

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 3:15 p.m., Tuesday, May 11, 1999
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Ali C. Razi, Chair
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
Eric C. Mitchell
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Michael D. Stennis

Consent Item

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1999

1. Amend the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University, *Action*
3. Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

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

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

March 16, 1999

Members Present

Ali C. Razi, Chair
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Harold Goldwhite
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Eric C. Mitchell
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Frederick W. Pierce IV
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

Chancellor's Office Staff

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafacci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources
J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

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 4:37 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 26, 1999, meeting were approved as submitted.

Amend the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

This item was taken off the consent calendar and moved for discussion after San Francisco State University's "Village at Centennial Square" schematic and master plan presentation.

Mr. Drohan asked the committee's approval to amend the 1998/99 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to include the projects as outlined in the printed agenda.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-99-03).

Professional Appointments

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

Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Chair Razi introduced Patrick Drohan, senior director, capital planning, design and construction, to present the item.

Referring to the status report handout, Mr. Drohan reviewed the information as shown. He recapped briefly the actions of the Board of Trustees at their September 1998 meeting pertaining to their capital outlay budget request. Mr. Drohan stated that the status report that was before them has a third column identifying the actions of the legislative analyst with regard to their recommendations on the capital outlay program proposed by the governor. He indicated that staff is continuing to have discussions with the committee members in both houses to seek their support for the Governor's Budget. At the same time, staff is also negotiating with the governor's administration in an effort to restore the projects that were deferred or deleted from the original trustees' budget request. Final actions of the Department of Finance will be known after its April 1 technical letter of adjustment is released.

Trustee Wang indicated that it appeared to him that the legislative analyst was recommending the deletion from the budget of the funding for the San Jose State University Joint Library project and asked if there was a possibility of revising that action.

Mr. Drohan said that the legislative analyst's recommended deletion of the project was based on several items of concern. They are costs, need, and the issue of the joint ownership elements of this library project. He stated that staff is attempting to correct some misperceptions regarding the lack of need and to identify for the analyst some oversights with respect to the cost elements. Staff has brought to their attention that the documents signed by both the city and the university clearly delineate the conditions pertaining to the joint ownership issue. In the end, the staffs of the CSU and legislative analyst will probably agree to disagree, requiring the solicitation of support of the legislative committee members.

Richard P. West, executive vice chancellor and chief financial officer, pointed out that it is the intent of both the Department of Finance and the CSU to persuade the legislature to reject all of the legislative analyst's recommendations so the CSU can keep the trustee-approved programs, including the reinstatement of the projects that were deleted in the Governor's Budget.

Trustee Wang inquired as to the reason in the large difference between the trustees' request and the Governor's Budget in funding for the San Jose State University Joint Library project—\$26 million vs. \$70 million, respectively.

Mr. West stated that trustee-approved project was proposed to be funded over a two-year period with \$26 million for the first year and \$43 million in the second year. The Department of Finance, however, recommended that the total funding be granted in one year only. Therefore, the total funding is about the same.

Categories and Criteria for the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Mr. Drohan summarized the item as printed in the agenda.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-99-04).

Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision and Schematic Plans for The Village at Centennial Square—San Francisco State University

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. He stated that the appropriate CEQA documentation had been prepared and reviewed, and no adverse comments were received during the public review period.

At Chair Razi's invitation for comments, President Corrigan stated that this master plan revision included on-campus housing, a student services building, and off-street parking. He continued by saying that it is the intent of the university for the student services building to house all of the student services and the cashier's office, thus allowing the students to be served morning, noon and night. This facility is viewed as being important since it will serve the entire student population.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel inquired as to why the university does not plan to build a more than 760-bed housing facility in view of the fact that there is a current waiting list of 800.

President Corrigan responded that the funding mechanism has limited the university from building a larger housing facility at this time. It is hoped that in the future the revenue stream will be sufficient to allow the university to replace both the Mary Ward and Mary Park housing facilities with new student housing. President Corrigan said that the 800-wait list for student housing is a relatively new phenomenon and is probably the result of a lack of affordable housing in San Francisco.

Mr. Jeff Goldblat, a speaker from the audience, made a few comments on the use of campus land with respect to retrofitting vs. replacing Verducci Hall. Since San Francisco State University occupies a very small parcel of land, it is Mr. Goldblat's is feeling that retrofitting Verducci Hall would house a large number of students on a small footprint of land, leaving plenty of room for an additional parking garage. Replacing Verducci Hall with the construction of the new village apartments will occupy a much larger footprint and will not house any more students than the existing student hall.

With respect to the severe parking shortage, Mr. Goldblat stated that with the building of a 130-car garage, no additional parking spaces would be created. It will merely replace the existing 120-car parking garage that is being sacrificed to construct the new apartments, thus continuing a campus hardship.

Trustee Pierce stated his concern regarding the cost to build the proposed housing project. He has personal knowledge of a wood frame apartment building over a level of underground parking, presently under construction, with a turnkey construction contract cost of \$75 a square foot. This includes the parking garage. The subject project has a turnkey budget of \$136 a square foot.

Chair Razi asked the project architect to respond to Trustee Pierce's concern. Trustee Otomo-Corgel also asked if the architect would speak to the earthquake risk in the San Francisco area and whether or not the building would withstand a magnitude 6.0–8.3 earthquake.

Mr. Steve Kalmbach, vice president of Catellus Residential Group, stated that he would need to defer on the earthquake question since he is not a seismic specialist. He continued by saying that Catellus is very familiar with building costs in the San Francisco market and, unfortunately, those costs really do not bear much relationship to most areas in California. Catellus hired a cost estimator to work with them on this project who has been a consultant to six or seven Type I and Type V projects in the San Francisco market. Mr. Kalmbach's firm is currently close to breaking ground on a major Type V and Type I, 8,000-unit residential project located across from the new ball park in San Francisco. Therefore, Catellus has significant background and information on what it costs to build in this market.

Mr. Kalmbach indicated that there are three or four other projects under construction in San Francisco that are Type I constructions, steel and concrete, at a possible \$125 per square foot cost. Catellus' numbers associate with those numbers. The proposed buildings located to the left of the subject site plan are on top of the parking garage. When a project is over four levels of residential housing, you are required to use Type I construction. The building to the right of the subject site plan will be built on grade, a Type V construction. That product is an approximately \$95-\$105 per square foot building cost.

In summary, Mr. Kalmbach stated the two reasons for the project's high cost are (1) San Francisco is a high-cost building market, and (2) the prevailing wage and union labor cost is approximately 15-20 percent higher than other California markets.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-99-05).

Approval of Schematic Plans

President Suzuki gave brief comments regarding the two projects. With the use of a short visual presentation, Mr. Drohan asked the committee's approval of the item as printed in the agenda.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-99-06).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
May 11-12, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1998/99 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- | | | |
|---|------|-------------|
| 1. California State University, Dominguez Hills
Parking Lot #7 | PWC | \$897,000 |
| 2. California State University, Monterey Bay
Renovation of Building 45a—Classrooms/Faculty Offices | PWCE | \$928,000 |
| 3. California State University, San Marcos
Field House and Student Union Offices | PWCE | \$7,124,000 |

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1998/99 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: (1) \$897,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, Parking Lot #7; (2) \$928,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for California State University, Monterey Bay, Renovation of Building 45a-Classrooms/Faculty Offices; and (3) \$7,124,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for California State University, San Marcos, Field House and Student Union Offices.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 2
May 11-12, 1999

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, 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 San Diego State University (SDSU). The campus master plan revision proposes to improve, enhance and rehabilitate several core areas of the SDSU campus, including the consolidation and redevelopment of SDSU's athletic, recreational and student housing resources. Replacement locations for parking and utility facilities are also part of the proposed revision. The project components are located in the western and eastern portions of the SDSU campus and include parking, athletic facilities, SDSU Aztrack lighting, campus mall and street improvements, housing, and a cogeneration facility and chiller plant.

The FEIR analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed campus master plan revision in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under CEQA in order to approve the campus master plan revision.

This item includes the proposed campus master plan with the revisions indicated in hexagons (Attachment A) and the previously approved campus master plan dated September 1998 (Attachment B). The FEIR is included in the agenda mailing.

Executive Summary

This executive summary identifies potential contested issues raised through public participation, with CSU responses.

(1) Traffic and Access Issues. Some comments questioned the traffic impacts due to inbound left-turn trips at the intersection of College Avenue and Street Z in terms of intersection capacity.

CSU Response: Overall, the proposed project is estimated to generate 40 inbound and 30 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday morning peak-hour, and 35 inbound and 74 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday evening peak-hour. This amount of traffic is principally due to the redistribution of traffic relating to construction of a new parking structure (Parking Structure 6). However, due to traffic signalization improvements to control left-turn inbound trips in the vicinity of Street Z, which are proposed as mitigation for the College Area Redevelopment Project, this intersection impact would be reduced to less than significant levels, as defined in the traffic study which is part of the FEIR.

(2) Regional Infrastructure Improvements and Financing. Related to the traffic issue described above, some comments stated that CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off-campus roadway infrastructure costs that will be affected by campus development.

CSU Response: SDSU campus personnel have met with staff of the City of San Diego in order to address regional concerns. SDSU has identified master plan impacts to roadway infrastructure capacity as significant without mitigation, and has identified the regional improvement program to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation to reduce project traffic impacts to less than significant levels. However, monitoring and implementation of the mitigation required under the College Area Redevelopment Project remains the responsibility of the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency, which is vested with the authority, responsibility and sources of revenue to implement the appropriate regional roadway infrastructure improvements.

(3) Western Campus Boundary. Some comments questioned the interface between the proposed new tennis courts/parking structure (Parking Structure 7) and the existing residences located along Hewlett Drive on the western boundary of the SDSU campus.

CSU Response: The visual quality section of the FEIR considered the western project components adjacent to the existing residences along Hewlett Drive. According to the FEIR, the proposed project components, which would be located approximately 20 feet from the existing property line to the west, would not represent a further extension of improvements to the west when compared with existing residence hall and parking lot uses on the western boundary of the SDSU campus. However, absent mitigation, these project components would represent abrupt changes when compared to existing uses. In response, the FEIR recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt as mitigation: setbacks, wall construction and landscape treatment to be implemented during project construction along the western boundary of the campus. Inclusion of these mitigation measures would minimize impacts to less than significant levels. SDSU representatives also met with area neighbors to obtain their input on the wall construction and landscape treatment in an effort to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

3
CPB&G
Agenda Item 2
May 11-12, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

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

Background

The SDSU campus master plan revision has been proposed to improve, enhance and rehabilitate several core areas of the SDSU campus. The primary goal is to create a template of uniform planning for future development within certain areas of the campus. The project components have been designed to be consistent with the SDSU *Physical Master Plan, Phase 1, Existing Conditions*, dated November 1997, which sets forth guidelines for campus pedestrian malls, landscaping, lighting, visual quality, open areas and other campus features. This campus master plan revision would result in consolidation and redevelopment of SDSU's athletic, recreational and student housing resources. In order to complete the redevelopment of athletic and recreation areas, replacement locations for parking and utility facilities have been proposed as well. The project components are located in both the western and eastern portions of the SDSU campus.

The project components located in the western portion of the campus consist of construction of an aquaplex, a tennis court facility and parking structure, an athletics administration building and hall of fame, a softball field and parking lot, a racquetball court facility, campus open area, the addition of lighting to the SDSU Aztrack, and campus mall and street improvements. The project components located in the eastern portion of the campus consist of construction of replacement residence hall housing, a cogeneration facility and chiller plant to service campus needs, and a new parking structure to accommodate on-campus parking needs. To provide space for new utilities, an existing residence hall structure would be demolished.

The Board of Trustees approved the existing SDSU campus master plan in September 1998, with a master plan student enrollment of 25,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES). The focus of the plan is on the campus boundaries, parking facilities, and existing and future campus buildings and structures. The *proposed* SDSU campus master plan revision reflects the project components described above. The campus master plan revision would not increase or otherwise impact the master plan FTE student enrollment for the SDSU campus.

The following attachments are included in this item:

Attachment A illustrates the proposed campus master plan (May 1999).

Attachment B illustrates the existing campus master plan (September 1998).

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

Attachment D is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

Master Plan Summary

The proposed campus master plan revision adds new athletic, recreational and student housing facilities to meet the existing approved on-campus enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTE students. Replacement locations for parking and utility facilities are also included in the campus master plan revision.

Proposed Revisions

The proposed revisions are identified with a hexagon numbering system on Attachment A as follows:

- Hexagon 1: Site for new Aquaplex
- Hexagon 2: Site for new Tennis Court Facility/Parking Structure 7
- Hexagon 3: Site for new Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame
- Hexagon 4: Site for new Softball Field and Parking Lot
- Hexagon 5: Site for Racquetball Courts
- Hexagon 6: Open Area/Improvements
- Hexagon 7: Lighting of Aztrack
- Hexagon 8: Aztec Walk Campus Mall and Street Improvements
- Hexagon 9: Replacement Residence Hall Housing
- Hexagon 10: Site for Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant
- Hexagon 11: Site for new Parking Structure 6

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

The 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR (DEIR) began on February 11, 1999, and ended on March 29, 1999. Public comments were received on the DEIR. The following public agencies submitted comments on the DEIR: The City of San Diego and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB).

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

- (a) Traffic and Access Issues
- (b) Regional Infrastructure Improvements and Financing
- (c) Western Campus Boundary
- (d) Street/Pedestrian Crossing
- (e) Lighting Impacts
- (f) MTDB Transit Bus Mall

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 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 Access Issues. Some comments questioned the traffic impacts due to inbound left-turn trips at the intersection of College Avenue and Street Z in terms of intersection capacity.

CSU Response: Overall, the proposed project is estimated to generate 40 inbound and 30 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday morning peak-hour, and 35 inbound and 74 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday evening peak-hour. This amount of traffic is principally due to the redistribution of traffic relating to construction of a new parking structure (Parking Structure 6). However, due to traffic signalization improvements to control left-turn inbound trips in the vicinity of Street Z, which are proposed as mitigation for the College Area Redevelopment project, this intersection impact would be reduced to less than significant levels.

(b) Regional Infrastructure Improvements and Financing. Related to the traffic issue described above, some comments stated that CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off-campus roadway infrastructure costs that will be affected by campus development.

CSU Response: SDSU campus personnel have met with staff of the City of San Diego in order to address regional concerns. SDSU has identified master plan impacts to roadway infrastructure capacity as significant without mitigation, and has identified the regional improvement program to be implemented as the appropriate mitigation to reduce project traffic impacts to less than significant levels. However, monitoring and implementation of the mitigation required under the College Area Redevelopment project remains the responsibility of the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency which is vested with the authority, responsibility and sources of revenue to implement the appropriate regional roadway infrastructure improvements.

(c) Western Campus Boundary. Some comments questioned the interface between the proposed new tennis courts/parking structure (Parking Structure 7) and the existing residences located along Hewlett Drive on the western boundary of the SDSU campus.

CSU Response: The visual quality section of the FEIR considered the western project components adjacent to the existing residences along Hewlett Drive. According to the FEIR, the proposed project components, which would be located approximately 20 feet from the existing property line to the west would not represent a further extension of improvements to the west when compared with existing residence hall and parking lot uses on the western boundary of the SDSU campus. However, absent mitigation, these project components would represent abrupt changes when compared to existing uses. In response, the FEIR recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt as mitigation: setbacks, wall construction and landscape treatment to be implemented during project construction along the western boundary of the campus. Inclusion of these mitigation measures would minimize impacts to less than significant levels. SDSU representatives also met with area neighbors to obtain their input on the wall construction and landscape treatment in an effort to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

(d) Street/Pedestrian Crossing. Some comments expressed concern that there should be a pedestrian crossing on campus at 55th Street.

CSU Response: The pedestrian crossing at 55th Street was addressed in a prior campus master plan revision and included in the SDSU Parking Structure 5 project FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 98021065). The university is presently developing engineering studies for a pedestrian underpass at 55th Street to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection in the vicinity of the proposed Aztec Walk.

(e) Lighting Impacts. Some comments expressed concern regarding the lighting proposed for the Aztec Walk.

CSU Response: All new lighting proposed as part of the Aztec Walk will comply with campus lighting standards and the university's lighting policy, as reflected in the SDSU *Physical Master Plan, Phase 1, Existing Conditions*, dated November 1997.

(f) MTDB Transit Bus Mall. Some comments have expressed concern regarding traffic impacts resulting from the MTDB bus center design and related pedestrian/transit mall revisions, which are part of the MTDB Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit project (hereafter, "the MTDB project"). The specific concern is whether traffic impacts and traffic/pedestrian conflicts will arise when the MTDB project is considered in conjunction with the Aztec Walk component of the proposed SDSU campus master plan revision. As discussed below, the Aztec Walk component is a proposed east-west pedestrian mall located along the southern boundary of the campus.

CSU Response: The MTDB project is separate from the proposed SDSU campus master plan revision. Since this is a separate project with its own CEQA requirements, the CSU has no requirement to include it as part of its master plan. However, the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision has addressed the MTDB project as a related project for cumulative impact assessment purposes. This assessment was performed because the MTDB project proposes to utilize a portion of the proposed east-west Aztec Walk pedestrian mall area located between Campanile Drive and College Avenue on the SDSU campus. An agreement for its use will be granted as an easement at a future date. As proposed, the east-west Aztec Walk pedestrian mall would serve as a primary pedestrian walkway to facilitate pedestrian circulation on campus, and to encourage the use of mass transit facilities, including bus and light rail stations, to reduce traffic congestion within the campus community. This pedestrian mall component is consistent with the pedestrian circulation goals and objectives set forth in Section 4.15 of the SDSU *Physical Master Plan, Phase I, Existing Conditions*, dated November 1997.

In conjunction with the proposed Aztec Walk pedestrian walkway, the university proposes to construct the pedestrian walkway in such a way as to not impair or impede any portion of the MTDB project, which calls for the use of a portion of that pedestrian mall area for the routing of buses to the MTDB bus transit center. In fact, the university plans to ensure that the proposed Aztec Walk pedestrian mall area is separated from vehicular traffic through a landscaped median. This median would also permit the installation of a bike lane to further facilitate bicycle use through the east-west portions of the campus.

The MTDB has provided the university with a supplemental traffic analysis assessing the traffic and intersection conditions associated with the MTDB project in conjunction with the Aztec Walk pedestrian mall area. This traffic analysis has concluded that the MTDB bus operations would not have any significant impact on the level of service of adjacent intersections and roadways, including College Avenue.

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision adds nonstate funded projects at an estimated cost of \$115 million in current dollars.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A comprehensive final environmental impact report (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 was prepared in October 1998, for the proposed campus master plan revision (*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 proposed project. The campus also held a public information meeting on October 20, 1998, to obtain public input on both the proposed project and the DEIR. In addition, the campus prepared a revised NOP/Initial Study for the proposed project, which was necessitated by a project modification adding a new parking structure (Parking Structure 6) to accommodate existing and projected on-campus parking needs. On February 17, 1999, the campus held a public information meeting to obtain public comment on the DEIR. On March 16, 1999, the campus also held a focus group meeting for area residents adjacent to the western campus boundary. The purpose of this meeting was to obtain additional input with respect to potential impacts of the proposed project.

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 proposed resolution contained in this item:

- Geotechnical and Soil Resources
- Water Quality/Hydrology
- Biological Resources
- Visual Quality
- Traffic/Access/Parking
- Noise
- Air Quality

A complete listing and discussion of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures are included in the FEIR as part of this agenda item. In addition, the FEIR includes the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, describing the procedures that will be used to implement the mitigation measures.

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, including revisions to the SDSU campus master plan dated May 1999, as proposed by the campus.

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

Alternative 2—A-W-1 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility in the basement of the proposed Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame.

Alternative 3—A-E-1 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility in the basement of the dining hall portion of the proposed Replacement Residence Hall complex.

Alternative 4—A-E-2 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Replacement Residence Hall complex on the site designated for that complex under the proposed project against the construction of the complex on campus Parking Lot C.

Alternative 5—A-W-2 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Parking Structure 7 on the site designated for that structure under the proposed project against the construction of Parking Structure 7 beneath the proposed Softball Field.

Alternative 6—A-W-3 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Parking Structure 6 on the site designated for that structure under the proposed project against the construction of the parking structure on campus Parking Lot W.

For a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed project, please see the alternatives section of the FEIR. The alternatives to the proposed project 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 (Attachment C) 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 upon consideration of the information contained in the FEIR prepared for the SDSU campus master plan revision, the board finds that:

WHEREAS, 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 the campus master plan revision, and all discretionary actions relating thereto, and those revisions consist of the following project components: (1) Construction of an aquaplex, a tennis court facility and parking structure (Parking Structure 7), an athletics administration building and hall of fame, a softball field and parking lot, a racquetball court facility, campus open area, the addition of lighting to the SDSU Aztrack, and campus mall and street improvements; and (2) Construction of replacement residence hall housing, a cogeneration facility and chiller plant, and a new parking structure (Parking Structure 6); and

WHEREAS, The FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision (State Clearinghouse No. 98111063) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

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

WHEREAS, This board hereby adopts the findings of fact in Attachment C and related mitigation measures in Attachment D, Agenda Item 2 of the May 11-12, 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 incorporated by reference; and

WHEREAS, The findings in Attachment C and the related mitigation measures in Attachment D are incorporated by reference and adopted by this board, and those 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 SDSU campus master plan revision pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines;

2. Review and Consideration by the Board of Trustees

Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the 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, including comments received on the DEIR and responses to comments;
- C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced prior to or at the meetings; and
- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

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

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision, including its component construction projects; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for each of the component construction projects identified in the Project Description, 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; and, be it further

RESOLVED, 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 and Reporting Plan, which is Attachment D, Agenda Item 2 of the May 11-12, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6); and, be it further

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University adopts the SDSU campus master plan revision, dated May 1999, and approves the proposed project as described in the FEIR.

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment A
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment B
Item 2

ATTACHMENT C
CPB&G—Item 2
May 11-12, 1999

**San Diego State University
Campus Master Plan Revision**

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

(Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and
Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code)

Final Environmental Impact Report
(State Clearinghouse Number 98111063)

Project Files May Be Reviewed at:

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

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

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Purpose

This statement of findings and overriding considerations addresses the environmental effects associated with construction of the SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision (“the project”), located within the western and eastern portions of the San Diego State University (“SDSU”) campus in the city of San Diego. This statement is made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) under Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines. The potentially significant effects of the project were identified in both the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) and the Final EIR.

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified 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 preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states, in part, that:

“(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR.
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.”

In accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable.”

The Final EIR for the project identified potentially significant effects that could result from project implementation. However, the Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures, as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less than significant levels. Those impacts, which are not reduced to less than significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific project benefits (see Section 6, Statement of Overriding Considerations, below). As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

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

1.2 Summary of Project Description

The project analyzed in the EIR is the SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision. The project has been proposed to improve, enhance and rehabilitate several core areas located within the western and eastern portions of the SDSU campus. The primary goal of the project is to guide future development within campus areas in a manner that is generally consistent with the guidelines found in the SDSU *Physical Master Plan, Phase I, Existing Conditions*, dated November 1997.

In general, the project would result in the consolidation and redevelopment of SDSU athletic, recreational and housing resources. In order to complete this development effort, replacement locations for campus parking and utility facilities are part of the project. For purposes of the environmental analysis, the project was divided into campus subareas, the "Western Project Subarea" and the "Eastern Project Subarea." The project components located in the Western Project Subarea consist of construction of an aquaplex, a tennis court facility and parking structure, an athletics administration building and hall of fame, a softball field and parking lot, a racquetball court facility, campus open area, the addition of lighting to the SDSU Aztrack, and campus mall and street improvements. The project components located in the Eastern Project Subarea consist of construction of replacement residence hall housing, a cogeneration facility and chiller plant, and a new parking structure.

For a detailed discussion of the project description and setting, please see Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Final EIR.

1.3 Project Objectives

The Board of Trustees has considered the statement of the objectives sought by the project as found in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR. The Board of Trustees adopts those objectives as part of the project.

1.4 Initial Study and Notice of Preparation

To determine the environmental topics to be addressed in this EIR, SDSU prepared a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) and an Initial Study, and circulated the NOP/Initial Study to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and individuals in order to receive input on the proposed project. SDSU also held a public information meeting on October 20, 1998, to obtain public input on both the project and EIR. Interested parties attended the public information meeting and provided important input.

In addition, SDSU prepared a *revised* NOP/Initial Study for the proposed project, which was necessitated by project refinements made since distribution of the prior NOP/Initial Study. In the revised NOP/Initial Study, the project description was modified to add a new parking structure (Parking Structure 6) to accommodate existing and projected on-campus parking needs. On February 17, 1999, the campus held a public information meeting to obtain public comment on the DEIR. On March 16, 1999, the campus also held a focus group meeting with area residents along the western boundary of the project. Based on the public review and comment process, the EIR addressed the following topics:

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

Based on the public review and comment process, the following topics are not considered significant and, therefore, are not discussed in detail in this EIR: (a) Land Use and Planning; (b) Population and Housing; (c) Energy and Mineral Resources; (d) Environmental Hazards; (e) Public Services; (f) Utilities and Service Systems; (g) Cultural Resources; and (h) Recreation.

1.5 Environmental Impact Report

SDSU has prepared the EIR in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The EIR is a full-disclosure informational document, which informs public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effect of the project. Possible ways to minimize significant effects are identified in the EIR and reasonable alternatives to the project are evaluated.

The Draft EIR was made available to the public for review and comment for a 45-day period. The review and comment period began on February 11, 1999, and ended on March 29, 1999. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available for public review at the following locations: (a) College Heights Public Library, 4710 College Avenue, San Diego, California; (b) SDSU Love Library, Government Publications, 3rd Floor; and (c) SDSU, Office of Facilities Planning and Management, Administration Building Room 130.

All comment letters received in response to the Draft EIR were reviewed and included in the Final EIR, along with written responses to all substantive comments. In accordance with Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR for the project consists of the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, written responses to significant environmental issues raised in the public review and comment process, and other information contained in the administrative record.

SECTION 2: FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts, which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the Board of Trustees, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts have been determined to fall within this “significant unavoidable impact” category.

2.1 Air Quality

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

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

2.1.3 Finding: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant air quality impacts as identified in the Final EIR. However, cumulative air quality impacts of the project in conjunction with related development in the region must be considered unavoidably significant because regional emissions in the San Diego air basin continue to exceed state and federal standards even after implementation of all feasible air quality mitigation measures. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this cumulative air quality impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* Section 6 below).

2.2 Traffic

2.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: The intersection of College Avenue and “Z” Street is significantly impacted by the redistribution of project traffic to the southbound left-turn movement. This impact is almost entirely due to the large increase in parking supply from Parking Structure 6 on the east side of the SDSU campus. Mitigation would be as outlined in the College Area

Redevelopment Project EIR. Pursuant to that EIR, the intersection will be signalized to eliminate conflicting movements. However, if the proposed SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision is completed prior to implementation of the traffic signal mitigation at the College Avenue and “Z” Street intersection, a significant unavoidable traffic impact would occur.

2.2.2 Mitigation Measure: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the traffic impact identified above and in the Final EIR. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, however, the Board of Trustees has determined that this traffic impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

2.2.3 Finding: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant traffic impacts as identified in the Final EIR. In addition, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(2) and Section 15091(a)(2), the traffic signal mitigation measure discussed above is a change that has been required in, and incorporated into, the College Area Redevelopment Project and is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency. However, traffic impacts of the SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision project must be considered unavoidably significant if that project is completed before implementation of mitigation required by the College Area Redevelopment Project. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that the identified traffic impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* Section 6 below).

SECTION 3: FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the project that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and that require findings to be made under Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Based on information in the Final EIR, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3.1 Geotechnical and Soil Resources

3.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Development associated with the project must take into account slope instability and erosion. Development associated with the project must also take into account unconsolidated soils, expansive soils, excavatability, groundwater hazards and seismic hazards and seismicity.

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

Landslides

There are no known or suspected deep-seated landslides impacting the project area. Therefore, mitigation of deep-seated landslides does not appear to be necessary.

Surficial Slope Instability

In general, to reduce the potential of slope instability concerns (both deep-seated and surficial), current grading codes typically require that graded slopes not exceed a gradient of 2 to 1 (horizontal to vertical). Slopes steeper than 2 to 1 are generally known to be prone to surficial instability. Typical mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts of surficial instability will include slope flattening, slope-top setbacks, the installation and maintenance of drainage provisions, and planting of slope-stabilizing vegetation.

Erosion

Proper grading techniques (with appropriate compaction efforts), revegetation of disturbed areas, and construction of appropriate drainage provisions can reduce the potential for erosion. Maintenance of drainage provisions, such as periodic removal of accumulated eroded soils and debris from surface drains, is also needed. A project designed and constructed in accordance with a properly engineered grading and drainage plan will not negatively impact the erosion potential of the site and surrounding area. The grading and drainage plan for the proposed project shall be prepared prior to construction, and approved by the project geotechnical consultant as well as the Office of Facilities Planning and Management.

Unconsolidated Soils

The extent and depths of potentially compressible, unconsolidated soils can be assessed by subsurface exploration and laboratory testing during project-specific geotechnical investigations. Mitigation measures for structural/fill areas underlain by unconsolidated soils typically will include removal of the compressible soils and replacement with properly compacted fill or deep foundation systems, such as drilled piers or piles, which extend through the compressible soils and are supported by the underlying, firm natural soils. Prior to construction, a project-specific geotechnical report shall be prepared by the project geotechnical consultant to address unconsolidated soils. The report shall be approved by the Office of Facilities Planning and Management.

Expansive Soils

The expansion (shrink-swell) potentials of the onsite soils can be assessed by laboratory testing of representative soil samples obtained during site-specific geotechnical investigation studies. Typical mitigation measures will include grading such that expansive soils are not placed within the upper few feet of finished grade. As an alternative, deepened and/or stiffened foundation systems for proposed structures may be considered. Surface and subsurface drainage provisions may also be implemented to reduce moisture fluctuations in subgrade soils. Prior to construction, a project-specific geotechnical report shall be prepared by the project geotechnical consultant to address expansive soils. The report shall be approved by the Office of Facilities Planning and Management.

Excavatability

Well-cemented, concretionary zones (within the Lindavista Formation and Stadium Conglomerate) may be encountered during excavations in the project area. Heavy ripping or jackhammering of the hard concretionary areas may be necessary to facilitate excavation.

Groundwater/Seepage

Groundwater is not anticipated to be a constraint to site development if project-specific recommendations for groundwater and surface water control are incorporated into the design and construction of the project. Appropriate trench shoring can reduce the potential for trench wall caving due to groundwater seepage.

Fault Rupture

Surface rupture due to active faulting at the site is considered very low and mitigation measures with regard to ground rupture along active faults are not needed at the Aztec Walk project area.

Seismic Shaking

Evaluations of potential seismic shaking will be performed during site-specific geotechnical studies for the various components of the project. The effects of seismic shaking will be reduced by adhering to current design parameters of the Structural Engineers Association of California.

Liquefaction

The potential for liquefaction at the site is considered very low and mitigation measures with regard to liquefaction are not needed.

Tsunami

The potential for inundation by tsunami at the site is considered very low and mitigation measures with regard to tsunami are not needed.

Seiche

The potential for inundation by seiche at the site is considered very low and mitigation measures with regard to seiche are not needed.

3.1.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the geotechnical and soils-related impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the geotechnical and soils-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.2 Visual Quality

3.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Project development of the proposed Aquaplex and Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7 may result in significant visual impacts to sensitive receptors on Montezuma Road and residents of Hewlett Drive. Project development of the proposed Replacement Residence Hall complex may result in significant visual impacts to sensitive receptors on College Avenue, East Campus Drive and pedestrian bridge users. Project development of the proposed Parking Structure 6 may result in significant visual impacts to sensitive receptors on the eastern campus boundary. Project development may result in significant lighting impacts to sensitive receptors.

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

Visual Impacts

- (a) For visual impacts associated with the Aquaplex and Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7 complex, setbacks, wall construction and landscape treatment, as depicted in the Final EIR, Figures 3.4-20 and 3.4-21, shall be implemented during project construction. Inclusion of this mitigation measure as a project condition of approval would minimize visual impacts to sensitive receptors on Montezuma Road and residents of Hewlett Drive. The university will ensure that off-campus views from the proposed tennis complex will be blocked by wind-break fences along the western perimeter of the courts, and further obstructed by landscaping and an 8-foot high masonry wall located on campus property adjacent to the common boundary line between the campus and the Hewlett Drive residences. (As discussed in Section 6.2 of the Draft EIR, the 8-foot high masonry wall will also act as a noise barrier.) The landscape treatment will consist of a landscape buffer between the tennis courts and the campus property line, and that area will be restricted to maintenance access only. The area will also be included in the existing comprehensive landscape maintenance program for the campus.
- (b) For visual impacts associated with the Replacement Residence Hall complex, a landscape treatment plan shall be developed and implemented during project construction. Inclusion of this mitigation measure as a project condition of approval would minimize visual impacts to sensitive receptors on College Avenue, East Campus Drive and the pedestrian bridge.
- (c) For visual impacts associated with Parking Structure 6, enhancement of existing landscaping as depicted in the Final EIR, Figure 3.4-23, *Cross Section C-C*, will be implemented during project construction. This would include plantings of additional vegetation between backyard property lines and South Parking Lot E. The parking structure will be constructed in such a way that headlights are not directed onto adjacent residential properties, either at exits or from within the structure. Light sources within the parking structure will be shielded to

reduce visibility from outside the structure. Lighting at the entrances and exits will be sufficient for security and safety, but will not be directed onto adjacent properties. Inclusion of this mitigation measure as a project condition of approval would minimize visual impacts to sensitive receptors.

- (d) As part of the project design, the Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant (Component E-2) will screen the four outlet stacks on the rooftop of the structure, as shown in the Final EIR, Figure 3.4-24.

Lighting Impacts

- (e) For lighting impacts associated with the Aquaplex, a landscape plan, as depicted in the Final EIR, Figures 3.4-20 and 3.4-21, is required for the south and west sides to limit the impacts to sensitive receptors located along the east side of Hewlett Drive. Further, all light fixtures planned for the facility would be consistent with SDSU's lighting policy and shielded away from the sensitive receptors of Hewlett Drive. This facility would not operate past 10:00 p.m., thus further limiting the amount of light during a majority of the nighttime hours. Implementation of these mitigation measures during project construction would minimize lighting impacts to sensitive receptors.
- (f) For lighting impacts associated with the Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7, a landscape plan, as depicted in the Final EIR, Figures 3.4-20 and 3.4-21, is required to shield sensitive receptors on Hewlett Drive from new lighting impacts. Further, as mandated by the SDSU lighting policy, all light fixtures will be shielded away from Hewlett Drive residences and toward the tennis facility. This operation of the proposed tennis complex will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. This would allow for the elimination of all competition-based lighting to sensitive receptors during a majority of the nighttime hours. Implementation of these mitigation measures during project construction would minimize lighting impacts to sensitive receptors.
- (g) For lighting impacts associated with the Softball Field and adjoining Parking Lot, all light fixtures planned for the facility would be consistent with SDSU's lighting policy and shielded away from the sensitive receptors of Hewlett Drive. During evening events, all activities would end by 10:00 p.m. Implementation of these mitigation measures would minimize lighting impacts to residents of the adjacent residence halls, residents of Hewlett Drive and other sensitive receptors.
- (h) For lighting impacts associated with the Aztrack, and for consistency with SDSU's lighting policy, all four fixtures planned for the facility would be shielded downward and away from sensitive receptors on Hardy Avenue and Lindo Paseo Drive. A time limit of 10:00 p.m. would further reduce the impact to sensitive receptors.
- (i) For lighting impacts associated with the Replacement Residence Hall Complex, landscape treatments, as outlined in the Final EIR, Figure 3.4-23, are required to be implemented in

order to shield residents on the west side of the Adobe Drive cul-de-sac. In order to minimize impacts to sensitive receptors on College Avenue or the pedestrian bridge, a landscape plan would be developed. In compliance with SDSU's lighting policy, all exterior lighting shall be pointed downward as much as possible. Implementation of these mitigation measures would further reduce the impact to sensitive receptors.

- (j) For lighting impacts associated with Parking Structure 6, landscape treatments, as outlined in the Final EIR, Figure 3.4-23, are required to be implemented in order to shield residents on the west side of the Adobe Drive cul-de-sac. In order to further minimize impacts, a landscaping plan would be developed for the east side of the structure. All light fixtures within and around the exterior of the building would be shielded away from sensitive viewers to the east of the campus. Implementation of these mitigation measures would further reduce the impact imposed by this project component to sensitive receptors.

3.2.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures, as modified, are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the visual quality impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the visual quality impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.3 Traffic/Access/Parking

3.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Development of the project may result in significant traffic-related impacts. Development of the project may result in significant impacts to traffic access.

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

- (a) The intersection of College Avenue and "Z" Street should be signalized to eliminate conflicting movements at the intersection . A significant unavoidable impact would occur if the Aztec Walk project (i.e., the Parking Structure 6 component) was completed prior to the signal being implemented at or in the vicinity of this location.
- (b) There is a significant impact at the intersection of 55th Street/Lindo Paseo in baseline conditions without the one-way reversal. If the one-way reversal is not implemented, 55th Street/Lindo Paseo should be signalized to mitigate the impact to less than significant levels.
- (c) Install a stop sign at Street "A." Provide a westbound left-turn pocket on Remington Road.
- (d) Install a stop sign at Street "B." Provide a westbound left-turn pocket on Remington Road.
- (e) Realign Street "C" opposite 55th Street.

- (f) Access to both the underground parking Structure 7 and surface parking Lot R served by Street “A” should be a minimum of 100 feet from Remington Road and aligned opposite each other.
- (g) Expand the campus Event Management Plan to incorporate events at project-related athletic and recreation facilities (Aquaplex, Tennis, Softball) to control traffic on Remington Road to assist drivers in exiting the proposed parking areas during special events.

3.3.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the traffic and access impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the traffic and access impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR. In addition, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(2) and Section 15091(a)(2), the traffic signal mitigation measure at the intersection of College Avenue and “Z” Street is a change that has been required in, and incorporated into, the College Area Redevelopment Project and is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency. Please refer to Section 2.2, above, for the Board of Trustees’ “significant unavoidable impacts” findings in the event that the proposed traffic signal is not implemented when the Aztec Walk project is completed.

3.4 Noise

3.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Development of the project may result in short-term construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors. Development of the Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7 may result in significant long-term noise impacts to sensitive receptors. Development of the Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant may result in significant long-term noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

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

Short-Term Construction Noise

Mitigation of short-term construction noise impacts on residences could be achieved through implementation of the following measures:

The contractor will be required to comply with the city’s noise ordinance criteria. Thus, construction activity is only permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Construction is prohibited on Sunday or legal holidays. In addition, the contractor will be required to prepare a Noise Control Plan to demonstrate compliance with the city’s noise ordinance criteria. The plan will include a detailed description of the noise control measures that the contractor will use to mitigate short-term construction noise impacts on existing noise-sensitive land uses. The contractor will include measures such as:

- (a) Locate noisy equipment as far as possible from the site boundaries and occupants of buildings.
- (b) Install stationary equipment in enclosures.
- (c) All construction equipment fixed or mobile will be equipped with properly operating and maintained muffler exhaust systems.
- (d) Stockpile and vehicle staging areas will be located as far as practical from residences and occupants of buildings.
- (e) Use quieter (*i.e.*, typically smaller) pieces of equipment while working immediately adjacent to the residences situated along the western boundary of the site.

Other Noise Impacts

A noise barrier should be installed along the western boundary of the site as depicted in the Final EIR, Figure 3.6-3. Based on conceptual grading information, the noise barrier will be a minimum of eight feet in height and located on campus property at the top of slope along the western portion of the tennis courts. The precise location and height of the noise barrier should be confirmed when a site-grading plan has been prepared.

All public address systems should be designed to minimize any unnecessary sound beyond the seating and playing areas. This will include the use of directional speakers that are oriented away from the residences.

When building plans are prepared for the cogeneration facility, they will be evaluated to ensure that adequate noise abatement measures are incorporated into the building design. These measures will be designed to comply with the city's noise ordinance criteria (*i.e.*, one-hour average noise levels of 40 dB during nighttime hours, 45 dB during evening hours and 40 dB during the daytime hours). Noise abatement measures could include sound attenuating louvers, duct silencers, sound absorbing materials and orienting louvers away from noise sensitive receivers.

3.4.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the noise impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the noise impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

SECTION 4: FINDINGS ON LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

This section identifies impacts that have been determined to be less than significant or less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures identified below.

4.1 Water Quality/Hydrology Impacts

4.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Project development may result in surface water impacts.

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

- (a) Demolition and excavated material must be either removed from the project site as soon as possible, or covered to prevent potential contamination of surface and groundwater.
- (b) Standing water must be eliminated at all times during construction.
- (c) The storm drainage system must be properly coordinated with surrounding properties to ensure that runoff does not cause damage to other properties. Storm drains and culverts must be sized appropriately. Inlets and outlets shall be hydraulically designed to admit design quantities.
- (d) If groundwater is encountered during construction, standard dewatering techniques must be employed in compliance with standard industry practices and/or the Uniform Building Code (UBC).
- (e) All hazardous materials stored on site during construction shall be stored to minimize potential impacts to surface water and groundwater. After construction, remaining hazardous materials shall be disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.
- (f) Contractors must comply with all waste discharge requirements per State Water Resources Control Board No. 92-08-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS00002.
- (g) Storm runoff must be carried in pipes, lined channels, or paved swales to prevent soil erosion. Riprap energy dissipaters are required at each discharge point to unlined drainage courses.
- (h) Storm runoff must be controlled within the SDSU campus during construction. The contractor shall provide temporary diversion measures in order to provide acceptable drainage.
- (i) All waste materials and rubbish must be properly disposed of at a reasonable interval. Collection of waste materials on site should be kept to a minimum.
- (j) Surface drainage must be directed away from structures at a minimum slope of 2 percent to the nearest collection points or paved surfaces. All drainage will be directly discharged into collector pipes whenever possible without discharging into landscaped areas. All possible ponding elimination measures shall be implemented.

4.1.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid any water quality/hydrology impacts associated with the project as identified in the Final EIR.

4.2 Biological Resource Impacts

4.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Project development may result in impacts to the disturbed riparian and disturbed coastal sage scrub habitats adjacent to the Aquaplex and Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7.

4.2.2 Mitigation Measures: The “biological” mitigation measures found below, while not required to mitigate any potential significant impact, are nevertheless recommended as part of the project approval to ensure that the project will not result in any biology-related impacts upon implementation of the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and will ensure that the biology-related impacts as identified in the Final EIR remain at less than significant levels:

Potential impacts to the disturbed riparian and disturbed coastal sage scrub adjacent to the Aquaplex, Tennis Courts/Parking Structure 7 can be mitigated by ensuring avoidance of impacts. The limits of grading in these areas shall be clearly staked. Orange snow fencing shall be erected along the limits of grading and a qualified biologist shall be retained to monitor construction activities to ensure that impacts are avoided. If grading is to be conducted in the spring or summer (between March and August), a breeding bird survey shall be conducted in the riparian habitat area prior to grading to ensure that any state or federally listed endangered species is not present in the project vicinity (*i.e.*, least Bell’s vireo). If a listed bird species is present within 500 feet of the grading area, grading activities will be deferred until the end of the breeding season in mid-August to September.

4.2.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid any biological impacts associated with the project as identified in the Final EIR.

SECTION 5: FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1 Project Alternatives

The alternatives section of the Final EIR contains an analysis of the alternatives to the project, including the “No Project” alternative. The alternatives, which were considered and analyzed in the Final EIR, were as follows:

- (a) Alternative 1—The No Project Alternative. This alternative is required by CEQA, and it compares the present existing condition of the project site against the significant effects that would result from implementation of the proposed project.

- (b) Alternative 2—A-W-1 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility in the basement of the proposed Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame.
- (c) Alternative 3—A-E-1 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Cogeneration Facility and Chiller Plant on the site designated for that facility under the proposed project against the construction of the facility in the basement of the dining hall portion of the proposed Replacement Residence Hall complex.
- (d) Alternative 4—A-E-2 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Replacement Residence Hall complex on the site designated for that complex under the proposed project against the construction of the complex on campus Parking Lot C.
- (e) Alternative 5—A-W-2 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Parking Structure 7 on the site designated for that structure under the proposed project against the construction of Parking Structure 7 beneath the proposed Softball Field.
- (f) Alternative 6—A-W-3 Alternative. This alternative compares the significant effects that would result from constructing the proposed Parking Structure 6 on the site designated for that structure under the proposed project against the construction of the parking structure on campus Parking Lot W.

For a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision, please see Section 5.0 of the Final EIR.

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

SECTION 6: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

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

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR. Nonetheless, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are: (a) possible traffic impacts (at the intersection of College Avenue and “Z” Street); and (b) cumulative air quality impacts (emissions in the San Diego air basin exceed state and federal standards).

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

Cumulative Air Quality

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

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

For these reasons, the SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision, in conjunction with development in the area, is not anticipated to hinder timely attainment of emission standards within the San Diego air basin.

Traffic Impact

There are traffic impacts due to inbound left-turn trips at the intersection of College Avenue and “Z” Street in terms of intersection capacity. Overall, the project is estimated to generate 40 inbound and 30 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday morning peak-hour, and 35 inbound and 74 outbound new trips to the campus during the weekday evening peak-hour. This amount of traffic is principally due to the redistribution of traffic relating to construction of a new parking

structure (Parking Structure 6). However, due to traffic signalization improvements to control left-turn inbound trips in the vicinity of “Z” Street, which are proposed as mitigation for the College Area Redevelopment Project, this impact would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation by the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency.

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

- (a) The project implements master planning of campus academic, athletic, recreation and student housing resources on the SDSU campus.
- (b) The project improves the vehicular and pedestrian circulation at gateways into the SDSU campus.
- (c) The project utilizes campus land resources as efficiently as possible.
- (d) The project enhances recreation and athletic facilities in response to campus needs.
- (e) The project maximizes the use of existing campus resources and infrastructure, thereby providing the most cost-effective opportunities for meeting existing and future higher education needs.
- (f) The project minimizes project costs and, at the same time, improves overall campus design, architectural character, accessibility, image and identity.
- (g) The project enhances student residential housing on campus, and implements a unifying dining hall component to student housing.
- (h) The project improves pedestrian circulation at various walkways through the central portion of the campus.
- (i) The project enhances campus access to transit facilities, and encourages use of transit by campus commuters.
- (j) The project enhances campus utility plant and support facilities.
- (k) The project maximizes the number of new parking spaces per square foot of land area by limiting the use of surface parking lots.
- (l) The project will have positive humanistic, educational and cultural influences on the areas surrounding the campus.
- (m) The project is the result of input from both the campus and surrounding communities, and responds to their concerns and desires for the university.

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

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-1
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-2
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-3
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-4
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-5
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-6
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-7
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-8
Item 2

See Printed Agenda
For
Attachment D-9
Item 2

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
May 11-12, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

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 1999/00 state funded program identified campus needs totaling \$347,797,000. The trustees approved a budget request in the amount of \$214,898,000 based on anticipated general obligation funding subsequently approved by the voters on November 3, 1998.

The governor's proposed 1999/00 budget published on January 8, 1999, included revisions to the CSU budget request and were reported to the Board of Trustees at the January meeting. The Governor's Budget included \$209,481,000 for CSU projects.

The Legislative Analyst's Office published the "Analysis of the 1999/00 Budget Bill" on February 17, 1999. The analyst recommended approval of \$124,100,000 of the CSU budget request and further recommended a variety of potential actions on projects pending receipt of additional information and/or re-evaluation. Capital Planning, Design and Construction continues to provide the requested information to the LAO and has held several meetings to resolve their questions and concerns.

On March 24, 1999, the Department of Finance amended the Governor's Budget to reinstate three CSU capital outlay projects in the amount of \$54,043,000, thereby adjusting the CSU capital outlay budget request to \$263,153,000. A complete report on this action will be provided at the meeting.

Legislative hearings are in progress, and a status report will be distributed at the meeting comparing the trustees' requested program, the Governor's Budget proposal, the legislative analyst's recommendations, and the results of the Assembly and Senate hearings to date.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4
May 11-12, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

1. California State University, Northridge—Associated Students Children's Center
2. California State University, Northridge—University Club

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolutions.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4
May 11-12, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

1. California State University, Northridge—Associated Students Children's Center
Project Architect: Amador/Whittle Architects

Background

The Associated Students Children's Center provides childcare services for students enrolled at California State University, Northridge. Current facilities are in converted houses classified as temporary campus buildings. These undersized facilities are in poor condition and will be demolished upon completion of the new Associated Students Children's Center. The new center will provide childcare services for 120 children, an increase of 42 children, and adds infant care services and after-school care for older children. The project site is on the approved campus master plan in the northwest corner of the main campus, providing easy access to parking areas and public transportation.

Scope

The new children's center includes seven classrooms with direct play yard access that defines the L-shaped plan. The center will have a strong front entry façade on Plummer Street, a popular campus entry, welcoming both students and the youngsters. The project also includes administrative space that provides excellent oversight for the center plus meeting areas for staff training and parents. The 12,200 gross square foot building will be stucco with a standing seam metal roof, complementing the palette of smaller facilities located on the campus's perimeter, and providing a transition to adjacent residential buildings.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	June 1999
Completion of Working Drawings	August 1999
Construction Start	October 1999
Occupancy	October 2000

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	12,200 square feet
Assignable Building Area	7,000 square feet
Efficiency	57.4 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3722

Building Cost (\$110 per gross square foot)	\$1,346,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$5.33
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$33.77
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$26.64
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$44.57
Site Development	195,000
Group I Equipment	<u>70,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$1,611,000
Fees and Contingency	<u>376,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$163 per gross square foot)	1,987,000
Group II Equipment	<u>111,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$2,098,000</u>

Funding Data

Construction funding for this project will be provided through associated student fees. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

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 Associated Students Children's Center (see Table III-5 of the certified Final MEIR). No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the Associated Students Children's Center. 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 MEIR prepared for the California State University, Northridge master plan revision, the board finds that:

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

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures and implementation of 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, Associated Students Children's Center; and, be it further

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

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is requested, under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Northridge, Associated Students Children's Center; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Associated Students Children's Center are approved at a project cost of \$2,098,000 at CCCI 3722.

2. California State University, Northridge—University Club
Project Architect: Moule Polyzoïdes, Architects and Urbanists

Background

The new University Club will provide on-campus fine dining facilities for faculty and staff, as well as catering for university functions. The current building was constructed by the faculty and is in poor condition with outdated kitchen facilities. The new club will be built immediately south of the current facility on its master planned site and will enable the club to enhance its food, meeting, and banquet services.

Scope

The University Club will anchor the southeast corner of the campus at the entrance to the university. The historic orange grove provides a unique setting for this building that is designed to complement the orchard and weave outdoor dining areas into the landscape. The 12,000 gross square foot project includes flexible size banquet room(s), dining room, members' room, and the president's meeting room. California design features incorporate views of the landscape within each room and develop outdoor "rooms" to maximize utilization of the facility. A tower will conceal cooling equipment on the dining patios. This tower combines with the exterior design of stucco, wood-siding, and metal roofs to blend with the historic orange grove and provides a distinctive design on the edge of the campus.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	June 1999
Completion of Working Drawings	September 1999
Construction Start	November 1999
Occupancy	November 2000

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	12,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	8,470 square feet
Efficiency	71 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3722

Building Cost (\$200 per gross square foot)	\$2,402,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$10.16
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$86.58
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$26.58
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$70.16
e. Moveable Partitions	\$6.67

Site Development	890,000
Group I Equipment	<u>530,000</u>
Construction Cost	
\$3,822,000	
Fees and Contingency	<u>756,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$382 per gross square foot)	4,578,000
Group II Equipment	<u>0</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$4,578,000</u>

Funding Data

The university intends on constructing this project through the issuance of tax-exempt debt by the foundation. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

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 University Club (see Table III-5 of the certified Final MEIR). No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the proposed University Club. 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 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 the Board of Trustees on May 13, 1998, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final MEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary; and
4. The project will benefit The California State University; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures and implementation of 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, University Club; 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, University Club; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, University Club are approved at a project cost of \$4,578,000 at CCCI 3722.