programs. It will be developed in coordination with the City of San Bernardino, Public Services Department Recycling and Environmental Projects Division. It will identify recycling collection programs with targeted materials, destination and markets for these materials.

**CSU Response:** Waste generation of the increased floor space based on the current rate determined by the CSUSB Office of Physical Plant has been added to the EIR text. This estimate of waste generation does not alter the finding of no significant impact based on the available capacity of both the waste hauler and the local landfills. The extent to which special events at the theater and arena could add to the waste stream has been determined to be relatively negligible compared to the much greater generation rate associated with office use, lecture, school cafeteria, and the campus as

a whole. The university already has a campus-wide recycling program, with a goal of reducing waste generation to 0.12 pounds per gross square foot per year. This goal would satisfy regulations governing the amount of institutional waste CSUSB is allowed to dispose of through landfills.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision adds state funded projects at an estimated cost of \$140 million and nonstate funded projects at an estimated cost of \$105 million in current dollars.

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

A comprehensive environmental impact report has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the 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 was prepared in April 1996 for the proposed project. Business associations and other interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the DEIR along with the notice of public review. The public review period ended November 29, 1996. The FEIR incorporates the results of comments received from the distribution of the DEIR. Significant issues derived from those comments were discussed earlier in this item under issues identified through public participation.

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

- Air Quality
- Noise
- Aesthetics
- Traffic
- Geologic Hazards
- Drainage
- Water Quality
- Biology
- Land Use
- Public Services
- Recreation

A complete listing and discussion of impacts and proposed mitigations are included in the FEIR as part of this agenda item.

### **Alternatives**

The alternatives section of the DEIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the 20,000 FTES campus master plan as proposed by the campus.

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

No Project Alternative  
Revised Site Plan – Eliminate Development on Badger Hill  
Reduced Student Capacity – 16,000 FTES

The no project alternative does not serve the university mission.

The revised site plan alternative would eliminate proposed construction on Badger Hill, a prominent natural feature on the campus. The facilities proposed on Badger Hill would be relocated to other areas of the campus. The essential concept of this alternative is incorporated in the proposed campus master plan revision.

The reduced size alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in seven issues, and similar in five issues. However, this alternative would not fully meet the identified need for higher education in this area.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the FEIR prepared for the CSUSB campus master plan revision, the board finds that:

**WHEREAS**, The FEIR for the CSUSB campus master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with the approval of the campus master plan revision and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

**WHEREAS**, The FEIR for the CSUSB campus master plan revision (State Clearinghouse No. 96041050) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and state CEQA Guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines require that the Board of Trustees makes findings prior to approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding); and

**WHEREAS**, This board hereby adopts the findings of fact in Attachment C and related mitigation measures in Attachment D, Agenda Item 3 of the January 26-27, 1999, meeting

of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are hereby incorporated by reference; and

**WHEREAS**, The findings in Attachment C and the related mitigation measures in Attachment D are hereby incorporated by reference and adopted by this board, and said findings include specific overriding considerations which outweigh certain remaining significant impacts; now, be it further

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

**1. Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report**

The FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the CSUSB campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act;

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

Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the CSUSB 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 CSUSB 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 at the meetings; and
- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720 and at the Office of Physical Planning and Development, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397.

10  
CPB&G  
Agenda Item 3  
January 26-27, 1999

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board certifies the FEIR for the CSUSB campus master plan revision; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board adopts the findings set forth in Attachment C of this resolution including the identification of other specific agencies which are the proper agencies responsible for specified traffic mitigation measures; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Matrix, incorporated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan which is Attachment D, Agenda Item 3 of the January 26-27, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the CSUSB campus master plan revision FEIR; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the CSUSB campus master plan revision, dated January 1999, is approved with the goal of serving a total on-campus enrollment of 20,000 FTES.

**Attachment A**  
**CPB&G—Item 3 (2 pages)**

**California State University, San Bernardino**  
***Proposed Campus Master Plan, January 1999***

***See printed Agenda.***

**Attachment B**  
**CPB&G—Item 3 (2 pages)**

**California State University, San Bernardino**  
*Campus Master Plan Approved, May 1988*

*See printed Agenda.*

ATTACHMENT C  
CPB&G—Item 3  
January 26-27, 1999

**California State University, San Bernardino  
Campus Master Plan Revision**

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

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

Final Environmental Impact Report  
State Clearinghouse Number SCH-96041050

Project Files May be Reviewed at:

California State University, San Bernardino  
Office of Physical Planning and Development  
5500 University Parkway  
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397

**CEQA Findings, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations  
Regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the  
CSU San Bernardino, Campus Master Plan Revision**

**SECTION A: INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

**A-1 Purpose**

This statement of findings and overriding considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, addresses the environmental effects associated with construction and operations of the CSUSB 20,000 FTES campus master plan revision dated January 1999. The adverse environmental impacts, including potentially significant impacts of the project, were identified in the FEIR. They are provided herein in accordance with Article 7, Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines as revised.

The CSUSB 20,000 FTES campus master plan revision DEIR identified significant environmental impacts, which will result from the implementation of the updated master plan. Based on comments received by CSUSB from responsible agencies, the FEIR includes additional clarification regarding the potential impacts. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the Lead Agency issue written findings for those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees is the Lead Agency responsible for the preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA.

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

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

- a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
  - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.
  - (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.”

### **A-2 Initial Study and Notice of Preparation**

In accordance with Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Lead Agency must conduct an Initial Study following preliminary review of the project. The Initial Study for the subject EIR was developed based upon early review of the proposed project. Based on the results of the Initial Study and public response, it was determined that an EIR was required. In April 1996, CSUSB distributed a Notice of Preparation, including the Initial Study, to all responsible agencies, interested agencies, and interested groups and individuals, soliciting their comments.

### **A-3 Environmental Impact Report**

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

The DEIR was made available to the public for review on September 12, 1996. The public review of the DEIR was completed on November 29, 1996. All comment letters received were reviewed, and they are reprinted in the FEIR along with responses to all substantive comments. Agencies and citizens who received copies of the DEIR are included in Section A, Response to Comments of the FEIR.

## **SECTION B: FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

The EIR also discussed the following project alternatives:

- A. No Project Alternative
- B. Revised Site Plan - Eliminate Development on Badger Hill
- C. Reduced Student Capacity - 16,000 FTES

The “environmentally superior” alternative is that which causes the least amount of adverse change in the physical environment, which typically is the “no project” alternative. In this instance, the reduced size alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in seven issues, and similar in five issues. However, these alternatives would not fully meet the identified

need for higher education in this area. It would not support the California State University mandate to provide educational opportunities to upper division community college transfers and the top one-third of the state's high school graduates.

**SECTION C: FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT AND POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IDENTIFIED IN THE DEIR AND FEIR**

**C-1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts** are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued per Section 15093 of the state CEQA Guidelines, if the campus master plan revision is approved. Based on the analysis contained herein, the following impacts have been determined to fall within this impact category.

1. Air Quality: Pollutant emissions due to increased vehicular travel to campus.

A statement of overriding considerations is found in Section E below.

2. Noise: General cumulative increase in noise levels due to increased vehicular use.

A statement of overriding considerations is found in Section E below.

3. Traffic and Circulation: Traffic growth related to the increase in students served by the university could cause unacceptable levels of service at local intersections.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified below will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on traffic to a less than significant level. However, because the university cannot commit to funding sources or expenditure of funds for such road improvements, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations is found in Section E below.

**A. The university should increase the use of vanpools in its trip reduction program.**

B. A Bicycle Plan for the campus should be developed. All new buildings included in the revised master plan should incorporate design features in accordance with the Bicycle Plan, such as bicycle/pedestrian pathways, bike storage areas, and designated bike-only paths.

C. The improvements described below will mitigate the significant impacts identified under Year 2015 Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The responsibility for city street improvements rests with the City of San Bernardino. The university can provide additional right-of-way for streets abutting the university where such right-of-way is needed and available for dedication to the city consistent with university program needs. In coordination with the City of San Bernardino, the university will advocate allocation of funding for the recommended improvements from appropriate state, local, and regional sources of street and highway funding.

T-1(a) Palm Avenue/Kendall Drive - Restripe Kendall Drive east and west of Palm Avenue to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound approach and two exclusive left-turn lanes, one through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane on the westbound approach. Widen and restripe the south leg of the intersection to provide one left-turn lane, one through lane, one shared through/right-turn lane and one exclusive right-turn lane on the northbound approach and three departure lanes on the southbound direction.

T-1(b) Palm Avenue/I-215 northbound ramps - Signalize this intersection. Widen the I-215 off-ramp to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane and one exclusive right-turn lane on the westbound approach. Widen and restripe to provide two through lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane on the southbound Palm Avenue approach. This section of the improvement should be coordinated with the widening proposed for the south leg of Palm Avenue/Kendall Drive. Restripe the south leg of the intersection to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and two through lanes on the northbound approach, and three departure lanes on the southbound direction with the inner lane being served as a southbound left-turn lane onto the I-215 on-ramp for the intersection of Palm Avenue/I-215 southbound ramps.

T-1(c) Palm Avenue/I-215 southbound ramps - Signalize this intersection. Widen the I-215 off-ramp to provide one shared left-turn/through lane and two exclusive right-turn lanes on the westbound approach. Restripe the eastbound approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. Restripe to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on the southbound Palm Avenue approach. This section of the improvement should be coordinated with the restriping proposed for the south leg of Palm Avenue/I-215 northbound ramps. Formally restripe Palm Avenue northbound approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane. Parking will be prohibited on the eastside of Palm Avenue.

T-1(d) University Parkway/Northpark Boulevard - Reduce median from the south leg of the intersection and restripe to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes and two exclusive right-turn lanes on the northbound University Parkway approach. The north leg of University Parkway will need to be realigned. Reduce the median from the east leg of the intersection to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on the westbound Northpark Boulevard approach.

T-1(e) University Parkway & Kendall Drive - Reduce the median from the south leg of the intersection to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound University Parkway approach. Reduce the median from the north leg of the intersection to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, three through lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound University Parkway approach. Right-of-way acquisition will be required to provide for the southbound exclusive right-turn lane. Restripe Kendall Drive east and west of University Parkway to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound and westbound Kendall Drive approaches.

T-1(f) University Parkway & I-215 southbound ramps - No mitigation measures are recommended at this location. To fully mitigate the project and cumulative impacts at this location (i.e., attain LOSD or better), it is estimated that construction of a trumpet-style southbound on-ramp in the northwest quadrant of the interchange serving left-turning on-ramp vehicles would be required (right-turning on-ramp vehicles would still use the existing diamond ramp located in the southwest quadrant of the interchange). This reconstruction would entail relocation of the southbound off-ramp to the west and widening of the I-215, including the bridge structure, to provide sufficient acceleration and merging distance. To provide adequate turn radius for the new ramp, right-of-way acquisition would be required. (Not considered feasible at this time.)

T-1(g) Little Mountain Drive/Northpark Boulevard - Signalize this intersection. Remove median from the west leg of the intersection and restripe to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound Northpark Boulevard approach. Restripe westbound approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. Restripe Little Mountain Drive to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach, and one exclusive left-turn lane, one through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound approach.

T-1(h) Kendall Drive & 40th Street - Restripe the southbound Kendall Drive approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one through lane, one shared through/right-turn lane and one exclusive right-turn lane.

T-1(i) Waterman Avenue & SR-30 eastbound ramps - Restripe Waterman Avenue between the SR-30 westbound and eastbound ramps to provide three southbound travel lanes. Two of the three travel lanes will serve as the through lanes on the southbound approach. The inner lane will lead into the exclusive southbound left-turn lanes onto the on-ramp. In addition, the on-ramp will need to be widened to provide two travel lanes. The responsibility for state highway improvements rests with Caltrans. In coordination with Caltrans, the university will advocate allocation of funding for the following highway improvements on I-215 from the appropriate state and regional sources of funding:

Northbound

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| 5th Street to SR 259 | +1 mixed flow, +1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) |
| SR 259 to SR 30      | +1 HOV   |
| SR 30 to University  | +1 mixed flow, +1 HOV                          |
| University to I-215  | +1 HOV   |

Southbound

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Palm to University | +1 HOV                |
| University to 27th | +1 mixed flow, +1 HOV |
| 27th to Baseline   | +1 HOV                |
| Baseline to 5th    | +1 mixed flow, +1 HOV |

**C-2 Significant But Mitigable Impacts** are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines. The following impacts have been determined to be significant but mitigable given the measures identified herein.

1. Aesthetics: Development and grading at the base of Badger Hill and loss of mature trees, increased parking areas and parking structure, additional light and glare, especially that associated with lighting the track field.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on aesthetics to a less than significant level:

- A. All mature trees measuring greater than 6" in diameter at the base of the trunk which would be removed for the construction of new structures shall be replaced with 5-gallon tree transplants at a one-for-one ratio.
  - B. All surface parking areas shall include a minimum of 15 percent landscaped area.
  - C. The proposed parking structure shall incorporate design details to minimize its bulk and to ensure design compatibility with campus structures.
  - D. Grading method for projects at Badger Hill should comply with the intent of the City of San Bernardino Hillside Management Overlay Zone with respect to visual effects. Facilities proposed for development on or at the base of Badger Hill are relocated to other areas of the campus.
  - E. Illumination of the parking lot should be designed in a manner that minimizes the nighttime impact. Light standards shall be designed to achieve one (1) foot-candle at the property line, considering weather conditions.
2. Geologic Hazards: Potentially unstable cut slopes, hazards from strong ground shaking during earthquakes.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on geologic hazards to a less than significant level:

- A. Fill material shall be placed and compacted to minimize settling that could occur with seismic ground shaking. Landslides, unstable rock slopes and debris flows shall be stabilized to prevent movement during or following an earthquake.
- B. If liquefiable soils are encountered during grading, then proper re-engineering of the soils shall be performed or the proposed structures moved to areas away from liquefiable soils.

3. Air Quality: Construction-related dust.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on air quality to a less than significant level:

- A. Water trucks shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site.
- B. Amounts of disturbed area shall be minimized and onsite vehicle speeds shall be reduced to 15 mph or less. Grading is not to be performed during the rainy period (October 1 to April 15) unless the grading plans include provisions to mitigate erosion, flooding, or the deposition of sediment or debris. Grading performed during the rest of the year should incorporate appropriate dust suppression.
- C. If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil with 5 percent or greater silt content that is stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- D. After clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation are completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, or revegetation, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed.

4. Wind: High wind hazards.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect of high wind to a less than significant level:

- A. All structures shall be designed to withstand wind loadings using the highest wind factor in the most recent update of the Uniform Building Code.
- B. Choice of landscaping trees should be limited to those capable of withstanding high wind loads on their larger branches. Trees should be chosen for deep rooting characteristics and irrigation system design and watering schedules shall be formulated to encourage deep rooting.
- C. Building design and orientation shall consider the strongest winds coming from the northern quadrant. In particular, the wind flow around the proposed engineering building should be investigated during its design.

5. Drainage: Erosion and debris flow hazards.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measure will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on drainage to a less than significant level:

A. As necessary, a specific drainage study and plan for identified facilities shall be prepared during the design stage to delineate the erosion and debris flow hazard and provide appropriate solutions.

6. Water Quality: Construction-related sedimentation and pollutant discharge, additional oil and grease emissions into surface water runoff from new parking lots.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on water quality to a less than significant level:

A. The university shall require the contractor for each new facility subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing specific Best Management Practices to be instituted during site construction.

B. The university shall require construction of oil and grease traps within catch basins for the parking lots and /or construct perimeter infiltration trenches. The catch basin shall include a trap that prevents floatables from discharging with the drainage water.

7. Biology: Possible disturbance and loss of habitat for Parry Spine Flower and San Diego Horned Lizard.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on biology to a less than significant level:

A. At the time that specific development or landscaping plans associated with construction of the education building, Parking Lot I and the arena are proposed, a botanical survey will be required during the spring to search for and confirm the presence or absence of sensitive species, in particular, the Parry Spine Flower. If such species are found, the botanical report shall contain recommendations to reduce the impact on these species, such as: avoidance and retention of the natural habitat, collection and redistribution of this annual's seeds to adjacent suitable habitat, or maintenance of a suitable habitat within naturalized landscaping designs.

B. Construction workers shall be notified through preconstruction meetings that a variety of sensitive wildlife are present at the site and that they shall not willfully harm any species, especially snakes and other reptiles. During the construction meeting, the proper method of moving snakes from construction zones shall be illustrated.

- C. When development is proposed for areas occupied by sage scrub vegetation, a site-specific biological survey for horned lizards shall be conducted. If San Diego Horned Lizards are discovered, a capture and offsite relocation plan shall be developed for this species.
8. Land Use: Potential inconsistency of proposed arena with city hillside development policies, land use compatibility of lighted fields and parking lots with adjacent residential land use.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on land use to a less than significant level:

- A. Concurrent with the adoption of the campus master plan revision, the university shall recommend that the City of San Bernardino process a General Plan Amendment to apply PF-Public Facilities to all university land. Such an amendment would clarify the long-range planning intent of university properties for uses in support of university functions.
  - B. As applicable and prior to proceeding with construction of the arena, the university shall in its design of the facility meet the intent of the Design and Development Guidelines 1.14.30 through 41, governing development within the Hillside Management Overlay District. The university shall meet with the city to review these plans.
  - C. All lighting shall be designed in a manner to minimize spillage of light pools from the immediate field and grandstand areas.
  - D. A windrow of trees shall be incorporated into the landscape plan within the setback area of the extended Little Mountain Drive directly between the university campus and any adjoining RS - Residential Single-family uses to shield residential areas from stadium lighting.
  - E. Vehicular ingress or egress to parking areas provided along the extended Little Mountain Drive shall not immediately face residential areas designated RS in city zoning.
9. Noise: Amplified music at the arena, formerly proposed as an open amphitheater.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that with the change of the open amphitheater to an enclosed arena the potentially significant effect of noise on surrounding residences will be reduced to a less than significant level.

10. Public Services: Increased demand for police services due to increased campus size and special events, increased fire danger from expansion into fire hazard zone, and additional solid waste, which would result in a less than significant effect on the local collection services and land fill capacity.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on public services to a less than significant level:

- A. To further prevent crime and reduce the demands on police services, the university shall consult with the university police department to use landscape and architectural designs that deter crime and contribute to a safe environment.
  - B. The university shall develop a plan to provide police and security services for special events including parking attendants, ushers and other security staff as needed.
  - C. The university shall design its buildings and landscaping to reduce the risk of fire through the proper choice of building materials and landscaping, provision of interior sprinklers, and the provision of adequate fire hydrants and water flow.
  - D. A long-term plan for recycling should be developed with specific collection goals for each recyclable material category and a method to track quantities of materials.
  - E. The university should promote the use of materials with recycled material content in them.
  - F. A source reduction plan should be developed and integrated with a long term recycling plan.
11. Recreation: Conflict with planned trail alignments, increased demand on bike path system.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on recreation to a less than significant level:

- A. The university shall cooperate with the county to implement the planned trail system through the inclusion of the Devil's Canyon connector in the master plan.
- B. The university shall incorporate a bicycle facility component in the master plan.

#### **SECTION D: LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND BENEFICIAL EFFECTS**

**D-1 Less Than Significant Impacts** are those effects that have been determined to not be significant because they do not exceed the thresholds of such a determination. The following issues have been determined to be less than significant.

- 1. Geologic Hazards: Liquefaction and surface rupture
- 2. Drainage: Additional storm water flows from campus
- 3. Biology: General loss of plant and wildlife habitat in development area
- 4. Noise: Noise during construction
- 5. Population: Increased number of people in city, increased employment
- 6. Public Services: Increase in emergency calls, effects on local K-12 schools, increased wastewater flows, increased solid waste
- 7. Public Utilities: Increased electrical power use, natural gas use, and water consumption
- 8. Cultural Resources: Damage to unknown buried fossils or archaeological deposits
- 9. Aesthetics: Alteration of views along Northpark Boulevard

**D-2 Beneficial Effects** are those effects of the project that are considered to be potentially beneficial to the local community.

1. Provision of additional higher education facilities to meet the needs of the local populace.
2. Reduction of existing drainage facilities deficiencies within the campus.
3. Long term preservation of plant and wildlife habitat on Badger Hill.
4. Expanded recreational facilities within the campus that serve the general public.
5. Ultimate build out of the master planned site will provide a beneficial impact on the aesthetics of the built environment of the academic core.

## **SECTION E: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

Notwithstanding the disclosure of the significant effects and the mitigation measures described above, the Board of Trustees has determined that the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the adverse impacts and the project should be approved. With reference to the above findings and in recognition of those facts, which are included in the record, the Board of Trustees has determined that the project will have environmental impacts.

The Board of Trustees specifically finds and makes this statement of overriding considerations that there are special, social and economic reasons for approving this project, notwithstanding the disclosure of substantial adverse impacts in the FEIR. The reasons are as follows:

1. The CSU's long-range study has identified the need for growth at existing campuses beyond their current master planned capacities and/or additional campuses to serve the state's population.
2. The primary mission of the CSU is to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degrees with admission priorities accorded to upper-division transfers from community colleges and to freshmen from the top one-third of the state's high school graduating classes. The CSU is an essential component of California's higher education system and is a major resource for the economic and cultural well being of the state.
3. CSUSB has a primary two-county service area including San Bernardino and Riverside counties. In 1997, the population in the two counties totaled 2.97 million. The State Department of Finance projects a 26.8 percent population increase over the 1990 population figures by the year 2000. In addition to the overall increase in population, the mix of the population is increasingly ethnically diverse.
4. The project will have positive humanistic, educational and cultural impacts on the area.
5. The university alone cannot eliminate the use of private vehicles in the vicinity of the campus. Further, the university cannot refuse to accommodate vehicles without having an adverse impact on other activities surrounding the university. The university is taking positive steps to support alternative modes of transportation. Nevertheless, based on travel habits similar to those currently exhibited by students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the campus, there is a need to provide for additional parking when the population approaches 20,000 FTES. This requirement for additional parking results in the conversion of 20 acres of undeveloped land to parking use.

6. The solution to regional air quality problems through this project is beyond the reasonable capability of the university and will ultimately require community and societal changes in lifestyles and technology. The university has committed itself to seek alternatives to the automobile as opportunities and funds become available. Until workable community-wide solutions are devised, the university must continue to accommodate and provide for the education of those who choose to come to the university in vehicles, as well as those using alternative forms of transportation.

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

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report based on the attached Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Plan shall be prepared for this project by campus staff until project completion or until compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file in Capital Planning, Design and Construction, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720, and the Office of Physical Planning and Development, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, California, 92407-2397. The report shall describe the status of all mitigation measures for the project adopted by the Board of Trustees.
3. Once significant construction is begun and under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the designated university construction supervision staff, who shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is complete and occupied.
4. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the senior vice chancellor, business and finance. Reference to such changes shall be made in the annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

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

**Attachment D**  
**CPB&G—Item 3 (6 pages • *charts*)**

**California State University, San Bernardino**  
**Campus Master Plan Revision**  
**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Plan**

*See printed Agenda.*

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 4  
January 26-27, 1999

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

**Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Northridge—Arts, Media, and Communication Building**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

Schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge—Arts, Media, and Communication Building will be presented for approval.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4  
January 26-27, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Northridge—Arts, Media, and Communication Building**

Project Architect: Fields/Devereaux Architects in association with Robert A. M. Stern Architects

#### **Background**

Damage caused by the 1994 Northridge earthquake resulted in the demolition of the fine arts building, which housed many components of the College of Arts, Media, and Communication. This project is a partial replacement of the fine arts building and will enable the college departments to move into permanent facilities. The proposed visual arts building will complete the replacement of the fine arts building.

#### **Scope**

The proposed 65,000 gross square foot building will be located at the southwest corner of Sierra Quad, immediately north of the music and speech/drama buildings. The three-story building will create a strong presence for the College of Arts, Media and Communication in the heart of the campus. The L-shaped plan opens southward providing a smaller quadrangle. The departments of Journalism, Communication Studies, and Radio, Television, and Film will share the facility and provide opportunities for interdisciplinary studies. Public spaces are concentrated on the first floor of the northern wing, including an art gallery, film screening room, lecture rooms, and the campus newspaper. Laboratory and faculty offices occupy the upper two floors of this wing. The southern wing houses entertainment-industry technical spaces including soundstages, blue-screen and Foley stages, plus film, video, and audio editing laboratories.

The building will have brick facing up to the one-story level and glazing on the two upper stories. The brick wall provides the display area for the art gallery and is on one edge of an interaction space. The glazed gallery provides natural light for all three floors by day and an articulation of the activities within by night. A series of columns matches the columns of the Oviatt Library across the quad.

#### **Timing (Estimated)**

|                                    |               |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Completion of Preliminary Drawings | February 1999 |
| Completion of Working Drawings     | May 1999      |
| Construction Start                 | July 1999     |
| Occupancy                          | August 2000   |

#### **Basic Statistics**

|                          |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Gross Building Area      | 65,000 square feet |
| Assignable Building Area | 50,100 square feet |
| Efficiency               | 76.9%              |

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3722**

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Building Cost (\$199 per gross square foot)      | \$12,960,000     |
| Site Development                                 | 337,000          |
| Group I Equipment                                | <u>588,000</u>   |
| Construction Cost                                | \$13,885,000     |
| Fees and Contingency                             | <u>2,943,000</u> |
| Total Project Cost (\$259 per gross square foot) | \$16,828,000     |
| Group II Equipment                               | <u>0</u>         |
| Grand Total                                      | \$16,828,000     |

**Funding Data**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency and the California Office of Emergency Services will provide funding for the project.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

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

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The Final MEIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously approved by this Board of Trustees on May 13, 1998, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final MEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and

4

CPB&G

Agenda Item 4

January 26-27, 1999

3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and
4. The project will benefit The California State University; and, be it further

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

**RESOLVED**, That mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees as Attachment D of Agenda Item 5, master plan revision and Final MEIR certification, approved on May 13, 1998, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor is requested, under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Northridge, Arts, Media, and Communication Building; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Arts, Media, and Communication Building are approved at a project cost of \$16,828,000 at CCCI 3722.