

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting:**               **3:15 p.m., Tuesday, November 16, 1999**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Harold Goldwhite  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Michael D. Stennis  
Anthony M. Vitti

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Amended Minutes of Meeting of May 11, 1999  
Approval of Amended Minutes of Meeting of July 7, 1999  
Approval of Minutes of September 14, 1999

1. Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*
2. Acceptance of Interest in Real Property, *Action*

#### **Discussion Items**

3. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Multi-Purpose Event Center at California State University, Fresno, *Action*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

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

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

**May 11, 1999**

**Members Present**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Bob Foster  
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**

William D. Campbell

**Other Trustees Present**

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

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Samuel A. Strafaci, 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, present

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:23 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the March 16, 1999, meeting were approved as submitted.

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

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

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-99-07).**

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

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

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. He stated that the appropriate CEQA documents had been prepared that included the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C of the printed agenda item). A handout was introduced to the committee members as a clarifying statement to be added to the end of the first paragraph of Page 18, Attachment C, of this agenda item.

President Weber said that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity for San Diego State University because of the confluence of three separate projects. The Aztec Walk component is a major east-west pedestrian corridor through the campus. San Diego State University does have a north-south corridor. The coming of the San Diego Trolley to the campus in approximately the year 2004 will be the second project. This will be an underground transit system that will have two entrances on our campus. The San Diego State University Foundation Community Redevelopment project has started and is located south of the Aztec Walk. This is the third project and will include residential and mixed-use commercial facilities. Over the next five to ten years, approximately 1.1 billion dollars in nonstate dollars will be spent to improve San Diego State University and its neighbors.

Trustee Pesqueira inquired as to where on the campus the trolley would surface.

President Weber responded that the trolley would travel under the Aztec Walk with one entrance at the intersection of Campanile and Aztec Walk and one entrance over the Student Center.

Trustee Pierce congratulated the president and the campus's architect in putting together this master plan that includes the private contributions, making several projects a reality.

Chair Razi asked that with the advent of the trolley bringing a lot of people to the campus, had the issue of reducing the number of parking spaces been addressed.

President Weber stated that his immediate concern is the need for extra parking spaces during construction of the trolley since the lay down and staging facilities will require the use of existing parking spaces. With the completion of the project, it is the president's hope that a shifting to the use of the trolley for access to the campus will result in not needing another parking structure at San Diego State University.

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-99-08).**

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

Referring to the status report handout, Mr. Drohan reviewed the information as shown. He indicated that the last two columns on pages three and four reflect the actions of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Subcommittee No. 1 on Education and the Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2 on Education Finance. Staff has been successful in getting our budget through these two committees. In addition, the Department of Finance submitted a revised technical letter to the legislature reinstating two projects that had been previously deferred as a result of the funding requirements for the San Jose State University Library. Mr. Drohan opined that it is a good budget that will fund a number of needed projects and other critical elements of our 1999/2000 capital program.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

**Using a short visual presentation, Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. He stated that the appropriate CEQA documentation had been completed on both projects and staff recommended approval of the schematics.**

At Chair Razi's invitation for comments, President Wilson stated that the University Club is historically significant for two reasons. The original building was built by the faculty and is located in one of the two remaining San Fernando Valley orange groves. The Associated Students Children's Center project, when completed, will complement the renovation of Monterey Hall, and will provide a transition to adjacent residential buildings.

President Wilson continued by saying that the University Club has begun to serve as a very popular meeting and banquet facility for the university and surrounding communities. A weekly Sunday Brunch is being served. The historic deficit that the University Club had experienced, when it was a university membership club only, has now disappeared and the university would not like those deficits to return. The remodeled University Club, in its design, is a very unusual building, serves multiple purposes, will be showcased within the orange grove and complement the Monterey Hall for public use of the academic programs.

Chair Razi noted that this is a two-project action item. He called for the vote on the first project, California State University, Northridge—Associated Students Children's Center.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution for the CSUN Associated Children's Center project (RCPBG-05-99-09).

In reference to the second project, the University Club, Trustee Pierce asked if an appropriate campus staff person would elaborate on the aggregate construction cost of \$382 per square foot.

Mr. Drohan asked to respond, stating that while the unit cost is correct, as shown, it is a project level cost. The building construction cost, the site development of over 50,000 square feet that includes a large area beyond the building lines to enhance the entrance to the facility, and the patio improvements for outside dining are all part of the project cost. There is almost two hundred thousand dollars worth of utilities within the site development cost with an approximate breakdown of \$13 per gsf for the general site development and another \$4 per gsf for the utilities. The \$756,000 for fees and contingency applied to the \$3.8 million construction cost equates to a little over 19 percent. Our standard fee structure for architecture/management fees and project contingencies runs between 18 and 20 percent. Mr. Drohan noted that when he reviewed the schematics, he was advised by the architects and campus staff that part of the appeal to the community would be the setting and ambience established by the architectural solutions. This provides some of the reasons for the cost.

Trustee Pierce stated that if he understood the agenda item correctly, the construction cost for this project would be financed through the auxiliary probably with tax-exempt bonds. Using today's prevailing rates at a 6 percent assumed rate that would include interest and amortization, the debt service alone would be \$275,000. This means that the monthly rent would be approximately \$3.25 per square foot triple net. He questioned how a faculty restaurant with community support could afford to pay that kind of rent from the revenue generated by this facility.

Mr. Phil Loughman, real estate manager, University Corporation, responded that a pro forma had been developed for this facility. Two revenue sources are anticipated: one from the surrounding community using the banquet and meeting facilities, and the other from the continued Faculty Club membership fee. He said that staff expects it will take two years before the facility will start to make a profit.

Trustee Pierce indicated that he was not comfortable with the total aggregate budget. He suggested that the item be continued until the next board meeting to give the campus staff an opportunity to take a second look at the development cost budget versus occupancy cost and what other options there might be for a more reasonable cost.

Chair Razi asked President Wilson if the campus staff would have a problem in delaying the item until the July 1999 Board of Trustees' meeting.

President Wilson responded that it is always the intent of the campus to fully satisfy the board. Since the board does not meet monthly, a delay in approval means delaying the project.

At Trustee Stennis' suggestion and concurrence of the committee members, it was agreed that discussion between committee members, campus and Chancellor's Office staffs would take place sometime before 8 a.m. on Wednesday, May 12.

Trustee Wang noted that there are a lot of factors involved in the site development cost. He pointed out that the facility was designed so that the patio area totals approximately 3,500 to 4,000 square feet and provides seating for banquets and other types of activities. Therefore, the patio furniture is a large portion of the patio cost. Additional parking spaces to accommodate 125 cars will supplement existing parking. Improved access to the site is needed to make the facility a little less remote to the academic core. An extensive landscape budget is anticipated to tie the indoor and outdoor space together. In summary, Trustee Wang stated that in essence we are buying a lot of outside seating space at less cost than it would be if included inside the structure itself.

The committee recommended tabling the item until the reconvening of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds on Wednesday, May 12, 1999, at 8:00 a.m.

### **Recess**

The meeting recessed at 4:00 p.m.

### **Reconvened**

Chair Razi greeted the audience and reconvened the meeting at 8:07 a.m., May 12, 1999. All members of the committee were present except William D. Campbell and Bob Foster. Ralph R. Pesqueira and Anthony M. Vitti were the other trustees in attendance.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

Chair Razi stated that the committee was reconvened because the cost of the CSU Northridge University Club was in question. He informed the committee that a new resolution had been developed and asked Mr. Drohan to elaborate.

Mr. Drohan stated that the new resolution modifies the approval of the schematic plans at the cost published with the condition and understanding that the university will engage a contractor to assist in value engineering the schematic plans and adjusting costs, as appropriate, prior to the university requesting approval of the financing from the trustees.

Trustee Pierce emphasized that it is essential that a contractor be consulted at this time with the hope that the cost will be reduced. It was his opinion that this step needs to be completed before the campus proceeds with working drawings.

Chair Razi suggested that in the future when staff reviews capital costs that are over the norm, a detailed breakdown of the cost would be helpful for the trustees to review.

6

CPB&G

Trustee Wang said that even if the design on this project is different in several ways, what if the University Club has a constant deficit?

Mr. Drohan said that this point was discussed in an earlier meeting that day. He said that it is hoped that the compromise that was reached will have a favorable influence on the financial package for CSU Northridge.

Mr. Drohan noted that on page six of Agenda Item 4 under Funding Data, the word “foundation” should be University Corporation, the sponsor of this project.

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-99-09).**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 a.m.

AMENDED

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

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

**July 7, 1999**

**Members Present**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Harold Goldwhite  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Michael D. Stennis  
Anthony M. Vitti

**Other Trustees Present**

William D. Campbell  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Dee Dee Myers  
Ralph R. Pesqueira

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Jackie McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Charles Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs  
J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:22 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the May 11, 1999, meeting were approved as submitted.

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-99-10).

**Professional Appointments**

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

**CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report**

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

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan gave a brief historical overview of the CSU Board of Trustees' seismic safety program and its accomplishments to date. Mr. Drohan noted that CSU facilities have always been built in compliance with the seismic provisions of the building codes in effect at the time of their construction. The CSU has evaluated the seismic safety of its facilities for some time, completing some seismic retrofits during the 1980s, 1990s, and, specifically, falling hazards in 1993.

Governor Deukmejian's 1990 Executive Order regarding seismic safety asked the CSU to give priority to seismic safety issues when designing and constructing campus facilities. Mr. Drohan stated that funds were received in 1992 to initiate a systemwide survey of the CSU facilities, using the report results of the State Seismic Safety Commission as the basis for that engineering evaluation.

Mr. Drohan said that the creation of the CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) was perhaps the most insightful piece of this program. This board is comprised of top flight independent structural engineers who provide the technical expertise to ensure our seismic safety assessments meet the highest standards of the engineering profession. The SRB also provides an ongoing evaluation of new technologies, codes and understandings of seismic events.

Mr. Drohan indicated that the SRB initially identified 101 buildings as requiring immediate seismic safety action. The retrofit plan for these buildings was presented to the Board of Trustees in the context of a ten-year program. To date 73 of the initial 101 buildings have had their seismic risks resolved. Risks were resolved either by construction retrofit or, in a few cases, by an SRB determination that the buildings in question were safe and could be removed from the list.

As developments in seismic safety knowledge change the engineering professional's assessment of what comprises a structural earthquake risk, new projects are added to the list. Mr. Drohan stated that every new earthquake expands our knowledge of how structures perform during one of these events. Following such events, the building codes and engineering practices continue to evolve to achieve better life safety performance in all of our buildings. The SRB's review list currently includes 57 active projects.

Mr. Drohan emphasized that the impact of the CSU Seismic Safety Review Board extends beyond our system. The technical peer review process is now a requirement for all state buildings. In fact, the language in Division 3R of the Uniform Building Code was created to emulate our assessment and review processes. Mr. Drohan continued by saying that the Seismic Safety Review Board has received state and national recognition. As recently as 1998 the CSU's evaluation criteria for determining seismic risk were used as a comparison for the California State Architect's seismic risk program.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel said that there are some unresolved seismic issues listed in the university auditor's 1997 report. Since the Board of Trustees changed standards related to specific seismic issues in 1998, she asked (1) if the board was duplicating coverage, (2) how closely the staff works with the university auditor on specific seismic issues, and (3) if there are financial problems in resolving these issues.

Mr. Robert Schulz, chief of architecture, capital planning, design and construction, said that he was not aware of any discrepancies between what the university auditor and CPDC staff consider high-hazard buildings. In fact, the CSU no longer has any high or moderately high hazard buildings. He continued by saying that the CSU has, and will continue to have, outstanding projects. Many of these are high-cost projects because they are incorporated into building retrofit programs.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked if the trustees would be liable in the case where an audit recommendation had not been resolved and a catastrophe occurs.

Mr. Schulz responded that the CSU has a very aggressive seismic safety risk abatement program. The program extends well beyond code and legal requirements for protecting occupant safety. He said that the building code or potential litigation does not drive these issues. The CSU Board of Trustees made a commitment to protect the safety of its students, faculty, and staff and the seismic safety program is proceeding to fulfill that commitment.

Mr. Drohan stated that the university audit report's recommendations pertained to more global operational issues rather than specific building concerns. He said that the board-approved projects have taken care of every one of our immediate seismic risks. In 1995 and 1996, staff informed the board that the CSU capital outlay program was systematically moving through the list of high-risk elements as part of the ten-year plan. At that time, the SRB incorporated the balance of program needs within an overall renovation program rather than treating them as separate seismic risk projects.

In referring to item number 7 of the SRB's annual report, Trustee Pierce stated that after the Northridge earthquake, the City of Los Angeles passed an ordinance requiring every building owner to test the moment frame connections to determine the structural integrity of the buildings. He inquired as to whether or not the CSU has tested the moment frame connections in the high-risk areas of our facilities.

Mr. Schulz stated that every CSU moment frame structure has been evaluated in detail—the engineers have reviewed the engineering drawings and made detailed risk assessments of the specific structures, not using the broad-brush approach as was done by the City of Los Angeles. The assessment provided a priority ranking of moment frame issues. He said that one of the agenda items for the July 1999 meeting of the SRB is to determine where these moment frame structures will be placed in our

overall priority list. While moment frames are presently a hot topic, these structures must be prioritized in conjunction with the larger life safety issues, which are the SRB's priority.

Dr. Warren J. Baker, president, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and a registered civil engineer, commended Mr. Drohan and his staff for continuing the previously established extraordinarily aggressive risk analysis program and mitigating the effects that the CSU needs to address in earthquake management. Prior to the Northridge earthquake, the Southern California Center of the National Science Foundation released startling findings of the number of transverse faults that exist in the Los Angeles basin. The vertical motions that occurred in the Northridge earthquake provide more severe local effects than what might occur from the lateral effects that would occur from the San Andreas Fault. President Baker said that the seismic risk situation in the Los Angeles basin is severe, therefore making it important that the CSU continue to address its resources to those high-risk areas first.

Dr. James M. Rosser, president, California State University, Los Angeles, concurred with President Baker and commended staff for putting a program in place that addresses these kinds of high-risk issues.

### **Policy on the Roles in the Physical Development of CSU Campuses**

At Chair Razi's request, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda.

Trustee Pierce referred to Attachment B and asked if a project would require trustee review if it had gone out to bid and come in over budget. Mr. Drohan responded that the project would not come back to the trustees. In the management process, campuses are required to evaluate the project and make revisions appropriate to keep the project within budget, e.g., through value engineering, using bid alternates, or going back out to bid.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked that an explanation be given for the difference between validation and approval. Mr. Drohan responded that under the original policy, the CSU sought project approval from the Sacramento agencies. Under the new management and streamlining authority, the CSU was given considerable flexibility. However, it was coupled with very tight time constraints to complete the projects, therefore creating a need to expedite the process. He said that the CSU no longer goes to Sacramento for formal approval. Validation is where the chancellor, through his delegation to the Department of Capital Planning, Design and Construction, is able to review the projects and validates that the trustees' project approval of scopes, budgets, and schedules at the schematic phase are being maintained in subsequent design phases. Mr. Drohan stated that if a campus is not complying with these criteria, an evaluation letter identifying the issues is sent requesting that corrective action be taken.

Trustee Wang asked what was the dollar amount that defines a major capital outlay project. Mr. Drohan said that currently anything over \$250,000 is a major capital outlay project.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-99-11).

### **Streamlining Policies on Professional Appointments and Approval of Schematic Plans**

At Chair Razi's request, Mr. Drohan summarized the proposed streamlining policies on professional appointments and approval of schematic plans as printed in the agenda.

Trustee Vitti asked what oversight responsibility would the trustees have if the two provisions were approved. Mr. Drohan said that the answer to his question is tied to the previous agenda item. The annual report that will be presented to the board will be an extension of the report that presently is submitted to the Department of Finance and the legislative analyst. The report will assess the performances of the architect, contractor, whether or not the project is within budget, the nature of the overall management of the capital outlay process, and identify what corrective action, if any, is being administratively taken regarding the findings. As to the increased authority to approve schematic plans, Mr. Drohan stated that when the campuses' consulting master plan architects evaluate schematic plans, it is their responsibility to provide the Chancellor's Office with a letter of support and identify if the design solution for the project represents an architectural significance. Projects so identified are brought to the Board of Trustees without regard to cost.

Trustee Vitti asked how the trustees would address conflict of interest. Mr. Drohan stated that these issues, if they exist, would be reported to the Board of Trustees through the annual report. In addition, he said that an established CSU Certification Review Board (CRB) would examine potential conflicts of interest in a project post-completion performance evaluation. If corrective action was necessary, the CRB would recommend to Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West that certification be withdrawn. Upon approval of the recommendation by Mr. West, the campus's project management authority would be removed.

Trustee Vitti stated that leaving the professional appointments at the local level may not give the trustees adequate oversight. Mr. Drohan responded to reemphasize that current trustee policy regarding professional appointments would not be altered with the approval of this item. The proposed policy changes contained in these documents only prescribe how appointments are to be made at the campus level. In accordance with existing board policy, the Department of Capital Planning, Design and Construction maintains an annually updated list of prequalified architects. The campuses are asked to use this list when appointing architects. This process will not change at the system level.

Trustee Campbell expressed concern that these changes would remove the checks and balances that are in place. He also felt that most annual reports do not get read to the extent that would be needed in this situation.

Chair Razi requested that the dollar amount in the item's second resolution be amended from \$5 million to \$2 million.

After listening to all of the comments, Trustee Wang stated that the board has set a policy with certain procedures and, in his opinion, the board is trying to micromanage this process. It was his belief that even with the new policy, the board would have enough control. Trustee Wang asked for an explanation of the \$250,000 major capital outlay projects and the \$5 million project cost cap. Mr. Drohan said that in 1985, staff began bringing these streamlining issues to the board for consideration. At that time schematic plans for all projects with a cost exceeding \$250,000 required board approval. In 1985 the board approved raising the delegated amount to \$1 million for approval

of schematic plans. This action did not change the definition of a major capital outlay project of \$250,000; it merely raised the amount that needs to come to the board for approval, unless it was considered architecturally significant. This agenda item is requesting that delegation approval of projects with a project cost of \$5 million or less, now countered to \$2 million or less, be given to the chancellor or designee.

Trustee Fallgatter expressed concern that historically items of this nature first came to the board as an information item and as an action item at the following board meeting. The two-month time lapse would give the trustees time to discuss and absorb the recommended changes, and it was her feeling that this procedure had been a good rule of thumb.

Chair Razi declared that the item become an information item and asked staff to bring it back as an action item at the board's September 1999 meeting.

### **Status Report on the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program**

Chair Razi asked Mr. Drohan to give a brief summary of the item.

Mr. Drohan referred to the handout that reflected this year's actions of the Legislature and the governor. He stated that there were several unresolved items when the Board of Trustees met at their last meeting. During the final hearings, committees from both houses of the Legislature reached agreement regarding the 1999/2000 state funded capital outlay program budget and the governor has signed it. The CSU received a \$260,033,000 appropriation for 1999/2000.

Trustee Vitti inquired as to how the proposed budget appropriation went from \$214 million to \$124 million and then up to \$260 million without requesting it. Mr. Drohan indicated that the initial request identified a split funding approach for the San Jose library project over a two-year period (1999-2000 and 2000-01). After reviewing the request, the Department of Finance supported a one lump sum funding in the year 1999-2000. In order for the CSU to stay within the four-year average of Proposition 1A funds, the Department of Finance asked the CSU to defer two projects and cut funding on a third project. The \$124 million reflects the legislative analyst's original level of support. Finally, during the hearing process, the Department of Finance reconsidered its position and in the May Revision proposed restoring the projects which brought the funding to \$260,033,000.

### **Draft of the Capital Outlay Program 2000/01 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 Through 2004/05, State and Nonstate Funded**

Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda/handout. He said that the draft book is a summation of the campuses' requests for the upcoming budget cycle, 2000-01. Mr. Drohan noted that in order for the CSU to maintain the four-year average as established by the Department of Finance, the CSU's request will be limited to approximately \$150 million for fiscal year 2000-01. As a result, Mr. Drohan indicated that staff will be evaluating the requests through the end of July to come to some conclusion on a final priority list for presentation at the September Board of Trustees' meeting.

Mr. Drohan also mentioned that there is language in the budget bill regarding third-year funding for special purposes, i.e., new campuses and small campuses across the three segments. It was expected

that this funding allocation might allow the CSU to identify approximately \$55 million for such purposes in 2000-01. The Department of Finance's interpretation of the bond language, however, is that the funding allocation can occur over a two-year period. Whether or not this will have any impact on the final priority list will depend upon whether funding will be sought for one or two years.

#### Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex

A short visual presentation was used to review the item as printed in the agenda.

President Arciniega pointed out that this item represented the key base element in the campus's major fundraising effort. It is a combined three-year cornerstones campaign and this project is the headliner for this effort. Staff had set a fundraising goal of \$6.6 million dollars, which has been exceeded; therefore, the project is being reviewed with the expectation of increasing the total fundraising goal to \$9 million. He indicated that \$2.65 million will be provided from local funds and \$1 million has already been raised from a private source.

Trustee Wang inquired as to why the budget was broken down into state and nonstate funds with the state amount lower than the nonstate amount. Mr. Drohan stated that the breakdown was used to highlight the fund source to which the costs are assigned. He said that the state-funded portion of the project involves the classroom and office buildings that will be built to CSU standards. The same guidelines are considered when building the space for the nonstate portion of the project, but the unit costs for the nonstate portion are different based on the type of space being built. Mr. Drohan continued by saying that the nonstate funded projects also have more flexibility to allow some enhancements that might not have been afforded within state funding based on donor participation for the nonstate portion of the project.

Trustee Wang asked for the definition of Group 1 and Group 2 equipment. Mr. Drohan said that Group 1 is fixed equipment installed by the contractor at the time of the construction contract, and Group 2 is movable equipment purchases independent of the construction contract.

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-99-12).**

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

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

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

**September 14, 1999**

**Members Present**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Harold Goldwhite  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Michael D. Stennis  
Anthony M. Vitti

**Other Trustees Present**

William D. Campbell  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Dee Dee Myers  
Ralph R. Pesqueira

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the July 7, 1999, meeting were approved as submitted.

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-99-13).

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-99-14).

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Annual Report**

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

**State and Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 2000/2001; Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/2001 Through 2004/2005; and Previous Five-Year Funding Program 1995/1996 Through 1999/2000**

Chair Razi introduced Patrick Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, to present the item.

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan gave a brief overview of the item as printed in the agenda. He noted that the categories and criteria continue to remain the same as those established in the early 1990s, i.e., Funds for projects of systemwide benefit; Renovation—Funds to correct structural, health, and safety code deficiencies; Renovation—Funds to make new and remodeled facilities operable; Renovation—Funds to meet campus deficiency needs; and Growth.

Mr. Drohan stated that at the July 7, 1999, Board of Trustees' meeting he mentioned that there were a couple of other criteria being considered dealing with some limitations to our budget request that we will be facing in the 2000 year. The approved 1999/2000 budget included \$260 million for capital improvements. In order for the CSU to maintain its average of approximately \$207 million across the four-year span of Proposition 1A as determined by the Department of Finance, the CSU has been asked to tailor its 2000/2001 capital outlay budget request to \$153,350,000. Attachment A to this agenda item reflects this approach. Mr. Drohan pointed out that since the language in Proposition 1A calls for a concentration of funds for small and new campuses as well as permanent off-campus centers in the final two years of the bond, 38 percent of the capital outlay request is concentrated in growth.

Mr. Drohan continued by saying that while the state funded capital outlay program 2000/2001 priority list totals \$153 million, the item's resolution requests the chancellor to explore all avenues to increase state funding to bring the CSU closer to the \$505,534,000 needed to develop the facilities to adequately serve its students.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-99-15).

**Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Multi-Purpose Event Center at California State University, Fresno**

Chair Razi informed the committee members that this item was being postponed to a later date.

### **Campus Master Plan Revision—California State University, Sacramento**

With the use of a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-99-16).

### **Streamlining Policies on Professional Appointments and Approval of Schematic Plans**

Mr. Drohan prefaced the review of the item by referring to a particular board action at its July 1999 meeting. At that meeting there was a companion item to this item that asked for approval of a revised policy on the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, the Department of Capital Planning, Design and Construction, and the campuses. The intent was to reflect within the Board of Trustees' standing orders the changes that have occurred in the capital outlay management process in recent years. This revised section to the standing orders included an annual chancellor's report regarding the progress of all capital outlay projects.

Mr. Drohan stated that in preparation to providing an annual progress report beginning January 2000, the Department of Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC) has developed a report format. Mr. Drohan gave a visual presentation of the report that the trustees will be receiving each January identifying all projects completed in the previous calendar year.

Mr. Drohan continued by saying that the whole issue of the changes in the capital outlay management process is built around accountability. The annual report is viewed as another vehicle that will measure the accountability of the overall performance of our capital outlay program. He stated that the Chancellor's Office staff remains responsible for maintaining oversight and guidance of project implementation and control of the capital outlay budget process. At the same time, the Board of Trustees continues to control the master plan issues, environmental impact reports, the initial project budgets, and schematic designs. The campuses' roles relate to responsibility for management of the capital outlay process. Staff believes that the current capital outlay management process provides flexibility in expediting the capital outlay program while maintaining sufficient accountability that gives assurance that the CSU can handle the procedures properly.

In referring to the agenda item at hand, Mr. Drohan stated that the committee was revisiting two items of the proposed changes regarding professional appointments and approval of schematic plans. The first item pertained to modifying the current policy on professional appointments by eliminating the requirement to present professional appointments to the committee. He said that campuses would select their project architects from a pre-approved, pre-screened list of qualified architects maintained by CPDC. The second item involves the delegation of authority to the chancellor in approving schematic plans. At Trustee Razi's request, the major capital outlay project cost has been modified as "up to \$3 million."

Trustee Razi stated that he was very encouraged with the prospect of receiving an annual capital outlay project review report.

Trustee Vitti applauded staff in formalizing a project evaluation. He asked who would be conducting the evaluations.

In response, Mr. Drohan said that the evaluation team would be made up of CPDC staff members.

Trustee Vitti inquired at what point would staff determine to no longer deal with a third party due to poor performance—are there established criteria or would it be totally subjective.

Mr. Drohan responded that there are two categories to consider—an individual architect or design professional, and a contractor. In the case of an architect/design professional, the firm's performance would be evaluated and if found to be unsatisfactory, it would be removed from the prequalified list maintain by CPDC, and campuses would be advised.

Mr. Drohan continued that if poor contractor performance is alleged, a decertification hearing would be held to review the circumstances resulting in a ruling as to whether or not the contractor would be decertified. The hearing officer would also specify the length of time the decertification would be in effect. Further, Mr. Drohan stated that such decertification/poor performance information would be used in the prequalification process and disseminated to the campuses.

Trustee Vitti stated that he was looking for some kind of a scoring technique that when an architect reaches a certain number of repeat poor performances, he would be permanently disqualified.

Historically, Mr. Drohan said that such occurrences have been handled on a project-by-project basis, and if the actions were severe enough, we have recommended that the architect no longer be appointed to CSU capital outlay projects.

Trustee Campbell asked that if a project is advertised for appointment and a qualified local architect wishes to be considered but is not on the prequalified list, can he still apply for the project.

Mr. Drohan answered in the negative.

Trustee Pesqueira noted that in the past, architects have been chosen from a prequalified list that sometimes included one a campus had used before who had a good performance record. He inquired if staff provides the opportunity for new architects to become qualified.

Mr. Drohan stated that CPDC annually solicits architects new to the CSU to identify their capabilities and resources. They are rated and placed on the prequalification list.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-99-17).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 1  
November 15-17, 1999

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

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

**Presentation By**

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

**Summary**

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1999/2000 nonstate-funded capital outlay program to include the following project:

California State University, Sacramento Regional and Continuing Education Building	PWCE	\$5,500,000
---	------	-------------

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

**ITEM**

2

Agenda Item 1

November 15-17, 1999

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

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

This is a request to amend the 1999/2000 nonstate-funded capital outlay program to include the following project:

<b>California State University, Sacramento</b>	<b>PWCE</b>	<b>\$5,500,000</b>
<b>Regional and Continuing Education Building</b>		

CSU Sacramento wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Regional and Continuing Education (RCE) Building (Phase I). The proposed project includes 24,015 gross square feet of lecture, laboratory and administrative support space. The RCE program provides professional and continuing education for local and regional constituents. The facility will be funded through the sale of bonds by the CSU Sacramento Foundation. This project is consistent with the campus master plan and is the first in a series of RCE facility improvements over the next fifteen years.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include \$5,500,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Sacramento, Regional and Continuing Education Building.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 2  
November 15-17, 1999

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

#### **Acceptance of Interest in Real Property**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

William M. Roth proposes to transfer to Sonoma State University ownership of a 10-plus acre parcel adjacent to the Sonoma State University, Fairfield Osborn Preserve. This item includes a proposed resolution that authorizes the acceptance of the gift of real property.

#### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2

November 15-17, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### Acceptance of Interest in Real Property

##### Background

William M. Roth proposes to transfer to Sonoma State University ownership and operation of a 10-plus acre parcel adjacent to the university's Fairfield Osborn Preserve. The preserve is a CSU owned 200-plus acre parcel within five miles of the Sonoma campus. This additional 10-plus acre gift will facilitate preserve trail maintenance, security and a more clearly defined property line. The objective of the transfer is to maintain the property in its natural state and to protect and enhance the native flora, fauna and natural communities. Section 7-b of Chapter III of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees requires adoption of a "specific resolution" authorizing the campus president to accept this gift on behalf of the board. Accordingly, the following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the campus president or designee is authorized to accept on behalf of the Board of Trustees the interest in real property given to The California State University by William M. Roth to be operated as a nature preserve.

## BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3  
November 15-17, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Multi-Purpose Event Center at California State University, Fresno**

##### **Presentation By**

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

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

###### *Brief*

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for a multi-purpose event center at CSU Fresno:

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approval of a Campus Master Plan Revision
- Approval of an Amendment to the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program

The campus master plan revision proposes the construction of a multi-purpose event center for athletic, academic, recreational, and cultural events on the Fresno campus. The proposed 48-acre site is located on Shaw Avenue, between Woodrow and Chestnut Avenues. It is adjacent to the southeast corner of the academic core of the campus and a new interchange for State Route 168.

The proposed project is a complex of buildings totaling approximately 600,000 gross square feet (gsf). The east complex includes a 16,500-seat multi-purpose arena with luxury suites, public concourses, a club level dining area, food court, novelty and concession areas, and other amenities. The west complex includes a practice gym, office space for athletic administration and sports teams, and academic and other support areas. Other elements in the west complex include a business incubator, an entrepreneurial center, and a business institute with linkages to the Craig School of Business. The project also includes 3,600 new parking spaces in surface parking lots.

The 80,000 gsf commercial complex described in the Notice of Preparation has been deleted from the project. Temporary parking is planned for this area.

The FEIR analyzes the potential significant environmental effects of the development of the proposed project. This is in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines. The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under CEQA in order to approve the proposed project, including revisions to the campus master plan. The FEIR is in the agenda mailout.

The following attachments are included in this item:

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan dated November 1999.

Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated September 1994.

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

Attachment D is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

### *Executive Summary*

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

**1. Payment of Traffic Mitigation Fees.** The cities of Fresno and Clovis, and Fresno County, do not agree that the university, as a state agency, is not responsible for contributing funds for roadway improvements to mitigate project traffic.

**CSU Response:** The university's obligations and limitations on fee payment for off-site improvements are discussed on pages 3-2 through 3-4 of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR identifies roadway improvements needed to mitigate project traffic impacts, and notes that the university is legally constrained from funding such improvements. The legislature has established dedicated fund sources for road and highway improvements which depend on gas tax revenues and are prioritized for use by local agencies. In addition, the university cannot guarantee that such improvements would be constructed, even if funding were available. This is because the affected local roads are under the jurisdictions of the cities of Clovis and Fresno. The state highways are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. Nonetheless, the university has indicated a willingness to work cooperatively with these jurisdictions to identify and pursue potential funds from sources established for such improvements, such as prioritization for allocation of gas tax revenues.

**2. Sewer Capacity.** The cities of Fresno and Clovis raised the issue of whether the existing capacity of sewer pipelines can handle the additional increase associated with the project.

**CSU Response:** The entire campus is connected to the City of Fresno sewer system at two locations, as stated on page 4.6-11 of the Draft EIR. The campus' existing football, baseball and softball stadiums are connected to the Millbrook Avenue trunk sewer system, which is proposed to serve the event center. Because this sewer system has a limited capacity, a new mitigation measure was added to the FEIR to ensure that capacity of the trunk sewer line is not exceeded. Until sewer capacity is upgraded, the campus shall restrict scheduling simultaneous events with Bulldog Stadium to ensure capacity is not exceeded.

**3. Traffic Analysis.** Issues were raised by Caltrans on the traffic analysis included impacts on the State Route 168/Shaw Avenue Interchange in the year 2003 associated with queuing onto SR 168, and the feasibility of providing a second eastbound left turn lane on Shaw Avenue.

**CSU Response:** At Caltrans' request, Section 4-2, Traffic and Circulation, in the Draft EIR, addressed queuing at the southbound off-ramp and on Shaw Avenue. No significant queuing impacts were identified. The total ramp queuing space exceeds the storage requirements of the proposed project (see Response to Comment 1-3 in Chapter 3, Responses to Comments of the FEIR).

The dual left turn lanes (eastbound on Shaw Avenue) into the project site are not required as part of the project mitigation. They were only shown as a means of providing higher turning capacity into the project site. The intersection of Shaw and Chestnut will function effectively in the p.m. peak hour and the early evening without designating a temporary second left turn lane into the project.

**4. Traffic Analysis.** Issues raised by the City of Clovis on the traffic analysis included the feasibility of adding a fourth through lane on eastbound Shaw Avenue at Willow Avenue, and the need for a traffic control plan.

**CSU Response:** Mitigation Measure 4.2-5 on page 4.2-29 of the Draft EIR requires the university to prepare and approve a traffic control plan in consultation with the cities of Fresno and Clovis, and with Caltrans. The university has previously implemented a successful traffic and parking management plan for events at Bulldog Stadium, working cooperatively with Caltrans and the cities of Fresno and Clovis. Mitigation of the Shaw/Willow intersection is no longer required due to improvements planned by the City of Clovis. However, under cumulative conditions, this intersection would operate at an unacceptable service level. As stated on page 4.2-36, the project contribution to this intersection could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, the improvements would be under the City of Clovis' jurisdiction, and could not be guaranteed by the university. In addition, improvements at this intersection may not be economically or physically feasible.

**5. Parking.** The City of Fresno expressed concern that parking would not be adequate to serve the project.

**CSU Response:** The Draft EIR analysis noted that 2,150 existing parking spaces are available at 5:00 p.m. on a typical day in Lots A, B, J, and V. The project requires 4,950 parking spaces to accommodate a sold-out event. This assumes that there are three passengers per vehicle, and that some attendees will be on campus or will use other sources of transportation. The proposed project includes 3,600 new parking spaces, which leaves a total of 1,350 spaces to be provided in the existing lots. Therefore, parking capacity will be adequate.

#### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

4

Agenda Item 3

November 15-17, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Multi-Purpose Event Center at California State University, Fresno**

##### **Background**

Since the early 1980s, CSU Fresno has discussed plans to develop an on-campus multi-purpose event center. Currently, the men's basketball games are held in the 10,200-seat Selland Arena owned by the City of Fresno in downtown Fresno. The university made the decision to pursue the development of an on-campus event center when it was determined that expansion of the Selland Arena was not feasible. The proposed project will accommodate sporting and entertainment events. CSU Fresno is the only institution in the Western Athletic Conference without an on-campus arena.

In 1997, the university hired the firm of Parsons Brinkerhoff to conduct a site selection analysis. Two sites were analyzed: (1) the 78-acre Cedar/Barstow Avenue site, and (2) the 48-acre Shaw/Woodrow Avenue site. The firm's findings were presented to the university and a panel was convened to recommend a preferred site. In December 1997, a public meeting was held and campus and community constituents were invited to present their opinions on the merits of each site. Groups invited to make presentations included: University Portals Neighborhood; City of Fresno; City of Clovis; the university's Athletic Department, Bulldog Foundation, and AG Foundation. Based on the Parsons Brinkerhoff study and the public meeting comments, the panel recommended the Shaw/Woodrow site. It is currently agricultural land. This site will not adversely impact campus agricultural programs as the land is not used for significant crop production. Following an extensive selection process, the university hired Sink Combs Dethlefs to prepare a conceptual design of the facility. Schematic plans for the proposed project will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at a future meeting.

##### **Project Summary**

The proposed project is a multi-purpose indoor arena for athletic, academic, recreational, and cultural events. It includes a complex of buildings totaling approximately 600,000 gsf. The 500,000 gsf east complex contains a 16,500-seat multi-purpose arena with luxury suites, public concourses, a club level dining area, food court, novelty and concession areas, and other typical amenities. The 100,000 gsf west complex includes a practice gym, academic support areas, office space for athletic administration and sports teams, and other support areas. Other elements in the west complex include a business incubator, an entrepreneurial center, and a family business institute with linkages to the Craig School of Business. Approximately 3,600 new parking spaces in surface parking lots would be constructed to accommodate the needs of the project.

##### **Campus Master Plan**

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan with the event center including parking identified in Hexagon 1. Attachment B is the previously approved plan dated September 1994.

### **Amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program**

The university wishes to amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to provide \$127,910,000 for design, construction and equipment for the multi-purpose event center that includes parking. Project funding is from nonstate sources and a financial plan will be presented at a future board meeting.

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

Comments were received in response to the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study and the Draft EIR for the proposed event center. The comments included concerns about: (a) the increase in traffic on local roadways; (b) payment of fees to make required roadway improvements; (c) noise associated with the project; (d) increase in night lighting; (e) sewer line capacity; and (f) groundwater recharge capability. The FEIR includes written responses to all comments received. For complete copies of further information regarding comments received and written responses, please refer to Chapter 3, Response to Comments of the FEIR. Following is a summary of the most significant comments:

**1. Traffic Issues.** Many comments received from local jurisdictions concerned payment of mitigation fees by the university to make improvements to local city and county roadways associated with the project.

**CSU Response:** The university's obligations and limitations with respect to funding of off-site improvements are discussed on pages 3-2 through 3-4 of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR identifies roadway improvements that would be needed to mitigate project traffic impacts, and notes that the university is legally constrained from funding such improvements. In addition, the university cannot guarantee that such improvements would be constructed, even if funding were available. This is because the affected roadways are under the jurisdictions of the cities of Clovis and Fresno, and Caltrans. Nonetheless, the university has indicated a willingness to work cooperatively with these jurisdictions to identify and pursue potential sources of funds for such improvements.

**2. Sewer Issues.** Concerns were raised on whether the existing capacity of sewer pipelines can handle the additional increase associated with the project.

**CSU Response:** The entire campus is connected to the City of Fresno sewer system at two locations, as stated on page 4.6-11 of the Draft EIR. The campus' sewage is distributed between these two connections. It should be noted that the campus' existing football, baseball and softball stadiums are connected to the Millbrook Avenue trunk sewer system, which is proposed to serve the event center. The existing football stadium attracts a larger attendance than that proposed for the event center. Because the Millbrook Avenue trunk sewer system has a limited capacity, a new mitigation measure has been added to the FEIR to ensure that capacity of the trunk sewer line is not exceeded.

**3. Groundwater Issues.** Concerns were raised about the need to maintain adequate areas designated for recharge. Development of the proposed project would eliminate a large area of undeveloped land from recharge capability.

**CSU Response:** The university's agricultural irrigation water system is completely separate from the campus domestic water system and is not metered. The amount of water being extracted from the groundwater aquifer for agricultural irrigation has not been quantified. Currently, water used to irrigate the existing agricultural areas on the project site is obtained from surface water provided by the Fresno Irrigation District (FID). However, the CSU Fresno agricultural operations department of the school of agricultural sciences and technology is in the process of converting, wherever possible, their dependency on groundwater to more dependency on surface water. A 20 acre-foot holding and recharge ponding basin is currently being constructed on the north side of Bullard Avenue, between Willow and Chestnut Avenues (Bullard Basin). The basin will store surface water delivered from the FID. The campus will keep the basin full of water and pump out the farm's irrigation supply during the day. Although the project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact on groundwater recharge, a mitigation measure has been added to ensure no impacts would occur.

Overall, the campus has been aiding efforts to reduce the dependency on groundwater extraction and reduce the overdraft of the groundwater supply caused by the substantial recent increase in urban development of the overall Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area.

**4. Traffic Analysis.** Comments raised by Caltrans included impacts on the SR 168/Shaw Avenue Interchange in the year 2003 associated with queuing onto SR 168 and the feasibility of providing a second eastbound left turn lane on Shaw Avenue.

**CSU Response:** At the request of Caltrans, Section 4.2 of Traffic and Circulation in the Draft EIR addressed queuing at the southbound off-ramp and on Shaw Avenue. No significant queuing impacts were identified for the southbound off-ramp. The traffic volumes for the 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. period for the northbound off-ramp appear to be in error. Figure C-5b in Appendix C shows 1,220 right turns from the ramp for the p.m. peak hour and 1,754 right turns for the 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. period. It is highly unlikely that the hour after the peak would have more traffic than the peak when no project traffic will be contained in that movement. Comparing the eastbound traffic at the northbound off-ramp to the eastbound traffic on Shaw at Willow indicates that the right turn traffic at the off-ramp should be about 1,083 vehicles rather than 1,754. The 1,083 vehicles seem to be a reasonable reduction from the 1,220, which are expected during the p.m. peak hour.

A total of 2,712 feet of storage is required for all left and right turns. This value was calculated using one and one-half times the average number of vehicles per signal cycle with a 120-second cycle length as required in the *Highway Design Manual, 4th Edition*, pages 400-9. The ramp is three lanes wide for a total of 384 feet or 1,152 feet of storage and two lanes wide for 1,083 feet back to the gore for an additional 2,166 feet. Therefore, the total ramp queuing space is 3,318 feet. This exceeds the storage requirements for the inflated traffic figure by about 600 feet. If the revised right turn volume is used, only 2,709 feet of storage is necessary.

The dual left turn lanes into the project site are not required as part of the project mitigation and were only shown as a means of providing higher turning capacity into the project site. The intersection of Shaw and Chestnut will function effectively in the p.m. peak hour and the early evening without designating a second left turn into the project.

**5. Traffic Analysis.** Comments raised by the City of Clovis regarding the traffic analysis included the feasibility of adding a fourth through lane on eastbound Shaw Avenue at Willow Avenue and the need to create a traffic control plan.

**CSU Response:** Mitigation Measure 4.2-5 on page 4.2-29 of the Draft EIR requires the university to prepare and approve a traffic control plan in consultation with the cities of Fresno and Clovis, and Caltrans. Mitigation of the Shaw/Willow intersection is no longer required, due to improvements planned by the City of Clovis. However, under cumulative conditions, this intersection would operate at an unacceptable service level. As stated on page 4.2-36, the project contribution to this intersection could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, the improvements would be under the City of Clovis' jurisdiction, and could not be guaranteed by the university. The city noted that improvements at this intersection may not be economically feasible. Therefore, as stated on page 4.2-35, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP), as required by Mitigation Measure 4.2-5, would reduce vehicle trips; however, the extent of the reduction cannot be determined at this time. Therefore, even with the additions to the TCP, the impact on cumulative traffic conditions would remain significant and unavoidable.

**6. Noise Issues.** Eric L. Outfleet and Bill and Shirley Secrest expressed concerns with the operational and crowd noise associated with major events at the arena. The City of Clovis was concerned with the increase in traffic noise.

**CSU Response:** Any exterior equipment would be located along the eastern side of the event center near the loading dock area. This area would be designed below grade, which would help to minimize any equipment noise. In addition, all equipment would be fully enclosed further minimizing any potential noise impacts. The closest sensitive receptors are located to the south of Shaw Avenue. Due to the distance from the facility and existing noise levels, it is not anticipated that any nearby residences would be adversely impacted by equipment noise.

The proposed event center would be a fully enclosed building in contrast to Bulldog Stadium, which is an open-air stadium. The project will be used primarily for the university's men's basketball and women's volleyball games. On occasion, entertainment and cultural events would be held in the enclosed event center. It is not anticipated that noise from events would disturb neighboring areas. As stated on page 4.4-9 of the Draft EIR, noise generated during events (e.g., crowd noise, public address system, and amplified concert music) would likely be contained within the building and should not be audible to residential areas to the south.

To ensure that noise is contained within the building, Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 is required:

4.4-4 The company managing the event center shall be responsible for ensuring that doors and windows are closed during concerts and similar events that generate substantial noise.

In response to the comment from Clovis, an assessment of potential through-traffic noise impacts was conducted for the major intersections along Willow Avenue, from Ashlan to Herndon Avenues. The results of this analysis indicate that peak hour traffic noise levels are predicted to increase by less than 3.0 dB on the roadways leading into and out of these intersections. No significant through-traffic noise level increases are expected on project-area roadways that are located in the City of Clovis. Other residential streets south of the campus in the City of Fresno would be potentially impacted by noise from cars parking and event attendees walking to the venue. This would remain a potential significant impact without implementation of recommended mitigation measures by the City of Fresno.

**7. Lighting Issues.** Eric L. Outfleet commented on the increase in lighting and its effect on the night-sky.

**CSU Response:** Section 4.7, Visual Resources and Aesthetics, in the Draft EIR discussed the proposed project's potential to increase light and glare in the area. As discussed on page 4.7-6, the proposed project would introduce additional lighting into an area that is currently undeveloped. There would not be any lighting of sports fields. The parking lots, buildings, and sidewalk areas surrounding the project would be lighted. However, the main parking for the proposed project would be located behind the building to the north away from existing residential areas to the south. The parking lot area would be designed with a broad canopy of deciduous trees for shading, as stated in the landscaping plan prepared by the university. To ensure that all lights associated with the project would not adversely affect adjacent areas, Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 on page 4.7-7 requires that the configuration of exterior light fixtures shall emphasize close spacing and lower intensity light that is directed downward, away from off-site receptors. This is to minimize the effects of light and glare on adjacent areas. Compliance with the mitigation would reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The event center would be located in an urban area that already produces substantial light. The project contribution to night lighting, or "twilight haze," would not be considerable, especially with Mitigation Measure 4.7-3.

**8. Parking Issues.** The City of Fresno expressed concern that parking would not be adequate to serve the project.

**CSU Response:** Existing parking lots were surveyed for occupancy in the site selection analysis prepared by Parsons Brinkerhoff. The Draft EIR analysis found that restricting parking in Lots A and V after 5 p.m. would be necessary to accommodate a sold-out event. However, parking spaces in Lots B and J are available to accommodate displaced parking from Lots A and V. The occupancy analysis found that 2,150 existing parking spaces are available at 5 p.m. on a typical day in Lots A, B, J, and V. The project will need less than 1,500 of these spaces to accommodate a sold-out event. Therefore, parking capacity would be adequate.

It should be noted that over several years the university has successfully implemented a parking and traffic management plan for activities at the 40,000-seat Bulldog Football Stadium. The traffic management plan has been a cooperative effort between the university, Caltrans, and the cities of Fresno and Clovis, which has positively addressed similar issues.

**9. Emergency Services.** The City of Clovis commented that the project may adversely affect the ability of the city to provide police and fire services during events.

**CSU Response:** Campus police oversee traffic control on-campus and during events such as football games. The City of Fresno police department provides traffic control at selected intersections and is paid by the campus athletic department. Because of its proximity to the event center, the Fresno police department may request the assistance of Clovis police during some events. The Traffic Control Plan (see Mitigation Measure 4.2-5) could include measures requiring police involvement on Clovis streets. In either case, during events where the Fresno or Clovis police department provides traffic control on adjacent city roadways, the costs will be paid by the CSU Fresno Association or the arena management company.

The policies and procedures for operation of the event center will require the provision for emergency services, as needed (e.g., EMTs, ambulances), and the event center will have fire sprinklers. Therefore, no impact on the Clovis fire department is anticipated.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

A preliminary financial plan will be developed on the nonstate financial resources needed to implement the proposed project. The estimated project cost is \$127,910,000 as follows:

East Complex Arena	\$ 57,741,000
West Complex	25,000,000
Sitework	7,971,000
Group I Equipment	11,347,000
Fees/Contingency	22,701,000
Group II Equipment	3,150,000
Total	\$127,910,000

#### **California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. This item also requests approval to revise the campus master plan to reflect the event center complex and additional parking areas.

To determine the scope of the environmental review, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) was prepared in November 1998 for the proposed project. Local jurisdictions, including the cities of Fresno and Clovis and Fresno County, along with other interested agencies and individuals, were provided a copy of the NOP/IS. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on November 30, 1998, and obtained input on the scope of the EIR issues. A copy of the NOP/IS is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

10

CPB&G

Agenda Item 3

November 15-17, 1999

Based on the NOP/IS process, it was determined that implementation of the proposed project would result in either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts in the following issue areas:

- Population and Housing
- Geology
- Biological Resources
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- Hazards
- Public Services
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

Therefore, these issue areas were “focused” out of the EIR because implementation of the project would not result in any adverse impacts on these resources.

The Draft EIR addressed the following potentially significant issue areas:

- Land Use
- Traffic and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Flooding, Drainage and Water Quality
- Water Supply, Wastewater and Solid Waste
- Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Additionally, the Draft EIR included: (a) a description of the project; (b) an alternatives section that describes and analyzes alternative plans to reduce identified significant impacts; and (c) cumulative, growth-inducing, and significant and irreversible effects of project implementation.

The Draft EIR was made available for public and agency comments for a 45-day review period. During the review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR were submitted to the campus. Jurisdictions, interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the Draft EIR along with a notice of a public meeting to be held on the project. A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was also mailed to property owners within a one-quarter mile radius of the project site. A public meeting on the Draft EIR was held on April 22, 1999. The public review period closed May 12, 1999. The FEIR incorporates the results of the comments received on the Draft EIR. Significant issues derived from these comments were discussed earlier in this item under issues identified through the public review process.

A complete listing and discussion of significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and the proposed mitigation measures are analyzed in detail in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, and summarized in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR. The FEIR, Chapters 3 and 4, includes all the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The FEIR also includes the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, describing the procedures the university and others will use to implement the mitigation measures to be adopted in the event that the Board of Trustees approves the proposed project.

### **Analysis of Environmental Impacts**

Based on the analysis included in the Draft EIR, no significant environmental effects are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project in the following issue areas:

- Flooding, Drainage
- Water Quality
- Water Supply
- Wastewater Disposal
- Solid Waste

Mitigation measures are recommended for adoption in the following areas:

- Traffic and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise, Flooding
- Drainage
- Water Quality
- Water Supply
- Wastewater Disposal
- Solid Waste
- Visual Resources

However, even with implementation of recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project, if implemented, would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

**Land Use:** The loss of prime farmland both on a project-specific and cumulative level.

**Traffic and Circulation:** Increase in traffic congestion, both project-specific and under cumulative conditions, at local intersections in the project area. Increase in through traffic in the neighborhood south of Shaw Avenue and cumulative increase in traffic in the project area.

**Air Quality:** Increase in CO levels that would exceed the federal 8-hour standard. Operational emissions, both on a project-specific and cumulative level, would exceed ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO standards.

**Noise:** Increase in traffic noise in neighborhoods to the south of the project site.

**Visual Resources:** Change in the visual character of the project site, both on a project-specific and cumulative level.

In connection with this agenda item, the Board of Trustees will be asked to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable effects listed above. The board will also be asked to adopt Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in Attachment C to the effect that the remaining significant and unavoidable effects associated with the project are acceptable due to the overriding benefits associated with the proposed project.

### **Alternatives**

The alternatives section of the Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with the state CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the university's proposed project, including the revisions to the campus master plan.

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

**Alternative 1—No Project Alternative:** This alternative is required by CEQA and it compares the present existing condition of the project site against the significant effects that would result from implementation of the proposed project. This alternative would not meet project objectives and was rejected.

**Alternative 2—Reduced Arena Capacity:** This alternative reduces the size of the event center to a maximum of 11,000 seats, which is comparable to the capacity of Selland Arena. This alternative is rejected because it would not be cost effective or meet the project objectives. Therefore, it would not be prudent to build a new venue that could not accommodate a larger capacity.

**Alternative 3—Altered Site Plan:** This alternative would place the event center farther north on the project site and relocate the parking area to the front of the site adjacent to Shaw Avenue. This alternative is rejected because it would not reduce significant environmental impacts identified under the project and would create additional impacts.

The **No Project Alternative** assumes that no event center would be built on campus, and that men's basketball games would continue to be held at Selland Arena. This alternative would not meet the objectives set forth by the campus.

For a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed project, please see Chapter 5 in the Draft EIR. A table summarizing the comparison of alternatives is provided in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, Table 5-1.

### **Resolution and Final Environmental Impact Report**

A proposed resolution is presented below with respect to the Board of Trustees' certification of the FEIR, approval of a campus master plan revision, amendment to the nonstate funded capital outlay program, and approval of the proposed project. The FEIR, including comments and responses, is included in the agenda mailout. Referenced in this resolution as attachments to this item are the CEQA required Findings of Fact and the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C), and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (Attachment D).

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**WHEREAS**, The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the California State University, Fresno, multipurpose event center (State Clearinghouse No. 98111018) was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures,

and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed campus master plan revision for and the development of the multi-purpose event center at CSU Fresno and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

**WHEREAS**, The FEIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, This board certifies that the FEIR is complete and adequate and that it fully complies with all requirements of 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 make findings prior to approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding); and

**WHEREAS**, This board hereby adopts the findings of fact in Attachment C and related mitigation measures in Attachment D, Agenda Item 3 of the November 15-17, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are hereby incorporated by reference; and

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

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Board of Trustees, upon consideration of the information provided in the FEIR, 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 raised associated with approval of the proposed project, including the revision to the California State University, Fresno campus master plan and future construction of the multi-purpose event center 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 and finds that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the proposed project as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines, the record of the proceedings for the project comprises the following:

- A. The Draft EIR for the California State University, Fresno, campus master plan revision for the multi-purpose event center;
- B. The FEIR including all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to comments;
- C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings; and
- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

All of the above information is on file with The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802, and California State University, Fresno, Office of the Vice President for Administration, 5241 North Maple Avenue, Fresno, California 93740-8027.

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board adopts the findings set forth in Attachment C, Agenda Item 3 of the November 15-17, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, including the rejection or modification of mitigation measures and the other findings presented in Attachment C. The board specifically finds that the rejected or unmodified mitigation measures were not feasible for the reasons stated in the FEIR, and describes the reasons for modifying these measures in Attachment C; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board hereby certifies the FEIR for the California State University, Fresno, campus master plan revision for and development of the multi-purpose event center, and directs that the FEIR be considered in any further actions on the project; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Summary, incorporated in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan which is Attachment D, Agenda Item 3 of the November 15-17, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, and which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the California State University, Fresno, campus master plan revision, dated November 1999, is hereby approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include \$127,910,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Fresno, multi-purpose event center; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Fresno, campus master plan revision for and development of multi-purpose event center.

ATTACHMENT A  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

2  
ATTACHMENT A  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

ATTACHMENT B  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

2  
ATTACHMENT B  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

ATTACHMENT C  
CPB&G—Item 3  
November 15-17, 1999

**California State University, Fresno  
Campus Master Plan Revision for the Multi-Purpose Event Center**

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

Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines and  
Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code

Final Environmental Impact Report  
State Clearinghouse Number 98111018

Project Files May Be Reviewed at:

California State University, Fresno  
Office of the Vice President for Administration  
5241 N. Maple Avenue, MS TA52  
Fresno, CA 93740

**CEQA Findings, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the CSU Fresno Campus Master Plan Revision for the Multi-Purpose Event Center**

**SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Statutory Requirements for Findings**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21081), and the CEQA Guidelines (the Guidelines) (14 Cal. Code Regulations, Section 15091) require that:

“No public agency approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant 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 of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

(2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

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

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment (see, Pub. Res. Code Section 21081(b)).

The Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the California State University, Fresno Event Center project (“the project”) identified significant environmental impacts, which will result from the implementation of the project. However, the Board of Trustees of the California State University (“Board of Trustees”) finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those potential significant effects to a less-than-significant level. Those impacts which are not reduced to a less-than-significant level are identified and overridden due to specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other feasibility considerations. 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 as Attachment D, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 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 the certification of the FEIR for the project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the Board of Trustees also finds that the FEIR reflects the Board of Trustees' independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

## **1.2 Organization/Format of Findings**

Section 2.0 of these findings contains a summary description of the project and related background facts. Section 3.0 identifies the significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project. Section 4.0 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project which were determined to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Section 5.0 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant, and, therefore, no mitigation is required. Section 6.0 discusses the feasibility of project alternatives and mitigation measures. Section 7.0 includes the Board of Trustees' Statement of Overriding Considerations.

## **SECTION 2: THE PROJECT**

The project analyzed in the FEIR consisted of the siting, construction and operation of a multi-purpose event center on the California State University, Fresno campus.

### **2.1 Fresno State Event Center**

The proposed project consists of developing and constructing a multi-purpose Event Center to accommodate a variety of athletic, academic, recreational, and cultural events. A total of 3,600 new parking spaces in surface parking lots would be constructed to accommodate the proposed project.

The proposed scope of this project includes a complex of buildings comprising approximately 600,000 gross square feet (gsf). The East Complex (approximately 500,000 gsf) would include a 16,500-seat multi-purpose Event Center that would accommodate intercollegiate athletic events and a variety of other academic and commercial events. The Event Center would also include luxury suites, public concourses, a club level dining area, food court, novelty and concession areas, box office, locker rooms, athletic training facilities, office space, storage areas, and required additional parking.

The West Complex (approximately 100,000 gsf) would include a practice gym, academic support areas, and office space for athletic administration and sports teams. Additional elements include a business incubator, entrepreneurial institute, and a family business institute with linkages to the Craig School of Business.

The 80,000-gross-square-foot commercial complex described in the Notice of Preparation has been deleted from the project. This area, immediately east of the main building, would be used for temporary parking.

The FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed Event Center project. This is in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines. The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under CEQA in order for the board to approve the proposed project, including revisions to the campus master plan.

Included in this item are the proposed campus master plan with the revisions indicated in hexagon 1 (Attachment A) and the previously approved master plan dated September 1994 (Attachment B). The FEIR is included in the agenda mailout.

## **2.2 Project Objectives**

The Board of Trustees has considered the statement of objectives sought by the project as found in Chapter 2.0 of the FEIR. The Board of Trustees hereby adopts those objectives as part of the project.

For a detailed discussion of the proposed Event Center, the Board of Trustees incorporates by reference Chapter 2.0 of the FEIR.

## **SECTION 3: SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**

The FEIR identified the following significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level even though the Board of Trustees finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project: (a) Land Use impacts; (b) Traffic and Circulation impacts; (c) Air Quality impacts; (d) Noise impacts; and (e) Visual Resource impacts. This section includes the Board of Trustees' findings with respect to the above-mentioned impacts of the project are addressed below.

### **3.1 Land Use**

3.1.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Development of the proposed project would result in the loss of prime farmland. The project will permanently convert farmland to developed uses. Farmland cannot be recreated due to economic and technological limitations, so no feasible mitigation measures are available for this impact.

3.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the loss of Prime Farmland identified in the FEIR. 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.

3.1.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, that there are no mitigation measures that will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on the loss of Prime Farmland to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

### **3.2 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

3.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Development of the proposed project would increase traffic congestion at local intersections in the project area relative to existing conditions.

3.2.2 Mitigation Measures: Mitigation is proposed for the increase in traffic congestion (see FEIR, Mitigation Measure 4.2-1).

3.2.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record (see, e.g., FEIR Section 4.2-1), that the mitigation measures identified above will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on traffic to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the measure is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university cannot guarantee that the following mitigation measures would be implemented and, if not, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

3.2.4 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Development of the proposed project would increase congestion at local intersections in the Year 2003.

3.2.5 Mitigation Measures: Mitigation is proposed for the increased congestion (see FEIR Mitigation Measure 4.2-2).

3.2.6 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record (see, e.g., FEIR Section 4.2-2), that the mitigation measures identified above will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on traffic to a less than significant level. Implementation of the measure is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university cannot guarantee that the mitigation measures would be implemented by the City of Fresno and, if not, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

3.2.7 Unavoidable Significant Impact: The proposed project could increase through traffic and parking in the neighborhood to the south of Shaw Avenue.

3.2-8 Mitigation Measure: Mitigation is proposed for the increase in through traffic and parking (see FEIR Mitigation Measure 4.2-6).

3.2-9 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on traffic to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the measures is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university cannot guarantee that the mitigation measures would be implemented by the City of Fresno and, if not, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

### **3.3. Air Quality**

3.3.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Project-related traffic would contribute to local CO emission at levels that exceed the federal 8-hour standard.

3.3.2 Mitigation Measures: Mitigation is proposed for the increase in air pollutant in the project area (see FEIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1).

3.3.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on traffic to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university cannot guarantee that the mitigation measures would be implemented by the City of Fresno. Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would improve the project's impact on air quality, but measures to fully offset vehicle emissions are not technically or economically feasible. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because specific overriding considerations.

3.3.4 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Operational emissions resulting from project-related energy consumption and motor vehicle trip generation could exceed ROG, NO<sub>x</sub> and CO standards.

3.3.5 Mitigation Measures: Mitigation is proposed for the increase in air pollutants in the project area (see FEIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-2).

3.3.6 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on air quality, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(a) is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno, so the university cannot guarantee that the mitigation measure would be implemented. Mitigation Measure 4.3-2(b) would reduce air emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level, and economically and technically feasible measures to fully offset air emissions are not available. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because specific overriding considerations.

### **3.4 Noise**

3.4.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: Project-generated traffic noise at the proposed project would increase traffic noise in the neighborhood south of the project site.

3.4.2 Mitigation Measures: Mitigation is proposed for the increase in noise in the project area (see FEIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-3).

3.4.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described potentially significant effect on noise levels to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the measure is under jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university cannot guarantee that the mitigation measure would be implemented and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. 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 impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

### **3.5 Visual Resources and Aesthetics**

3.5.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: The proposed project would alter the visual character of the project site, which is within a densely developed urban setting. It would not intrude into a visually critical scenic landscape, or overpower the visual character of surrounding areas. Architecturally, the design will reflect the existing campus architectural themes, and the scale and mass of the buildings would not be visually incompatible with its setting. Nonetheless, the proposed project would alter the visual character of the project site. The project design incorporates measures to reduce the visual effect (e.g. landscaping, berms, and architectural features such as setbacks). However, reactions to architectural details, such as building materials and facade design, vary, and the judgment of these visual elements is largely subjective. Some individuals viewing new buildings constructed under the proposed project may consider their design visually incompatible with the surrounding area, and no mitigation is available to address all individuals' visual preferences. The university has developed schematics for an attractive facility and the Board of Trustees finds, based upon its assessment of the schematics, that the facility will be aesthetically pleasing.

3.5.2 Mitigation Measures: No feasible mitigation measures are proposed for the change in visual character in the project area.

3.5.3 Findings: Impacts on the conversion of the site from farmland have been considered under Impact 3.1. The Board of Trustees finds that the project will be aesthetically pleasing and consequently will not have a significant adverse aesthetic impact.

## **SECTION 4: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVELS**

The FEIR identified certain potentially significant effects that could result from the project. However, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce those potential significant effects to less than significant levels.

### **4.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

4.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: The project may result in significant traffic impacts upon implementation without the adoption of mitigation measures.

4.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the parking impacts of the project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. Restrict parking Lots A and V for Event Center parking only after 5 PM on any day scheduled for a sold-out event.
2. Prepare and approve a Traffic Control Plan for the proposed Event Center in consultation with the Cities of Fresno and Clovis and Caltrans. This plan shall address the different size and types of events that will be held and shall include, at a minimum, the following:

**Toll Booth Operation**

- (a) Provide a total of nine toll booths for sold-out events, and a proportionate number for under-capacity events.
- (b) If feasible, set the parking fee at a level that minimizes the need to make change (e.g., \$5).
- (c) Provide a sign at each toll booth as follows: “Parking Fee \$XX. Please have money ready.”
- (d) Provide the opportunity to purchase a parking pass with the event tickets, or include the parking fee with the ticket price.

**Traffic Controls**

- (e) Provide shuttle buses between offsite parking/gathering places and the Event Center.
- (f) Provide the following traffic controls as shown in Figure 4.2-8:

*Access from the North.* The amount of traffic from the north is approximately 2,200 vehicles. The northernmost proposed parking lot will contain approximately 2,200 parking spaces. All trips from the north using Chestnut Avenue shall be forced into this lot via three inbound lanes and one outbound lane for emergency vehicles only. The right lane for inbound traffic shall be coned into the parking access points and used for queuing. No general circulation shall be allowed past the roadway separating the north and south parking areas along Chestnut Avenue.

*Access from the West.* Traffic from the west can make a left turn at either Maple, Woodrow, or Chestnut. Each of these locations shall convert one of the eastbound through lanes to a left turn lane to provide for dual lefts into the project area from 5 PM to past event starting time, along with police traffic control. Maple Avenue and Woodrow Avenue shall each allow for two inbound lanes to receive the dual lefts. Traffic accessing from Maple shall be allowed to use Lots C and V only. Once these lots are approximately 90 percent full, all inbound traffic at Maple shall be blocked. Access at Woodrow shall be provided to Lots C and V, as well as the westernmost portions of the proposed parking east of Woodrow. Once these lots are full, access via Woodrow shall be blocked.

*Access from the East.* Traffic from the east shall make either a right turn at Chestnut or at Woodrow. The westbound right lane at Chestnut shall be coned to right turns only and enters its own lane on northbound Chestnut as a free flowing right turn with police traffic control. The cross section of Chestnut prior to events shall be one south lane, and three northbound lanes, two from eastbound left turns or northbound through movements and one from the westbound coned right turn.

**General Control Plan**

- (g) Conduct a public outreach program to encourage maximum vehicle capacity, and to enhance the campus and local community’s understanding of planned circulation, parking controls, and benefits of ride sharing.

4.1.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the traffic-related impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, 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 traffic impacts as identified in the FEIR.

## **4.2 Flooding, Drainage, and Water Quality**

4.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: The project may result in significant flooding, drainage, and water quality impacts upon implementation without adoption of mitigation measures.

4.2.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the flooding, drainage and water quality impacts of the project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. The development of the proposed Event Center shall include one of, or a combination of, the following options to increase the capacity of the Fresno State storm water disposal capabilities in order to fully accommodate the runoff generated by the proposed project. The option chosen would depend on the availability of additional land, negotiation with FMFCD for acceptance of additional storm water flow and the associated costs thereof.

(a) Enlarge the Woodrow basin at its present location to include not only the existing disposal capacity, but also the additional capacity needed for the development.

The Woodrow basin can be enlarged to accommodate the additional storage needed for the Event Center. Design restrictions of the storm drainage system would need to be incorporated into the final configuration.

The water surface of the reconstructed basin shall be designed to comply with the hydraulic design of the existing campus storm water system. As such, the surface area of the resulting basin may need to be increased in size and/or the basin deepened to accommodate the additional storage needs.

(b) Relocate and increase the capacity of the Woodrow basin to another area within the existing agricultural fields.

The water surface of the enlarged relocated basin shall be designed to comply with the hydraulic design of the existing campus storm water system. The surface area of the basin would vary depending on the location of and the existing ground elevation of the selected site. Due to the hydraulics of the existing storm water system, a location with a higher elevation would cause the pond's ground surface area to be larger than a site in a lower elevation.

(c) Maintain the size and location of the Woodrow basin to store and dispose of the existing storm water and construct a separate and independent storm water basin to accommodate the storm water flow from the proposed Event Center development. The water surface level would not need to be hydraulically linked to the existing system. An independent ponding basin would minimize the surface area and depth of the proposed pond.

(d) Construct additional underground storm drainage collection facilities to allow for the collection of the additional storm water and minimizing localized surface ponding or surcharge in the gutters.

(e) Negotiate an amendment to the existing FMFCD agreement to accept additional storm water flows from Fresno State as a result of development of the proposed Event Center. The amendment to the agreement could allow the existing storm water stored in the Woodrow basin together with the additional storm water generated by the proposed Event Center to discharge into the collection and disposal system for the FMFCD Improvement District “C.” Prior to obtaining the amendment, however, the following shall be required of the project:

- Perform a parallel pipe study of the storm drain facilities from the point of connection to FMFCD Drainage Basin “C.” The study shall identify the existing flows through the pipes and its capacity and identify if construction of parallel pipes is necessary.
- Define exactly the drainage area included in this discharge into Improvement District “C.”
- Pay to FMFCD a proportionate share of the costs of obtaining the required storage capacity.
- Construct the parallel piping that would be required to gain capacity in FMFCD’s storm drain pipelines.

The final routing of a new storm water pipeline shall be determined in the required study. The general location of the pipeline is between Barton and Maple Avenues and Shaw and Ashlan Avenues. The pipeline shall be incorporated into the FMFCD’s collection system and be subject to their development standards and approval.

2. (a) If construction of any offsite infrastructure needed to serve the proposed project occurs in undeveloped areas, the campus shall ensure that surveys have been conducted that are appropriate to the habitats where the infrastructure will be located. Construction of offsite infrastructure shall not begin until such surveys have been completed, the appropriate agencies have been consulted, mitigation measures outlined and permits (e.g., 404) have been obtained, as necessary. Mitigation for these potential impacts could include preservation, on-site construction, or the purchase of mitigation credits through an agency-approved mitigation bank or in lieu fee program.

(b) The campus shall document that appropriate cultural resource surveys and mitigation are completed prior to construction of offsite infrastructure in undeveloped areas.

(c) Implement Mitigation Measures 3 and 4 from the Initial Study, requiring that work stop if cultural resources are encountered during construction until the resources have been evaluated and/or recovered.

4.2.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the flooding, drainage and water quality-related impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, 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 flooding, drainage, and water quality impacts as identified in the FEIR.

### **4.3 Utilities**

4.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Development of the proposed project would result in an increased water and wastewater demand on the Fresno State domestic water system and wastewater system.

4.3.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the service impacts of the project associated with the provision of water, wastewater and the removal of solid waste will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. (a) A 10" water main shall be constructed from the existing water main at the intersection of Maple and Shaw Avenues to the proposed Event Center and then to the existing well site located on the east side of Woodrow Avenue, south of Barstow Avenue. A connection is to be made to an existing 6" water main located approximately 200 feet north of Scott Avenue. This "looped water supply" would provide additional flow and pressure capabilities to the project site in order to meet its domestic and landscape irrigation water needs.

(b) A booster pump may need to be installed within the proposed building to provide the water pressure needed to meet the requirements for domestic water and fire flow requirements.

2. The sewer main to be installed for the proposed Event Center shall connect to the campus sewer system at or near the existing connections to the City of Fresno Wastewater Collection System. The existing connection is located at the intersection of Maple and Shaw Avenues.

Incorporate into the design of the sewer system serving the proposed Event Center, in consultation with the City of Fresno, one of the following sewer design alternatives:

- Design and construct a sewer pump lift station at the proposed Event Center with a "wet well" sized of adequate capacity so as to allow the pump to discharge the wastewater flow at a metered rate which will not exceed the capacity of the downstream city sewer pipeline
- Design and construct an onsite gravity sewer pipeline and structure system of a size and configuration which will allow storage of the wastewater during the periods of peak flow. A metering device is to be constructed in the pipeline which would restrict wastewater flows to be discharged to the existing city collection system at its allowable capacity.
- Design the sewer system to allow only a portion of the wastewater to flow to the Maple and Shaw Avenue connection and the remainder to flow to the Cedar Avenue connection.

- Design the sewer system to connect to the city sewer pipeline connection without any special provisions to overcome the brief excess capacity flow rate to the city sewer pipeline.

4.3.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the utility-related impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, 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 utility impacts as identified in the FEIR.

#### **4.4 Visual Resources and Aesthetics**

4.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts: The proposed project could substantially increase glare and artificial light in the project area.

4.4.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the visual impacts of the project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

1. The configuration of exterior light fixtures shall emphasize close spacing and lower intensity light that is directed downward, away from off-site receptors, in order to minimize the effects of light and glare on adjacent areas.

4.4.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the visual-related impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, 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 visual impacts as identified in the FEIR.

### **SECTION 5: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, as discussed below, the following impacts associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

#### **5.1 Land Use Impacts**

5.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, development of the proposed project would not be incompatible with existing or planned land uses in the project area.

5.1.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the land use compatibility impacts associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.2 Transportation and Circulation Impacts**

5.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the proposed project would not increase congestion on the ramps at the future Shaw Avenue interchange with State Route 168; would not create conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists and pedestrians; and, would not increase congestion on the ramps at the future Shaw Avenue interchange with State Route 168.

5.2.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the traffic impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.3 Air Quality Impacts**

5.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, implementation of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative land use development in the project vicinity, and future changes in the emissions characteristics of the motor vehicle fleet, would not alter traffic conditions resulting in an increase in CO levels at local intersections.

5.3.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the air quality impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.4 Noise Impacts**

5.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, project-generated traffic would not increase exterior 24-hour noise levels at existing noise-sensitive areas and project-related traffic noise in combination with cumulative traffic would not increase future noise levels at existing noise-sensitive areas; and would not increase short-term noise levels at existing noise-sensitive areas. Project operation would not generate excessive noise on-site during events.

5.4.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the noise impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.5 Flooding, Drainage, and Water Quality Impacts**

5.5.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on information in the FEIR, development of the proposed project would increase the amount of surface water runoff, which could degrade surface and/or ground water quality; and the cumulative development within the Fresno/Clovis Metropolitan Area, including development of the proposed project, would increase the amount of surface water runoff, exceeding local drainage capacity and degrading surface and/or groundwater quality.

5.5.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the flooding, drainage and water quality impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.6 Utilities Impacts**

5.6.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on information in the FEIR, cumulative development within the Fresno/Clovis Metropolitan Area, including development of the proposed project, would not accelerate the overdraft of groundwater resources and would not result in an increased demand for wastewater treatment. In addition, development of the project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative increase in the solid waste stream to the landfill.

5.6.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the utility impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.7 Visual Resources and Aesthetic Impacts**

5.7.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the proposed project could obstruct views or intrude into major view corridors.

5.7.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the visual impacts identified above associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **SECTION 6: SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

### **6.1 Cumulative Land Use Impacts:**

6.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the cumulative loss of Prime Farmland is expected to be unavoidably significant.

6.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the cumulative loss of Prime Farmland impacts identified in the FEIR. 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.

6.1.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant land use impacts as identified in the FEIR. However, the cumulative loss of Prime Farmland impacts in conjunction with the loss of Prime Farmland throughout the region due to development must be considered unavoidably significant. No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce or offset this impact. 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 loss of Prime Farmland is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 8.0, below).

## **6.2 Cumulative Transportation and Circulation Impacts:**

6.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the cumulative traffic impacts of the project are expected to be unavoidably significant. Due to the increase in traffic in the area the cumulative impact must be considered significant.

6.2.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the cumulative traffic impacts identified in the FEIR. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, however, the Board of Trustees has determined this impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

6.2.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant traffic impacts as identified in the FEIR. However, cumulative traffic impacts in conjunction with related development in the region must be considered unavoidably significant because the mitigation measure (see FEIR, Mitigation Measure 4.2-8) proposed is under another jurisdiction so the university cannot guarantee that it will be implemented. 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 traffic impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 8.0, below).

## **6.3 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts:**

6.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the cumulative air quality impacts of the project are expected to be unavoidably significant. The emissions contribution of the project to air pollution is marginal; however, the cumulative air quality of the project with related development in the region must be considered significant because regional emissions in the air basin exceed air standards.

6.3.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the cumulative air quality impacts identified in the FEIR. 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.

6.3.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant air quality impacts as identified in the FEIR. 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 Joaquin Valley air basin continue to exceed state and federal standards even after implementation of all feasible air quality mitigation measures (see FEIR, Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2(b)). 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 8.0, below).

#### **6.4 Cumulative Visual Resources and Aesthetics Impacts:**

6.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the FEIR, the cumulative visual impacts of the project are expected to be unavoidably significant. Development of the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to alteration of the visual character in the Fresno/Clovis Metropolitan Area. The proposed project would be constructed in an urban setting, and would not intrude into a visually critical landscape, or overpower the visual character of surrounding areas. Therefore, the scale and mass of the buildings would not be visually incompatible with its setting. Nonetheless, the proposed project would alter the visual character of the project site. The project design incorporates measures to reduce the visual effect (e.g, landscaping, berms, and architectural features such as setbacks). However, reactions to architectural details, such as building materials and facade design, vary, and the judgment of these visual elements is largely subjective. Some individuals viewing new buildings constructed under the proposed project may consider their design visually incompatible with the surrounding area, and no mitigation is available to address all individuals' visual preferences.

The cumulative contribution to a change in the visual character must be considered significant as the campus continues to develop.

6.4.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the cumulative visual impacts identified in the FEIR. 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.

6.4.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant visual impacts as identified in the FEIR. However, cumulative visual impacts of the project in conjunction with related development on the campus must be considered unavoidably significant because, given the unknown design of future development and the potential for individuals to respond negatively to the aesthetics of increased urbanization, no feasible mitigation measures are available to offset this impact. 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 visual impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 8.0, below).

### **SECTION 7: FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **7.1 Project Alternatives**

The FEIR, Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, contains an analysis of the alternatives to the project, including the "No Project" alternative. The following alternatives were considered and analyzed in the FEIR:

(a) No Project Alternative: This alternative assumes that no development occurs on the project site. This alternative was rejected because it would not meet the objectives of the project and the university.

(b) **Reduced Arena Capacity Alternative:** This alternative reduces the size of the Event Center to a maximum of 11,000 seats, which is the same size as Selland Arena, and would reduce significant traffic impacts. This alternative was rejected because reducing the overall size of the arena, while reducing the severity of the impacts, would not meet some of the objectives of the project. This alternative would not be large enough to host regional NCAA and WAC Conference Championships (Objective 4). The ability of the Event Center to support the remaining objectives would be lessened as well, due to its reduced size. An 11,000-seat Event Center would not be economically feasible. The cost savings for this size venue (relative to the proposed project, with 16,500 seats), would not be proportionate to the decrease in the number of seats because of fixed costs. Revenue would be reduced, because the Event Center would not be able to host the regional championships or other large commercial events needed to sustain a positive operating budget. Therefore, Fresno State would continue to use Selland Arena, rather than construct a similar sized arena on campus.

(c) **Altered Site Plan Alternative:** This alternative would place the Event Center farther north on the project site and moves the parking to the front of the site adjacent to Shaw Avenue. This alternative would meet the project objectives; however, this alternative was rejected because it would potentially increase impacts on traffic congestion because of the location of the parking area adjacent to Shaw Avenue. Vehicles entering the parking areas would stack up (queue) onto Shaw Avenue resulting in an increase in the severity of traffic impacts. Furthermore, the only impact that would be reduced under this alternative is the change in visual character. By moving the Event Center away from Shaw Avenue, it would still be visible from Shaw Avenue, but would not be as visually predominant as the proposed project. However, this alternative would alter the visual character of the project site, and may be visually displeasing to those traveling on Shaw Avenue. Therefore, the visual impact would remain significant.

The FEIR, Table 5-1, provides a comparative analysis of each of the alternatives against the proposed project. This table is incorporated by reference in these findings.

The FEIR does not analyze off-campus or off-site alternatives because the Board of Trustees finds that other potential campus locations would result in more severe impacts than those identified under the proposed project and may not meet the project objectives. These issues would result in potentially more severe impacts than identified for the proposed project. Therefore, it can be concluded that no feasible alternative location exists to develop the proposed project.

The environmentally superior alternative has been identified as Alternative 2; however, the Board of Trustees finds this alternative would not meet the objectives of the project and would not be economically feasible. The Board of Trustees also incorporates the discussion in the FEIR, Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis with respect to the consideration and rejection of each alternative to the project.

## **7.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees has considered all of the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR for the project. None of the recommended measures that are within the university's jurisdiction have been rejected by the Board of Trustees; however, those mitigation measures outside of the jurisdiction of CSU and within the jurisdiction of a local agency have been rejected because

the campus cannot guarantee that they will be implemented. In addition, a few mitigation measures were either added (in response to public comment) or modified. The added mitigation measures are contained in the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The Board of Trustees finds that most of the modifications to the mitigation measures are minor clarifications that do not substantially affect any environmental issues associated with the project.

The following mitigation measures contained in the Draft EIR, Section 4.2, Traffic and Circulation were revised in the FEIR as shown (new text underlined; deleted text struck through):

~~4.2-2 (a) Add a through lane on the northbound approach of Willow and Ashlan Avenues. This measure would result in LOS D in the PM peak hour, and LOS C in the Early Evening and Weekend Midday periods. This improvement would be under the jurisdiction of the Cities of Fresno and Clovis.~~

*(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b).*

This measure would improve conditions at Chestnut and Barstow Avenues to LOS D in the PM and early evening and LOS C in the weekend midday peak hours. This improvement would be under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno.

~~(c) Add a right turn lane on the westbound approach to the intersection of Willow and Shaw Avenues.~~

This measure would improve conditions at Willow and Shaw Avenues to LOS D in the PM and weekend midday and LOS C in the AM peak hours.

*4.2-4 Restrict parking Lots A and V for Event Center parking only after 5 PM on any day scheduled for a sold-out event.*

*4.2-5 Prepare and approve a Traffic Control Plan for the proposed Event Center in consultation with the Cities of Fresno and Clovis and Caltrans. The Traffic Control Plan shall address the different size and types of events that will be held and shall include, at a minimum, the following:*

#### **Toll Booth Operation**

(a) Provide a total of nine toll booths for sold-out events, and a proportionate number for under-capacity events.

(b) If feasible, set the parking fee at a level that minimizes the need to make change (e.g., \$5).

(c) Provide a sign at each toll booth or electronic message center as follows: "Parking Fee \$XX. Please have money ready."

(d) Provide the opportunity to purchase a parking pass with the event tickets, or include the parking fee in the ticket price.

### **Traffic Controls**

- (e) Provide shuttle buses between offsite parking/gathering places and the Event Center.
- (f) Provide incentives for multiple occupancy vehicles (priority parking locations).
- (g) Include parking in the purchase of event tickets, and direct those ticket holders to specific lots by way of northern access routes.
- (h) Provide changeable message signs directing traffic to northern access points.
- (i) Through the use of coning increase the number of traffic lanes to access northern access routes before and after events.
- (j) Provide the following traffic controls as shown in Figure 4.2-8:

Access from the North — The amount of traffic from the north is approximately 2,200 vehicles. The northernmost proposed parking lot will contain approximately 2,200 parking spaces. All trips from the north using Chestnut Avenue shall be forced into this lot via three inbound lanes and one outbound lane for emergency vehicles only. The right lane for inbound traffic shall be coned into the parking access points and used for queuing. No general circulation shall be allowed past the roadway separating the north and south parking areas along Chestnut Avenue.

Access from the West — Traffic from the west can make a left turn at either Maple, Woodrow, or Chestnut. Each of these locations shall convert one of the eastbound through lanes to a left turn lane to provide for dual lefts into the project area from 5 PM to past event starting time, along with police traffic control. Maple Avenue and Woodrow Avenue shall each allow for two inbound lanes to receive the dual lefts. Traffic accessing from Maple shall be allowed to use Lots C and V only. Once these lots are approximately 90 percent full, all inbound traffic at Maple shall be blocked. Access at Woodrow shall be provided to Lots C and V, as well as the westernmost portions of the proposed parking east of Woodrow. Once these lots are full, access via Woodrow shall be blocked.

Access from the East — Traffic from the east shall make either a right turn at Chestnut or at Woodrow. The westbound right lane at Chestnut shall be coned to right turns only and enters its own lane on northbound Chestnut as a free flowing right turn with police traffic control. The cross section of Chestnut prior to events shall be one south lane, and three northbound lanes, two from eastbound left turns or northbound through movements and one from the westbound coned right turn.

### **General Control Plan**

- (gk) Conduct a public outreach program to encourage maximum use of vehicle capacity, and to enhance the campus community's and general population's understanding of planned circulation and parking controls.

The following mitigation measure contained in the Draft EIR, Section 4.3, Air Quality is revised in the FEIR as shown (new text underlined):

4.3-2 (a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.*

(b) Where feasible, use electric landscaping equipment.

(c) When feasible, the university shall purchase fleet vehicles (e.g., buses, maintenance vehicles, etc.) that have the capability of using alternative fuels such as compressed natural gas (CNG) or electricity.

The following mitigation measure is added to Section 4.6, Utilities: Water Supply, Wastewater Disposal and Solid Waste:

4.6-1(c) Until improvements are made to the water system, the university shall not schedule simultaneous events at Bulldog Stadium and the Event Center with a combined attendance in excess of 41,000 people.

The following mitigation measure, although not required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, is included in the Draft EIR, Section 4.6, Utilities: Water Supply, Wastewater Disposal and Solid Waste.

4.6-2(a) *Enlarge the Bullard Basin to accommodate additional surface water flows from FID in order to facilitate a larger amount of percolation and ground water recharge equal to or greater than the water pumped from the ground water supply and the loss of the recharge due to agricultural irrigation. Any increase in the surface area of the basin attributed to the enlargement of the basin to facilitate a greater degree of ground water discharge may require agricultural lands to be removed from production.*

4.6-2(b) *Develop cooperative agreements between the university and FMFCD in order to allow for the use of Big Dry Creek Detention Basin (Southeast quadrant of State Highway 168, south of Ashlan Avenue), for recharge of university surface water entitlements into the ground water supply; and /or*

4.6-2(c) *Develop a dedicated on-campus ground water recharge facility. This may require agricultural lands to be removed from production, however, there may be land areas of the campus that may be utilized for this purpose which is not in or conducive to agriculture production.*

The following mitigation measure contained in the Draft EIR, Section 4.6, Utilities: Water Supply, Wastewater Disposal, and Solid Waste revised in the FEIR as shown (new text underlined):

4.6-3(a) The sewer main to be installed for the proposed Event Center shall connect to the campus sewer system at or near the existing connection to the City of Fresno Wastewater Collection System. The existing connection is located at the intersection of Maple and Shaw Avenues.

Incorporate into the design of the sewer system serving the proposed Event Center, in consultation with the City of Fresno, one of the following sewer design alternatives:

- Design and construct a sewer pump lift station at the proposed Event Center with a “wet well” sized of adequate capacity so as to allow the pump to discharge the wastewater flow at a metered rate which will not exceed the capacity of the downstream City sewer pipeline.
- Design and construct an onsite gravity sewer pipeline and structure system of a size and configuration which will allow storage of the wastewater during the periods of peak flow. A metering device is to be constructed in the pipeline which would restrict wastewater flows to be discharged to the existing city collection system at its allowable capacity.
- Design the sewer system to allow only a portion of the wastewater to flow to the Maple and Shaw Avenue connection and the remainder to flow to the Cedar Avenue connection.
- Design the sewer system to connect to the City sewer pipeline connection without any special provisions to overcome the brief excess capacity flow rate to the City sewer pipeline.

4.6-3(b) *Until improvements are made to the Millbrook Avenue Trunk Sewer line to increase capacity, the university shall be restricted from scheduling simultaneous events at the football stadium (Bulldog Stadium) and the Event Center which would exceed a total combined capacity of 41,000 people.*

The Board of Trustees finds that the revised mitigation measures are appropriate to further reduce associated impacts. For this reason, the Board of Trustees adopts the revised mitigation measure.

## **SECTION 8: 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 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 Section 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 FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines Section 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 FEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the FEIR. Nonetheless, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are: (a) loss of prime farmland (project-specific and cumulative); (b) increase traffic congestion at local roadways (project-specific and cumulative); (c) increase through traffic and parking in neighborhoods to the south of Shaw Avenue; (d) increase in air pollutants (project-specific and cumulative); (e) traffic noise; and (f) change in visual character of the project site (project-specific and cumulative).

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, followed by an indication of the specific benefits of the project.

Loss of prime farmland impact. The campus thoroughly reviewed other possible locations on the campus to locate the proposed project. After this review, it was determined that the proposed project site was the most feasible and ultimately would result in fewer impacts. Any loss of Prime Farmland is considered a significant impact and no feasible mitigation measures are available to offset the severity of the impact. However, as discussed below, this land use impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

Increase in traffic congestion impact. Increased traffic associated with the proposed project would increase traffic congestion at local intersections in the project area under cumulative conditions. Roadway improvements would help to offset the impacts; however, because the campus is legally constrained from providing funding for off-site traffic improvements they would continue to be significant and unavoidable under cumulative conditions. As discussed below, this traffic impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

Increase in parking and through traffic in those areas south of Shaw Avenue. Increased traffic associated with the proposed project would increase through traffic and event center parking in those neighborhoods to the south of the project site on those days when an event is held. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce the impact on these neighborhoods to a less-than-significant level; however, because the implementation of these measures would be under the jurisdiction of the Fresno Police Department, the university cannot guarantee they would be implemented. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. As discussed below this traffic impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

Increase in air pollutants impact. The increase in vehicle traffic would contribute to an increase in CO emissions at intersections near the project site. These increases in CO emissions would exceed the federal 8-hour standard. Mitigation is proposed that would help to offset vehicle trips; however, it would not be substantial enough to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. As discussed below this air quality impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

Increase in traffic noise impact. Those vehicles traveling through and parking in residential neighborhoods to the south of the campus would expose those residents to vehicle noise and other noise which could result in the creation of a nuisance. Mitigation is proposed; however, as discussed previously, implementation of the mitigation would be under the jurisdiction of the City of Fresno. The university would not be able to guarantee its implementation; therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. As discussed below this noise impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

Change in visual character impact. Development of the proposed project would significantly alter the existing visual character of the project site. No mitigation is available to reduce or avoid the significance of the impact because any development in this area would result in the creation of the same significant impact. However, as discussed below this visual impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

The Board of Trustees specifically finds that there are 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 proposed project would provide a state-of-the-art multi-purpose venue at Fresno State to serve the campus, the residents of the Fresno/Clovis Metropolitan Area, and Central California.
- (b) The proposed project would support Fresno State’s educational mission by providing state-of-the-art athletic and related academic facilities on campus.
- (c) The proposed project would provide a venue for Central California that can host a variety of events currently not available in the region.
- (d) The proposed project would provide an on-campus venue for intercollegiate athletics, academic, cultural, and entertainment events that are easily accessible to students, faculty, staff, the Fresno/Clovis community, and regional and statewide patrons.
- (e) The proposed project would provide a facility that would enable Fresno State to host regional NCAA and WAC Conference Championships (which require capacity of 15,000).
- (f) The proposed project would provide an architectural landmark and economic catalyst for the university and the surrounding nine-county region;
- (g) The proposed project would facilitate compliance with Title IX by providing additional on-campus facilities for women’s athletic programs.
- (h) The proposed project would provide an economic benefit to the cities of Fresno and Clovis by providing temporary construction jobs, permanent service sector and other jobs, sales tax and other revenue and other economic activity associated with sporting, cultural and other events to be held at the Event Center.
- (i) The proposed project uses campus land resources as efficiently as possible.

In addition to the project benefits, some of the comment letters received on the Draft EIR expressed support for the project and its goals. For example, the City of Fresno’ letter stated that the proposed project “will be a major attraction for the entire Fresno region and [we] are very appreciative of the time and effort that has gone into its design and planning.”

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.

**California State University, Fresno  
Campus Master Plan Revision for the Multi-Purpose Event Center**

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan**

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measure Monitoring Report based on the attached Environmental Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Summary shall be prepared for this project by campus staff or until project compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file in Capital Planning, Design and Construction, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802, and the office of Facilities Planning, California State University, Fresno, 5241 North Maple Avenue, Fresno, California 93740. The report shall describe the status of all mitigation measures for the project adopted by the Board of Trustees.
3. Once significant construction is begun and under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the designated university construction supervision staff. The designated staff shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is complete and occupied.
4. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the executive chancellor/chief financial officer. Reference to such changes shall be made in the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

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

2  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

3  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

4  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—3  
November 15-17, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

5  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

6  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

7  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

8  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

9  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

10  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

11  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 199

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

12  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

13  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

14  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

15  
ATTACHMENT D  
CPB&G—5  
September 14-15, 1999

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 4  
November 15-17, 1999

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

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

**Presentation By**

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

**Summary**

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

1. San Diego State University—Residential Suites and Residential Dining Complex
2. California State University, San Marcos—Library Information Center

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolutions.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4

November 15-17, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### Approval of Schematic Plans

#### 1. San Diego State University—Residential Suites and Residential Dining Complex Executive Architect: Delawie Wilkes Rodrigues Barker & Bretton

##### Background and Scope

The proposed Residential Suites and Residential Dining Complex project is consistent with the revised campus master plan approved by the Board of Trustees in May 1999. The project will be adjacent to the existing housing complex and will complement and consolidate the campus residential area.

The project consists of two 101,252-square-foot six-story residential suite buildings, containing 347 beds each, for a total of 694 beds. Eight-person suites include four single bedrooms, two double bedrooms, two bathrooms, a living area and a small kitchen counter area. All suites will be fully handicapped accessible. Each floor has a lounge room and each building contains two elevators. The two residential buildings are identical double loaded corridor plans.

A 45,912-square-foot two-story commons building plus basement will be located between the residential buildings. The first floor provides housing related functions including offices, control counter, mail distribution, laundry and seminar rooms. Also included is a coffee shop for dining overflow and extended hours food service along with restrooms to accommodate the second floor dining area. Access to the secured residential suites complex is through the first floor of the commons building past the control counter. The second floor provides “market place” dining service with seating for 732. The dining facility will serve the entire campus residential population and is accessed from a main stair off the pedestrian mall. The basement contains storage, mechanical equipment and loading dock functions serving the entire complex. Two elevators will be included in the building.

The proposed project has been developed based upon market demand for suite style housing and an upgraded dining experience. The architecture is in keeping with the mission style character of the campus. This is a design/build project via a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposal (RFP).

##### Timing (Estimated)

RFP Document Bid Received	September 1999
Request for Board of Trustees to Approve Bond Sale	November 1999
Construction Start	April 2000
Occupancy	August 2001

**Basic Statistics**

*Residential Suites*

Gross Building Area	202,504 square feet
Assignable Building Area	140,064 square feet
Efficiency	69 percent
Total Bed Spaces	694 beds

*Dining Commons*

Gross Building Area (including exterior balconies @ 4,215 square feet)	45,912 square feet
Assignable Building Area	30,185 square feet
Efficiency	66 percent
Dining Seating (including outside & coffee shop)	732 seats

<i>Site Area</i>	3 acres
------------------	---------

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Residential Suite Buildings (\$115 per gross square foot)		\$23,255,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 2.78	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$40.84	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$34.20	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$37.18	
 Dining Commons Building (\$99 per gross square foot)		 4,538,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 4.18	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$47.41	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$14.29	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$33.12	
 Site Development (includes landscaping)		 2,016,000
Group I Equipment (kitchen)		1,147,000
Telecommunications (media and instruments)		<u>700,000</u>
 Construction Cost		 \$31,656,000
Fees and Contingency		<u>5,416,000</u>
 Total Project Cost (\$149 per gross square foot)		 \$37,072,000
Group II Equipment		<u>3,400,000</u>
 Grand Total		 <u>\$40,472,000</u>

**Funding Data**

Funding will be provided from the sale of nonstate dormitory revenue bonds.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

An initial study has been completed and an environmental impact report was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The public comment period ended on March 29, 1999. Comments were received and responded to in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) that was certified by the Board of Trustees at the May 1999 meeting. A copy of the previously approved Final EIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by San Diego State University on the Draft EIR, 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 EIR prepared for the San Diego State University master plan revision as it relates to the Residential Suites and Residential Dining Commons Complex, the board finds that:

1. The Final EIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously certified by the Board of Trustees on May 12, 1999, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final EIR 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 shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees as Attachment D of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, Agenda Item 2, Master Plan Revision and Final EIR Certification, approved on May 12, 1999, 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 the Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the San Diego State University, Residential Suites and Residential Dining Commons Complex; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the schematic plans for the San Diego State University, Residential Suites and Residential Dining Complex are approved at a project cost of \$40,472,000 at CCCI 3847.

**2. California State University, San Marcos—Library Information Center  
Project Architect: Carrier Johnson**

**Background**

The initial facility of CSU San Marcos (Craven Hall) included 34,000 assignable square feet for the campus library. This space is now insufficient to serve students and faculty. There are an inadequate number of reader stations to address the rapidly growing student enrollment and the campus has leased off-campus space at two locations to accommodate library holdings. The proposed Library Information Center will meet the projected library service needs of 8,000 full-time equivalent students, as well as emerging needs for production of technology-mediated instruction and faculty development activities. Construction of the proposed project will combine mutually supportive activities into a single facility and is consistent with the campus master plan.

**Scope**

The Library Information Center contains the following project components: 400,000 volumes in fixed shelving; 440,000 volumes in compact shelving; 1,563 student reader stations plus 35 small group study rooms; offices and office support space for librarians, library support staff, instruction support staff, and the director, faculty and staff of the Faculty Development Center; video studios and support spaces; and a computer laboratory. The 198,604 gross square foot building will be five levels in elevation and located at the center of the campus for quick access from existing and future buildings.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	February 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	September 2000
Construction Start	January 2001
Occupancy	June 2003

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	198,604 square feet
Assignable Building Area	139,056 square feet
Efficiency	70 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Building Cost (\$154 per gross square foot)		\$30,680,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	
a. Substructure (foundation)	\$ 6.50	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$52.53	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishers)	\$30.08	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$65.37	
Site Development (includes landscaping)		2,453,000
Group I Equipment (included in building cost above)		<u>0</u>
Construction Cost		\$33,133,000
Fees and Contingency		<u>6,870,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$201 per gross square foot)		\$40,003,000
Group II Equipment		<u>3,861,000</u>
Grand Total		\$43,864,000

**Funding Data**

Gift donations will fund the project's design and working drawings. Construction funding is proposed to be included in the Budget Act of 2000. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was certified by the Board of Trustees on March 9, 1988. The Draft EIR was distributed for a 45-day public review period, and a public hearing on the Draft EIR was conducted at the San Diego State University, North County Center on August 28, 1987. The Final EIR evaluated several proposed buildings and related development projects for the California State University, San Marcos campus, including the proposed Library Information Center. No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the proposed Library Information Center. A copy of the certified Final EIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by California State University, San Marcos on the Draft EIR, 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 EIR prepared for the California State University, San Marcos, campus master plan, the board finds that:

1. The Final EIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously approved by this Board of Trustees on March 9, 1988, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final EIR 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 EIR 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, San Marcos, Library Information Center; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the schematic plans for the California State University, San Marcos, Library Information Center are approved at a project cost of \$43,864,000 at California Construction Cost Index 3847.