

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: **1:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 25, 2024**
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Jack McGrory, Chair
Mark Ghilarducci, Vice Chair
Larry L. Adamson
Raji Kaur Brar
Douglas Faigin
Anna Ortiz-Morfit
Sam Nejabat
Jose Antonio Vargas

Consent 1. Approval of Minutes, *Action*

2. Approval of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, *Action*

Discussion 3. San Diego State University Approval of the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project
and EIR Certification, *Action*

4. California State University, Fullerton Engineering and Computer Science
Innovation Hub Schematic Design Approval, *Action*

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

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

July 23, 2024

Members Present

Mark Ghilarducci, Vice Chair
Larry L. Adamson
Raji Kaur Brar
Douglas Faigin
Anna Ortiz-Morfit

Jack B. Clarke, Jr., Chair of the Board
Mildred García, Chancellor

Trustee Ghilarducci called the meeting to order.

Public Comment

Public comment occurred at the beginning of the meeting's open session prior to all committees.

Consent Agenda

The minutes of the May 21, 2024 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds were approved as submitted.

Item 2, the 2025-26 Preliminary Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, was an information item.

Discussion Agenda

**California State University Maritime Academy Waterfront Master Plan Approval and
Environmental Impact Report Certification**

This agenda item requested the following actions by the Board of Trustees concerning the California State University Maritime Academy:

CPB&G

Agenda Item 1

September 22-25, 2024

Page 2 of 2

- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report dated July 2024.
- Approval of the Waterfront Master Plan.

Following the presentation Trustee Kimbell asked what will happen to the current ship, the Golden Bear, after the new ship is delivered. President Dumont explained that it belongs to the United States government, and it will be held in the mothball fleet and then will likely be recycled. Proceeds from recycling will be distributed back to the six national maritime academies.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-24-06).

Trustee Ghilarducci adjourned the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

Presentation By

Steve Relyea
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Paul Gannoe
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests approval by the California State University Board of Trustees of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (Five-Year Plan) covering the period from 2025-2026 through 2029-2030. The Five-Year Plan totals over \$30.9 billion including academic and self-support projects. The total for the first year of the Five-Year Plan is \$4.9 billion and includes \$1.4 billion in deferred maintenance projects and \$740 million in infrastructure improvement projects. The electronic version of the Five-Year Plan is available at: [Five-Year Capital Plan - 2025-2026 through 2029-2030](#).

The Five-Year Plan contains university-specific sections with descriptions of each improvement project as well as a five-year summary of requested projects and previously funded projects. The list of systemwide priority projects requested for 2025-2026 funding is provided in Attachment A. Funding for the academic and infrastructure projects is reliant upon approval of additional base operating funds, one time funding for capital projects, or passage of a General Obligation bond that includes higher education.

The Five-Year Plan also identifies university needs for Critical Facilities Renewal funding. These projects would address building systems and campus infrastructure that have been maintained either to the end of their useful life or past their useful life and are now in need of replacement or major repairs.

The preliminary Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan was included on the July 2024 Board of Trustees' agenda as an information item to provide an update on the use of capital and facilities renewal

funding and seek trustee input. This item reflects minor changes to the budget and scope of the projects list included in the July item.

Background of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

The primary objective of the Five-Year Plan is to support the academic mission of the CSU by providing facilities that are appropriate to educational programs, create environments that are conducive to learning and enable students to thrive, and ensure that the quality and quantity of facilities at each of the 23 universities serve all students, faculty, and staff appropriately.

As buildings age and become more difficult and costly to maintain and given the limited budgets available for critical facilities renewal and ongoing maintenance, universities face challenges in providing built environments in which effective teaching and learning can take place. With increasing global temperatures, resiliency and adaptation in the built environment have become imperative. The Five-Year Plan reflects the campus priority projects to address these critical challenges.

In March 2019, the Board of Trustees approved the Categories and Criteria for Priority Settings for the capital plan with the following categories:

- I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure
 - A. Critical Facilities Renewal
 - B. Modernization/Renovation
- II. Growth/New Facilities

Projects in the 2025-2026 through 2029-2030 Five-Year Plan align with these Categories and Criteria and focus on addressing critical infrastructure deficiencies, renovation or replacement of obsolete or deficient buildings, and propose a limited number of growth projects particularly in the areas of allied health and science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) programs.

Process for the Development of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

The process to develop the CSU Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan is an iterative one, starting with a call letter to the universities in which the Chancellor's Office begins to engage with each individual university on the development of their plan. Each university's assigned planner and associate planner provide support throughout this process. Planning begins well in advance of the funding cycle, for example the call letter that will go out in January 2025 will begin the planning process for the 2026-2027 fiscal year.

The call letter outlines the overall process and includes the Board of Trustees' established categories and criteria as an overarching framework for the development of the Five-Year Plan. University presidents are requested to submit a response in two phases; the first phase includes large academic program projects such as new buildings and major renovations. The second phase includes smaller infrastructure improvement and deferred maintenance projects. Examples of these projects include replacement of utility systems, energy efficiency projects, and projects affecting campus resiliency.

Each university submits supporting documents describing the nature of each project and the associated project budget along with proposed funding sources. The universities also communicate their highest priority projects over the five-year planning period and a proposed order of initiating each priority project.

In preparing the Five-Year Plan, universities rely not only on identified facility needs but projects are developed and recommended to the Board of Trustees using the following planning tools and resources:

- Seismic Priority List – This list identifies facilities that need either structural repair or evaluation. The list is maintained by the CSU Seismic Review Board that advises the Chancellor's Office. The list is updated as part of an ongoing review process.
- Facility Condition Assessments – Facility condition assessments, updated annually, provide a comprehensive list of critical facility renewal needs and their estimated budgets. This information is used as part of the project prioritization, with priority given to projects that address renewal needs. The assessments are used to determine the estimated university backlog of renewal needs.
- Summary of Campus Capacity – This planning tool compares projected full-time equivalent student (FTES) enrollment to seat capacity to quantify surpluses or deficits in lecture/classroom space, laboratory space, and faculty offices across the university academic disciplines. Projects that address significant space deficits are prioritized over other projects.
- Laboratory Enrollment versus Laboratory Capacity – This tool evaluates access to lab teaching space by discipline based on current space and forecast enrollment growth. Projects are evaluated and prioritized based on addressing a deficit in an existing program or adding space needed to grow a specific program.
- Utilization Report – This report provides classroom and laboratory use by facility and room occupancy. The data from the Utilization Report allows universities to focus on developing space types that are shown to be in the highest demand.

Using a combination of these tools, and information received from each university, the Five-Year Plan ensures that the most critical projects at each university are addressed. After careful review of the plan by the universities and staff at the Chancellor's Office, the Five-year Plan is presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. The final step in the process is the submission of the Five-Year Plan to the California Department of Finance for their review and approval.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The 2025-2026 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan Priority List is approved.
2. The chancellor is authorized to proceed with design and construction to fast-track projects in the 2025-2026 through 2029-2030 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan subject to available funds.
3. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the Board of Trustees, the governor, and the legislature the need to provide funds to develop the facilities necessary to serve the academic program and all eligible students.
4. The chancellor is authorized to adjust the scope, phase, project cost, total budget, priority sequence, and funding source for the capital plan and report budget adjustments in the subsequent Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan.
5. The chancellor is authorized to adjust the scope and budget of projects to be financed as necessary to maximize use of the limited financing resources and in consideration of the CSU's priorities for funding capital outlay projects.

2025/2026 Capital Outlay Program Project List

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News Record California Construction Cost Index 10461 and Equipment Price Index 5000

ACADEMIC PROJECTS LIST (Dollars in 000s)

Priority Order	Cate-gory	Campus	Project Title	FTE	Phase	Campus Reserves/ Other	SRB-AP ¹	Total Budget	Cumulative Total Budget	Cumulative SRB-AP Budget
1	IA/IB	Statewide	Capital & Infrastructure Improvements ²	N/A	APWCE	29,709	711,238	740,947	740,947	711,238
2	IA	Sonoma	Utilities Infrastructure (Water) ³	N/A	PWC	0	44,540	44,540	785,487	755,778
3	IA	East Bay	Library Seismic (West Wing Relocations) ⁴	0	PWCE	3,429	30,858	34,287	819,774	786,636
4	IB	Long Beach	Peterson Hall 1 Replacement Bldg (Seismic)	-2,221	CE	15,000	166,387	181,387	1,001,161	953,023
5	II	San Marcos	Integrated Sciences & Engineering Building	555	CE	7,133	107,084	114,217	1,115,378	1,060,107
6	IB	Dominguez Hills	Natural Science & Mathematics Bldg Reno (Seismic)	198	CE	0	90,634	90,634	1,206,012	1,150,741
7	II	Fullerton	Science Laboratory Replacement (Seismic)	214	PWCE	17,937	161,432	179,369	1,385,381	1,312,173
8	IB	Sacramento	Engineering Replacement Building	83	PWCE	9,635	151,428	161,063	1,546,444	1,463,601
9	IB	Northridge	Sierra Hall Renovation	0	PWCE	16,501	156,308	172,809	1,719,253	1,619,909
10	II	Fresno	Concert Hall	0	WCE	36,637	44,373	81,010	1,800,263	1,664,282
11	IB	San Diego	Life Sciences Building, Ph. 1	0	PWC	77,800	80,000	157,800	1,958,063	1,744,282
12	II	Channel Islands	Early Childhood Care & Education Center	75	PWCE	19,500	30,319	49,819	2,007,882	1,774,601
13	IB	San Francisco	Thornton Hall Renewal	-580	PWCE	0	172,394	172,394	2,180,276	1,946,995
14	II	Stanislaus	Classroom II	1,917	PWCE	10,446	126,876	137,322	2,317,598	2,073,871
15	II	Monterey Bay	Edward "Ted" Taylor Science & Eng - Academic IV	75	PWCE	27,500	7,000	34,500	2,352,098	2,080,871
16	IA	Pomona	Library Building Renovation (Seismic)	N/A	PWCE	2,000	76,659	78,659	2,430,757	2,157,530
17	II	San Luis Obispo	Student Success Center	500	PWC	40,000	20,000	60,000	2,490,757	2,177,530
18	IB	Humboldt	Visual Arts Building	133	PWCE	6,100	54,902	61,002	2,551,759	2,232,432
19	IB	Chico	Glenn Hall Replacement	0	PWCE	11,616	94,827	106,443	2,658,202	2,327,259
20	IB	San José	Duncan Hall Renovation, Ph. 1	0	PWCE	3,795	87,261	91,056	2,749,258	2,414,520
21	II	San Luis Obispo	Plant Sciences Greenhouse	N/A	PWC	30,000	0	30,000	2,779,258	2,414,520
Total Academic Projects				949		\$ 364,738	\$ 2,414,520	\$ 2,779,258	\$ 2,779,258	\$ 2,414,520

SELF-SUPPORT / OTHER PROJECTS LIST (Dollars in 000s)

Alpha Order	Cate-gory	Campus	Project Title	Spaces	Phase	Campus Reserves/ Other Budget	SRB-SS ⁵	Total Budget	Cumulative Total Budget	Cumulative SRB-SS Budget
1	IB	Fresno	Valley Children Stadium Mod - N Endzone Upgrades	N/A	PWC	7,660	0	7,660	7,660	0
2	IB	Long Beach	Student Union Renovation	N/A	PWCE	76,730	225,851	302,581	310,241	225,851
3	II	San José	Spartan Village on the Paseo Acquisition	679	A	99,000	66,816	165,816	476,057	292,667
4	II	San José	Alquist Faculty/Staff/Graduate Student Housing	399	PWC	264,000	0	264,000	740,057	292,667
5	II	San Luis Obispo	Track & Field Clubhouse	N/A	PWCE	20,000	0	20,000	760,057	292,667
6	IB	Sonoma	Parking Lot Repairs	N/A	PWC	6,800	0	6,800	766,857	292,667
Total Self-Support / Other Projects				1,078		\$ 474,190	\$ 292,667	\$ 766,857	\$ 766,857	\$ 292,667
Grand Total Academic and Self-Support Projects				2,027		\$ 838,928	\$ 2,707,187	\$ 3,546,115	\$ 3,546,115	\$ 2,707,187

A = Acquisition / P = Preliminary Plans / W = Working Drawings / C = Construction / E = Equipment

Categories:

- I Existing Facilities/Infrastructure
 - A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies
 - B. Modernization/Renovation
- II Growth/New Facilities

Notes:

¹ SRB-AP: Systemwide Revenue Bonds - Academic Program

² The Capital and Infrastructure Improvements Program addresses smaller scale utility, building systems renewal, ADA, seismic strengthening, and minor upgrades. Projects are listed separately on the following page.
[The list does not include State Deferred Maintenance funding requests.]

³ Projects in *italics* have been approved by the Board of Trustees and are included only relative to the project funding total.

⁴ Projects in *red italics* have previously received approval by the Board of Trustees and Department of Finance, and are included only relative to the project funding total.

⁵ SRB-SS: Systemwide Revenue Bonds - Self-Support Program

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

San Diego State University Approval of the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project and EIR Certification

Presentation By

Steve Relyea
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Adela de la Torre
President
San Diego State University

Paul Gannoe
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Board of Trustees serves as the Lead Agency, which certifies CEQA documents for capital projects. This agenda item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees concerning the San Diego State University:

- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated September 2024.
- Approval of the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project.

The Board of Trustees must certify that the EIR is adequate and complete under CEQA as a prerequisite to approving the proposed Fenton Parkway Bridge project. The EIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Findings of Fact, and Statement of Overriding Considerations are available for review by the Board of Trustees and the public at: <https://bfa.sdsu.edu/campus/facilities/planning/eir>.

Fenton Parkway Bridge Project

The Fenton Parkway Bridge Project is designed to improve connectivity in eastern Mission Valley by constructing a new vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the San Diego River. Spanning approximately 450 feet in length, 58 feet in width, and 7.5 feet in depth, the bridge would feature

a conventional prestressed concrete girder design. It will be constructed using one of two methods: pre-cast or cast-in-place. The pre-cast method involves manufacturing bridge components off-site and assembling them on-site, while the cast-in-place method entails pouring and curing concrete on-site to create structural elements.

The bridge will consist of up to four spans supported by concrete seat-type abutments on each end and two to three piers within the river channel. Each abutment will be supported by eight 4-foot-diameter cast-in-drilled-hole concrete piles, and each pier will be supported by a single 8-foot-diameter cast-in-drilled-hole concrete pile. Piles are estimated to reach depths between 50 and 200 feet below grade. The abutments will be protected with energy-dissipating riprap, which will be buried to allow for post-construction habitat restoration, fostering wildlife use.

The project's objectives include improving north-south vehicular mobility in eastern Mission Valley, enhancing pedestrian and bicycle access, and providing high-water crossing capabilities in a flood prone area. The project will connect residential and commercial areas on both sides of the river, facilitate emergency access, and support multimodal transit, including increased access to the Metropolitan Transit System Trolley Green Line as two stations are within walking distance of the project. Additionally, the project will minimize impacts to natural resources and sensitive biological areas in alignment with the San Diego River Park Master Plan and City guidelines.

The design and construction of the approach roadways and the bridge will comply with applicable standards from the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, California Department of Transportation, and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.

Background

The Fenton Parkway Bridge has been contemplated in the City's long-range planning documents for the Mission Valley community for more than 30 years as a local facility that would serve the needs of the Mission Valley community and benefit the public. The proposed project is referenced in the Mission Valley Community Plan (City of San Diego, 2019) and would connect residents and businesses south of the San Diego River to land uses north of the river off Friars Road, including the SDSU Mission Valley development, which was approved by the CSU Board of Trustees in 2020 (City of San Diego 2019).

The purchase and sale agreement between SDSU and the City for the SDSU Mission Valley site was executed in August 2020. Pursuant to terms previously approved by the CSU Board of Trustees in January 2020, SDSU agreed to help fund the planning, design, and construction of the Fenton Parkway Bridge. In furtherance of that, and pursuant to a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding between SDSU and the City and City Ordinance No. O-21564, SDSU has agreed

to plan, design, and construct the bridge, on behalf of the City, to city transportation department design standards. Once constructed, the City would assume operation and maintenance obligations for the bridge. As outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding, SDSU is preparing the EIR. The CSU Board of Trustees is the lead agency under CEQA and the City is a responsible agency. SDSU is also responsible for securing all environmental permits required from state and federal agencies.

Fiscal Impact

The total cost of the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project is estimated at \$53,000,000. During the January 2020 Board of Trustees meeting, the Board approved funding for the Fenton Parkway Bridge which was included in the issuance of systemwide revenue bonds in August 2020. Per the purchase and sale agreement, certain City funds were also identified to be applied toward the cost of the bridge. Since originally estimated, the cost of the bridge has increased due to construction cost escalation. Any gap funding necessary will be funded by revenue generated by the SDSU Mission Valley development, including transportation fees and ground leases. No additional funds will be requested from the Board of Trustees.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An EIR has been prepared pursuant to the CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed project. The Board of Trustees is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of CEQA have been met, certifying the EIR, and approving the project.

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific benefits of the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” and the agency is then required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations in order to approve the project. Because the EIR has determined that the project would result in a significant and unavoidable effect on biological resources and result in significant unavoidable noise impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared for Board of Trustees’ consideration.

Impacts identified during the public review period are fully discussed in the EIR and have been analyzed in accordance with CEQA requirements. Where a potentially significant impact is identified, mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact to the maximum extent feasible.

The EIR concluded that project construction would result in significant and unavoidable, though temporary, noise impacts to biological resources. Project construction activities have the potential to temporarily disturb nesting migratory birds as well as three sensitive native bird species that may have active nests in the project area: least Bell's vireo, a federally- and state-listed endangered species; California gnatcatcher, a federally-listed threatened species and state-listed species of special concern; and three willow flycatcher subspecies, all of which are state-listed as endangered and one of which is federally-listed as endangered. These species are also listed in the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan, a 200,000-acre urban preserve that includes the Mission Valley area and is managed in cooperation with wildlife agencies, environmental groups, and other stakeholders to ensure the protection of remaining core wildlife habitat areas and linking corridors. Despite all feasible mitigation measures, including preconstruction surveys, physical sound barriers, and modification of equipment and work areas, temporary construction noise impacts on these listed species and on nesting birds would remain significant and unavoidable.

All other project impacts were determined to be less than significant or mitigated to a less than significant level. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared in conjunction with the Final EIR.

Summary of Issues Identified Through Public Review of the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days commencing on April 12, 2024 and concluding on May 28, 2024. The Final EIR, including the Draft EIR, all public comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and revisions and clarifications to the Draft EIR, is available for review at: <https://bfa.sdsu.edu/campus/facilities/planning/eir>.

When the public comment period closed, 12 comment letters had been received by SDSU, including one letter from a federal agency (United States Fish and Wildlife Service), three letters from state agencies (the California State Clearinghouse, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Caltrans), one letter from a local agency (City of San Diego), three letters from organizations (Mission Valley Planning Group, San Diego Archaeological Society, and San Diego Audubon Society), and four letters from individuals.

SDSU prepared comprehensive responses to all comments in the Final EIR. Clarifications and/or revisions to the Draft EIR resulting from public comments are included in the Final EIR. None of the comments submitted or issues raised requires recirculation of the EIR or the need for additional analysis in the EIR. Public comments and responses are summarized below.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

USFWS is responsible for conserving, protecting and enhancing fish, plants, wildlife and their habitats through federal programs relating to migratory birds, endangered species, interjurisdictional fish and marine mammals, and inland sport fisheries. Federally protected resources present that would be affected by the project are therefore overseen by the USFWS.

USFWS commented on the project's purpose and need. In the Final EIR, SDSU further clarifies the project's purpose and need, citing several key City planning documents, guidelines and initiatives that point to the importance of establishing a new multi-modal crossing in eastern Mission Valley. These initiatives include the realization of the multi-modal goals and infrastructure investment to support population growth projections as outlined in the Mission Valley Community Plan Update, establishment of reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) throughout the City, which helps reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) as outlined and referred to in the City's Climate Action Plan, and response to several flooding and life-safety events that have rendered emergency service provision in eastern Mission Valley at unacceptable levels.

USFWS requested further consideration of different alternatives or modifications to the existing alternatives that were disclosed in the Draft EIR, suggested evaluating alternatives for a narrower bridge including stacking pedestrian/bicycle pathways above or below the vehicular lanes of the bridge. The response states that pathways beneath the bridge are infeasible because of the need to maintain adequate clearance during high-water events, as well as the need to avoid potential disruption of wildlife movement. Elevated pathways poses design challenges related to alignment and functional connectivity with existing streets.

USFWS suggested creation of a new fire station instead of the proposed new river crossing that would enhance emergency vehicle access. The response clarified that the goal of the project is to establish a vehicular bridge over the San Diego River for a several reasons including but not limited to emergency access, as outlined in the DEIR and the Mission Valley Community Plan. The USFWS also suggested that two low elevation crossings present farther from the proposed bridge location be retrofitted to allow use during high flow events. The Final EIR notes that these distant low elevation crossings present similar constraints as low elevation crossings more proximate to the proposed bridge site, which were considered but rejected in the Draft EIR.

USFWS commented on the need for compliance with the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan and Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations and consistency with the newly approved Stadium Mitigation Site which surrounds the proposed bridge site. The response reiterated that the EIR includes a full evaluation of all of these guidelines and regulations and describes the project's consistency with each guideline, policy or plan, and no

Multiple Habitat Preserve Area Boundary Line Adjustment is necessary, as confirmed by City staff.

The commentor noted requirements of long-term management plans to ensure consistency with the City's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations. SDSU confirmed that both on-site and off-site mitigation plans are being developed, with ongoing efforts to secure an appropriate off-site mitigation site. Appropriate funding to ensure adequate long-term management will be a component of these plans.

This commentor identified several alternative materials or strategies for bridge abutment stabilization. SDSU reviewed each of these solutions which included willow wattles, armor-flex, geogrid and riprap as requested by the commentor but ultimately due to unique constraints of each solution coupled by the unique characteristics of the project, none of these proposed solutions would help reduce impacts.

This comment also identified potential direct and indirect impacts to the federally listed endangered bird, the least Bell's vireo. The EIR acknowledges that despite these measures, construction related impacts to least Bell's vireo would be significant and unavoidable.

State Clearinghouse

SDSU received confirmation from the State Clearinghouse that the Fenton Bridge Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was published on its website and available for review as of April 12, 2024. The confirmation letter served as a notification and provided procedural instructions rather than raising specific concerns and no response beyond acknowledgment was required.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

CDFW is the State of California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust for the state's citizens. It has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish and marine biodiversity, wildlife, native plants, and habitat for those species, and is charged with providing expertise during public agency environmental review processes.

CDFW commented on the mitigation measures for several special-status species. CDFW requested additional mitigation for potential impacts to the Crotch's bumble bee and suggested revisions to MM BIO-5. MM BIO-5 has been clarified to further explain the specific steps that will be taken to avoid impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. CDFW also suggested that an Incidental Take Permit be pursued directly with CDFW for impacts to least Bell's vireo instead of reliance on the federal Incidental Take Permit process such as typical. SDSU discussed this comment with CDFW during

follow-up meetings in June and August 2024. While pursuit of a permit does not constitute mitigation for impacts to a listed species, SDSU clarified MM BIO-1 to note the need for a CECA permit to be obtained directly from CDFW.

CDFW recommended SDSU and the City coordinate to develop specific mechanisms for avoidance of potential impacts to the Western spadefoot toad. In response, SDSU worked closely with City biologists to clarify specific steps throughout the planning and preconstruction process to ensure that surveys are conducted during appropriate seasonal conditions and measures taken to ensure spadefoot movement patterns do not affect the project site. CDFW also provided suggestions on the qualifications of monitoring biologists if there is a need to handle wildlife during construction. SDSU clarified MM-BIO-9 to outline the types of species and/or situations where a scientific collection permit is necessary when handling wildlife during the construction process.

CDFW suggested that impacts to wetlands warrant higher mitigation ratios. The response noted that mitigation is consistent with the City's highly conservative methodology for mitigation of such impacts, and further noted that mitigation ratios will be finalized during the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement process with CDFW.

CDFW questioned the City's designation of the bridge as an Essential Public Project. In response, SDSU cited several key City planning documents, guidelines and initiatives that highlight the importance of establishing a new multi-modal crossing in eastern Mission Valley. These initiatives include the realization of the multi-modal goals and infrastructure investment to support population growth projections as outlined in the Mission Valley Community Plan Update, establishment of reduced vehicle miles traveled throughout the City as outlined and referred to in the City's Climate Action Plan, and response to several flooding and life-safety events that have rendered emergency service provision in eastern Mission Valley unacceptable.

CDFW requested clarification about the feasibility of alternative bridge retrofits at Mission Center Road and Camino del Este, which are farther from the proposed bridge site compared to more proximate low elevation river crossings fully evaluated in the Draft EIR. In response, SDSU noted that these suggestions did not present alternatives that would achieve the project's underlying purpose and objective of providing a vehicular crossing in eastern Mission Valley.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

The State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans), owns transportation infrastructure upstream and downstream of the proposed project site, however the project itself is not in Caltrans right-of-way and will not require Caltrans encroachment permits.

Caltrans commented on various aspects of the project, such as hydrology and drainage studies, project plans, complete streets and mobility network, land use and smart growth, system planning, and sustainability. Additionally, Caltrans highlighted the need for coordination with Caltrans on ADA accessibility, potential impacts on local transit, potential impacts to their facilities either directly or indirectly (through modification of San Diego River water levels).

Caltrans requested that any Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) process undertaken to document changes in water elevations within the San Diego River as a result of introduction of bridge piers be forwarded to Caltrans for review. SDSU responded that the CLOMR application will be submitted to the City of San Diego, which will act as Floodplain Administrator on behalf of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and will submit the CLOMR application package to Caltrans as part of the process.

Caltrans requested information about queuing on the bridge and surrounding street network that could result in congestion on nearby Interstate 8 or 15 on or off ramps, as well as traffic impacts during construction. An extensive queuing analysis was provided to show that there would not be impacts to Caltrans infrastructure with the bridge in place. Additionally, SDSU confirmed a traffic control plan will be developed to manage any necessary detours and impacts during construction.

Caltrans requested additional information related to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance requirements. SDSU confirmed that ADA requirements will be included in the project as it moves through final design. Caltrans also asked about the anticipated speed limit of the bridge which SDSU clarified will be 30 mph, subject to the City's final determination.

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego serves as a Responsible Agency under CEQA for the proposed project. The proposed bridge site is on City-owned land and, following its construction, the bridge will be turned over to the City for long-term operation and maintenance.

The City expressed its support for the project, identifying it as an Essential Public Project under the City of San Diego Land Development Code. The City provided approximately 65 individual comments gathered from numerous City departments; these comments are grouped and summarized below.

The City requested additional information related to project construction and phasing, biological resources and hydrology and water quality. SDSU clarified several construction details in the project description including more clarity around the treatment of the river bottom throughout the construction period. Additional analysis was prepared to show that the proposed temporary work

area would not result in increased sedimentation and therefore not create water quality impact issues upstream or downstream.

The City requested additional information about the biological resource mitigation measures, including the least Bell's vireo bird, western spadefoot toad, and Crotch's bumble bee, potential long-term impacts on native vegetation species, and potential indirect impacts of vibrations from construction equipment on wildlife. The Final EIR clarifies vibration would not cause adverse impacts to special-status species because pile driving would not be necessary for construction and any other vibration would be intermittent and extremely limited in duration.

The City requested adjustments to the proposed drainage easement, which can be made under City direction as it is a City-owned storm drain and the easement dimensions follow City standards. The City requested additional analyses of flood zones and steep slopes in accordance with San Diego Municipal Code requirements, to provide complete information necessary for the City's own findings process.

The City also requested additional low-elevation roadway retrofits be added to the alternatives chapter. The response states that these alternatives were already considered and deemed infeasible due to constraints.

Mission Valley Community Planning Group

The Mission Valley Community Planning Group (Planning Group), which is a community organization that has been actively involved with Mission Valley Community Plan matters over the years, generally expressed support for the proposed bridge. The Planning Group commented on potential traffic impacts during construction, suggesting that the project might exacerbate existing congestion in the area. SDSU reiterated planned adherence to best management practices such as clear staging areas, communication with local transportation officials and noise mitigation to minimize community disruption.

The Planning Group asked about the potential impacts of sea level rise on the proposed bridge, and SDSU clarified that sea level rise would not have a measurable effect on the bridge given its nearly 7-mile distance from the coastline from the ocean and elevation above mean sea level.

The Planning Group also expressed a preference for the tied-arch bridge (featured as an alternative in the Draft EIR) for aesthetic reasons and provided suggestions for lighting, construction materials, art and design elements as outlined in the San Diego River Park Master Plan, and the desire for the bridge to serve as an attractive gateway to the community. The Planning Group also asked that bridge design not disrupt the recently constructed San Diego River Trail segment within the recently constructed Mission Valley River Park.

SDSU confirmed that the bridge will not affect the trail and confirmed that the Planning Group's other proposed design suggestions would be taken into consideration as bridge design is refined.

The Planning Group also commented on the potential effects on local wildlife and natural resources. The Final EIR highlights various design elements that have been incorporated in the project design to safeguard local biological resources.

San Diego Archaeological Society

The San Diego Archaeological Society (Society) expressed agreement with the archaeological resource and Native American tribal cultural resource monitoring program mitigation measures. The Society suggested that monitoring should also include geotechnical testing of the soil column. The response noted that geotechnical testing was conducted in November 2023 with monitors present and did not reveal any recorded prehistoric resources. Moreover, mitigation measure MM-CUL-1 has been clarified to require the results of geotechnical testing to be provided to the monitors before cultural resource construction monitoring commences.

San Diego Audubon Society

The San Diego Audubon Society (Society) commented on the purpose of and need for the bridge. The Final EIR provides additional information about the essential public project rationale outlined in several key City planning documents, guidelines and initiatives that point to the importance of establishing a new multi-modal crossing in eastern Mission Valley. These initiatives include the realization of the multi-modal goals and infrastructure investment to support population growth projections as outlined in the Mission Valley Community Plan Update, establishment of reduced vehicle miles traveled throughout the City as outlined and referred to in the City's Climate Action Plan, and response to several flooding and life-safety events that have rendered emergency service provision in eastern Mission Valley unacceptable.

The Society commented that the environmentally superior alternative must be a "no bridge" alternative and not the Pedestrian/Bicycle Alternative, which the DEIR classifies as "environmentally superior." The Society also commented on the DEIR's analysis of environmental impacts, noting that the comparison of alternatives emphasizes short-term construction effects while neglecting long-term operational impacts. SDSU confirmed that the No Project (No Build) Alternative, which was evaluated in detail in the EIR, was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(2), in that event, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The response also confirms that both short-term and long-term impacts are adequately evaluated and mitigated in the EIR.

The Society commented on mitigation measures intended to reduce impacts to nesting birds. While there would be significant and unavoidable impacts to nesting birds, required mitigation would greatly reduce impacts by ensuring that all habitat is removed outside of the breeding season and the noisy construction operation be introduced to the river environment during the non-breeding season (September 15-January 15). An Incidental Take Permit from the USFWS will be sought to allow this potential temporary impact to this species. Stopping and starting construction to avoid the breeding seasons would elongate the overall construction duration rendering human presence in the river corridor for nearly three years instead of a single year, and therefore a single nesting season. The Final EIR explains why a single continuous year (62 weeks) of construction that may involve indirect impacts (i.e., annoyance during nesting activity) is preferable to a longer construction period of up to three years of human presence in the river corridor.

Lastly, the Society commented on the adequacy of mitigation and monitoring plans, particularly regarding the protection and quality of mitigation sites and the effectiveness of habitat restoration efforts. The Final EIR clarifies that there is a relevant “road map” for restoration in this reach of the river, given that the City recently completed a nearly 10-year restoration effort of the San Diego River in conjunction with the Stadium Mitigation Site. The Stadium Mitigation Site recently received sign-off by all resource agencies, documenting the success of the City’s extensive restoration effort. Lessons learned and staff best practice sharing has already occurred and is reflected in the draft on-site conceptual restoration plan for the proposed bridge.

Individuals

Richard Erth of the Mission Valley Planning Group highlighted the importance of the bridge serving as an iconic gateway over the San Diego River and suggested exploring alternative designs, such as a shorter span bridge, to enhance the bridge’s visual impact and minimize environmental disruptions. However, they noted that practical constraints, including the need for extensive back-stay structures and the existing infrastructure surrounding the site, make a shorter span bridge infeasible.

Doug Wescott with the Serra Mesa Planning Group commented on the bridge’s design and environmental impacts, stating that an alternative design for a pedestrian and bicycle-only bridge with emergency vehicle access was not considered. The commenter stated that such a design would result in a narrower bridge with fewer supporting columns, potentially reducing environmental impacts. The Final EIR clarifies that this alternative was not included as it would not substantially reduce environmental impacts compared to the proposed 58-foot-wide bridge and would not meet key project objectives, such as reducing VMT.

Karen Ruggles of KLR Planning expressed appreciation for the EIR's comprehensive evaluation and commented on the project objectives, suggesting the inclusion of project benefits on all public emergency and police services, not just San Diego Fire Department's Station 45. Additionally, the comment proposed expanding the high-water crossing objective to ensure accessibility for both motorists and non-motorists during flooding events. The commenter also suggested the need for quantified air quality, biological resource, and noise impact determinations in the alternatives analysis. SDSU responded that, while qualitative comparisons are standard in alternatives analysis per CEQA requirements, the DEIR includes a matrix summarizing quantitative impacts. A comment was also made about the Pedestrian/Bicycle Only Alternative not meeting key project objectives, particularly related to vehicular connectivity and emergency access. SDSU confirmed that while this alternative is recognized for its reduced biological impacts, it does not fulfill a majority of project objectives.

Sudberry Properties, LLC and Quarry Falls, LLC, submitted a comment letter expressing support for the project. Sudberry Properties owns several commercial properties near the proposed bridge. The comment letter suggested that the alternative analysis did not adequately consider the benefits of the reduction in vehicle miles traveled or VMT resulting from a vehicular connection across the San Diego River and suggested those reductions should have made the proposed project the environmentally superior alternative instead of the Pedestrian/Bicycle Only Alternative. In response, the project description has been revised in the Final EIR to further clarify the purpose and need for the proposed project as set forth in multiple City planning documents, guidelines and policies. The Final EIR recognizes the project's positive impact on VMT in Mission Valley and the resulting GHG reductions. The Pedestrian/Bicycle Only Alternative remains the environmentally superior alternative due to its reduced impacts on biological impacts compared to the proposed project.

Summary of Project Alternatives

The EIR identifies four project alternatives developed during the conceptual planning phase of the proposed project.

Alternative 1: No Project (No Build) Alternative: CEQA requires consideration of a no project alternative and recommends it evaluate what could reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (14 CCR 15126.6[e][3][C]). The No Project (No Build) Alternative assumes that the proposed project would not be developed and existing environmental conditions in the project area would remain in their current state. As such, no bridge would be developed across the San Diego River.

Alternative 2: Pedestrian/Bicycle Only Bridge Alternative (Environmentally Superior Alternative): The Pedestrian/Bicycle Only Bridge Alternative would involve the construction of a pedestrian/bicycle only bridge and would not provide vehicular access. This alternative would result in a narrower bridge design because it would not include vehicular lanes, and three smaller piers would need to be installed in the river channel. While this alternative would improve north-south pedestrian and bicycle access in the area, it would not provide any emergency access or improve evacuation capacity, thereby not meeting those project objectives.

Alternative 3: Tied-Arch Bridge Alternative: The Tied-Arch Bridge Alternative would avoid the installation of piers within the riverbed and the bridge span would instead be suspended by cables from a pair of tall arches. The entire structure would be supported by large abutment foundations installed in the north and south banks of the river. This alternative would avoid potential cultural and tribal cultural resource impacts in the riverbed but would necessitate larger impact footprints extending to and including existing roadways north and south of the river. This alternative would also require encroachment into the City's Stadium Wetland Mitigation Site. Construction of a tied-arch bridge would also require larger cranes within the river corridor, and a greater area of vegetation would need to be cleared to accommodate the tall temporary arch supports. Therefore, this alternative would have greater impacts related to biological resources and noise than the proposed project.

Alternative 4: Suspension Bridge Alternative: The Suspension Bridge Alternative would avoid the installation of any piers within the river bottom. Instead, the bridge span over the river would be supported by a pair of large towers (approximately 120 feet in height) and foundations installed in the north and south banks of the river. Two additional foundations would be required approximately 150 feet north of the north tower and 150 feet south of the south tower. This alternative would avoid potential cultural and tribal cultural resource impacts within the riverbed but necessitate larger impact footprints extending to and including existing roadways north and south of the river, as well as additional encroachment into the City's Stadium Wetland Mitigation Site, increasing impacts to biological resources compared to the proposed project.

Recommendation

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Board of Trustees finds that the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project EIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The EIR addresses the proposed Fenton Parkway Bridge Project and all related discretionary actions.
3. Prior to the certification of the EIR, the Board of Trustees reviewed and considered the EIR and found it to reflect the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees hereby certifies the EIR as complete and adequate and finds that it addresses all potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA. For purposes of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the administrative record includes the following:
 - a. The Draft EIR for the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project;
 - b. The Final EIR, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to comments, and revisions to the Draft EIR in response to comments received;
 - c. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings; and
 - d. All attachments, documents incorporated by reference, and references cited in the documents specified in items (a) through (c) above.
4. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which require the Board of Trustees to make findings prior to the approval of the project.
5. The Board of Trustees hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations stating that project benefits outweigh the remaining significant and unavoidable impacts related to biological resources and noise.
6. The Board of Trustees hereby adopts the CEQA Findings of Fact and Mitigation and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The required mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081.6; Guidelines § 15097).
7. The project will benefit the California State University.
8. The Fenton Parkway Bridge project dated September 2024 is approved.
9. The chancellor or her designee is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the EIR for the Fenton Parkway Bridge Project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University, Fullerton Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub Schematic Design Approval

Presentation By

Steve Relyea
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Ronald S. Rochon
President
California State University, Fullerton

Paul Gannoe
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests the California State University Board of Trustees approve schematic plans for the California State University, Fullerton (Cal State Fullerton) Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub project.

Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub

Construction Manager at Risk Contractor: CW Driver

Project Architect: Gensler

Background and Scope

California State University, Fullerton proposes to design and construct a three-story, 29,878 assignable square foot (ASF)/45,163 gross square foot (GSF) Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub (#84¹), situated in the heart of the campus, just west of the existing Engineering and Computer Science complex (#10A-E). The new building will serve as the gateway to the Engineering and Computer Science complex, providing much-needed learning and research laboratory capacity for students and the community.

¹ The facility number is shown on the master plan map and recorded in the Space and Facilities Database.

Cal State Fullerton, the largest university in the CSU system and the only one in Orange County, serves over 40,000 students. The university has experienced significant enrollment growth in engineering and computer over the years, driven by the increasing regional demand for engineers. In the final 2022-2023 California State Budget, the Governor and legislature approved \$67.5 million for the design and construction of this project aimed at bolstering regional economies, fostering research and innovation in the region, and supporting the growing need for a highly skilled, STEM-trained workforce for all industries. This initiative will prepare future engineers, software developers, cybersecurity experts, and computer hardware and tech professionals, equipping them with advanced knowledge and skills to launch their careers.

The project will construct specialized laboratories for computing, robotics, materials testing, and bioengineering. The project will also include a 120-seat multi-purpose room, student lounges, group study rooms, project labs, meeting and huddle rooms, makerspaces, lab support and equipment rooms, shared offices, and a wellness room. Designed for flexibility and maximum utilization, the new building will organize spaces by function, allowing them to adapt to evolving industry and workforce needs rather than being assigned to specific departments. Additionally, the outdoor hardscape and landscape areas will offer students more opportunities to study and collaborate.

The new building will be a three-story steel-moment framed structure. To minimize solar heat gain, the west-facing windows are shaded with vertically-oriented metal panels. The fiber cement panels and east-facing windows are protected from the eastern sun by the Engineering Tower building, while exterior stairs on the south side provide shade from southern exposures. The proposed project is currently designed to meet the CSU's Sustainability Policy requirements. Notable sustainability features include low-energy LED lighting design, low-flow plumbing fixtures, double-glazed windows, high insulation values for walls and roofs, drought tolerant landscaping, and efficient irrigation systems. The building will be fully electric, with a 34kW photovoltaic rooftop system.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	December 2024
Working Drawings Completed	February 2025
Construction Start	June 2025
Occupancy	April 2027

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	45,163 square feet
Assignable Building Area (CSU ²)	29,878 square feet
Net Useable Building Area (FICM ³)	39,750 square feet
Efficiency (CSU)	66 percent
Efficiency (FICM)	88 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) 8287⁴

Building Cost (\$893 per GSF)	\$40,317,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 22.30
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 251.82
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 119.46
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 283.53
e. Built-in Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 31.75
f. Special Construction & Demolition	\$ 19.97
g. General Requirements/Conditions and Insurance	\$ 163.87
Site Development	<u>6,411,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$46,728,000
Campus Project Contingency (CSU)	2,112,000
Fees & Services	<u>16,180,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$1,440 per GSF)	\$65,020,000
Fixtures, Furniture & Movable Equipment	<u>\$3,002,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$68,022,000</u>

² Assignable building area is based on CSU policy.

³ Net usable building area is greater than assignable building area by including corridors, restrooms, mechanical rooms, etc., based on the definitions of the Postsecondary Education Facilities Inventory & Classification Manual (FICM).

⁴ The July 2022 *Engineering News-Record* California Construction Cost Index (CCCI). The CCCI is the average Building Cost Index for Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$893 per GSF is lower than the \$942 per GSF for the Engineering & Technology Commons project at California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt approved in January 2024, the \$947 per GSF for the Science Replacement Building at San Francisco State University approved in November 2020, and higher than the \$825 per GSF for the Equity Innovation Hub at California State University, Northridge approved in May 2022, all adjusted to CCCI 8287. The lower cost of the California State University, Northridge project is attributed to its inclusion of more non-engineering laboratory spaces, which are less expensive.

The itemized building costs for this project are either in line with or lower than those of other comparable CSU projects. The Fees and Services are high due to the escalation to midpoint of construction as the project was approved for funding in 2022-2023 and commenced in July 2022.

The building shell is aesthetically designed and cost-effective. During the design process, Cal State Fullerton saved approximately \$3.25 million in direct construction costs. By strategically placing the new building next to the existing Engineering and Computer Science complex, the university saved \$1 million in direct costs by maximizing the use of the existing utility system. This decision allowed the existing utility tunnel and main electrical backbone to remain unaffected while maintaining proximity to the existing Engineering and Computer Science complex. Additionally, the design team incorporated a consistent lab planning module and structural bay for efficient program stacking and aggregated lab spaces while separating lab support areas with potential chemical use, which saved approximately \$1 million. This approach enhanced building systems distribution efficiency, reduced the area requiring full exhaust, and isolated structural vibration criteria for a more efficient design. Furthermore, Cal State Fullerton saved \$1.25 million by identifying areas for plaster on the exterior, switching from a curtain wall to a more traditional window wall and storefront system, and simplifying materials for floors and ceilings. The rectilinear design of the building also contributed to construction efficiencies by streamlining the foundation and primary structural systems, thus enhancing the construction scheduling process.

Funding Data

The project will be funded with donor funds (\$522,000) and the 2022-2023 state appropriation (\$67,500,000) which will be financed with CSU Systemwide Revenue Bonds supported by ongoing state appropriation.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

The proposed project is consistent with the 2020 Master Plan and parameters considered in the Master Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was certified by the Board of Trustees in July 2020. In addition, the proposed project would have no new significant environmental effects beyond those identified in the Master Plan Update Final EIR. No additional environmental documentation is required under CEQA.

Recommendation

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The California State University, Fullerton Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub project will benefit the California State University.
2. The project before the Board of Trustees is consistent with the project description as set forth in the previously certified Master Plan Update Final EIR.
3. Applicable mitigation measures adopted in conjunction with Campus Master Plan Update approval and EIR certification in 2020 shall be implemented, monitored, and reported in accordance with the requirements of CEQA (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081.6).
4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fullerton Engineering and Computer Science Innovation Hub project are approved at a project cost of \$68,022,000 at CCCI 8287.