

April 25, 2002

To: Campus Planning Committee
Dr. Bernard Goldstein, Chief Academic Officer
Mr. Laurence Furukawa-Schlereth, Chief Financial Officer
Dr. Nate Johnson, Director for Public Safety
Mr. Bruce Walker, Senior Director of Planning, Design and Construction
Dr. Rick Luttmann, Chair, Academic Senate
Mr. Thomas Emme, Campus Consulting Architect
Mr. Rick Ludmerer, Senior Director for Risk Management
Ms. Vicki Pannell, Staff Representative
Ms. Stephanie Giordano, Chancellor's Office Planner
Mr. Erick Dunncliff, Student Representative
Mr. Dave Sullins, Student Representative
Dr. Steve Orlick, Professor, ENSP (Faculty rep.)
Dr. Richard Zimmer, Professor of Anthropology, Hutchins School of
Liberal Arts (Faculty rep.)
Dr. Rand Link, Vice President for Student Affairs

From: Ruben Armiñana
President

Subject: Notes from the March 26, 2002
Campus Planning Committee Meeting

1. Skateboard/Bike/Scooter Policy

Nate Johnson summarized changes made in the Skateboard/Bike/Scooter Policy since the first reading of the document. He gave the committee a short briefing of events and responses that had taken place under the temporary policy set in place since the first reading of the policy at the May 9, 2001 meeting. In response to student concerns, changes had been made to the policy to regulate rather than ban the use of skateboards, bikes and scooters while still creating a safer environment for the community. Nate Johnson stated that, in order to strengthen the ability to enforce the policy, he was working with Lynn McIntyre to create a numbering system separate from vehicle code. He would work with Facilities to post the appropriate signs around campus notifying riders of the restrictions

Rick Luttmann asked for a friendly amendment to change the wording in section II A, 1, to read "Bicycles, Skateboards, Roller Skates and Scooters may be used on campus as an alternative mode of transportation when operated in a manner that is consistent with public safety" rather than "promotes public safety". After some discussion the committee agreed.

Rick Ludmerer spoke in support of the change to the policy which allows for regulation rather than a ban.

Rick Luttmann asked that a study be done by the Planning, Design and Construction Department to assure that the bicycle access, which was south of Schulz connecting the residential community to the central campus, be replaced to allow access around the Schulz plaza. The committee agreed that all bicycle paths should be reconsidered in light of this policy.

Dr. Goldstein moved that the policy be approved, Mr. Furukawa-Schlereth seconded the motion and the committee approved unanimously.

2. Proposal to Name Minor Facilities in Salazar Hall

Bruce Walker reported on the recommendation from a subcommittee, consisting of students, staff and faculty, appointed to consider a proposal to name the new science laboratories as well as the complex where the labs will reside in Salazar Hall. The proposal was to name the complex Cerent Engineering Science Complex and to name four of the labs as follows: Agilent Optical Transport Laboratory, AFC Access Technologies, Ralph Ilsley Jr. Photonics Laboratory and Keck Microanalysis Laboratory. Bruce Walker explained how the subcommittee had considered the proposal in accordance with the Naming of University Facilities Policy. He stated that the subcommittee had also considered the possibility of naming four other laboratories in the complex in the future. President Armiñana stated that future proposed names would have to come back to committee for consideration and that only the names proposed now would be addressed now.

Steve Orlick asked what would happen if any of the companies should go out of business after naming. Saeid Rahimi stated that the companies would want the names to remain as a remembrance of commitments made.

Steve Orlick asked if we knew about objectionable manufacturing methods that any of the companies might have participated in. Saeid Rahimi stated that all of the companies were local and were known as to their activities.

The two student representatives, Erick Dunncliff and Dave Sullins stated that they were aware of the proposal and knew that it had student support.

The committee then approved the proposal unanimously.

3. Faculty Housing Development Plan

Laurence Furukawa-Schlereth reported on the recent activities of the Faculty/Staff Housing Task Force working in an effort to provide sufficient University related housing. He briefed the committee on the search for possible land acquisition and the processes that would follow once appropriate land had been located and purchased. This action would include Campus Planning Committee work on Master Planning and the associated Environmental Impact Report.

4. Tree Removal/Replanting Program

Deborah DuVall reminded the committee of an action item several years ago concerning a Tree Management Program. The resolution at that time was that trees could be removed by the Landscape Department because of decay, or if causing a threat to facilities or people, as long as they were isolated and not a significant biological or aesthetic impact. If significant, however, the committee should be notified. The following areas would be considered significant removals and so were being brought back to the committee as information:

1. Two Willows at the Lake
2. Pines and Poplars at the Veterans Grove and several north of Stevenson and East of the Village.
3. Pines at the Baseball field
4. Ash on Redwood near the Residence Halls
5. Parking Lot H Pines
6. Health Center Pines

The committee was informed that these trees are scheduled for removal within the next year. Replacement trees would be planted where appropriate.

5. Copeland Creek Master Plan

Deborah DuVall gave a status report from the Copeland Creek Advisory Committee. She reported that the Committee had developed a Copeland Creek Master Plan to be used as a planning guideline to assist the Director of Campus Planning in implementing the Copeland Creek Policy. This policy was set up to maintain and enhance the native biodiversity of Copeland Creek.

The Master Plan contains information about plant and animal species existing and suitable for the creek corridor and recommendations ranging from flood control improvements to access improvements for educational research and recreation. The plan also establishes approved maintenance practices, monitoring recommendations and procedures for making application to conduct appropriate activities within the creek corridor.

The plan was made available for public comment during the months of February and March. The purpose of this review was not as part of an Environmental Impact Report but for purposes of general consultation. Comments received were discussed with the committee. One of the comments asked whether the plan would receive CEQA review. Deborah stated that she had consulted two CEQA authorities about whether a CEQA process was required in the case of a planning study and if so, what it should be. The response was that, if the plan was used as a planning guideline only, CEQA was not required under Exemption 15262. If the plan was approved and, therefore, committing the campus to a project or a

possible significant environmental impact, the plan should be part of an Amendment to the Campus Master Plan EIR. Funds required for that action would be approximately \$60,000. Since the Copeland Creek Advisory Committee did not have the budget for an Addendum, the advisory committee was making the recommendation to the Campus Planning Committee that the Copeland Creek Master Plan be used as a planning guideline for the Director of Campus Planning and that any projects that are developed from that plan be engineered, receive CEQA review and brought back to the Campus Planning Committee for approval.

Steve Orlick stated that he and his faculty colleagues did not agree with Deborah DuVall about the interpretation of whether a CEQA process was required for this type of planning document and stated that there could be a danger of piecemeal decisions being made without CEQA review. He added, however, that his real concern was the location and use of the north entrance road and asked for clarification about the process concerning that decision.

Rick Luttmann stated that it was his understanding that the north entrance road and its use had been approved already and was not in question at this time. There was general committee agreement in that regard.

President Armiñana asked if this item was for information only with no action needed at this time and Deborah DuVall agreed that was the case.

General Discussion:

Rick Luttmann asked for an update on where the campus was concerning installing a traffic signal at the main entrance. Mr. Schlereth stated that we had learned that the campus was not allowed to spend funds off-campus and that the cost of such an installation would be \$300,000. This would be a County expense and the County had no intentions of installing a signal at this time.

Rick Luttmann asked for an update on where the Greenhouses and Animal House would be located once the Recreation Center was being built. Bruce Walker stated that neither of those facilities were in the footprint of the future Recreation Center but that the campus might not want the aesthetic conflicts of having the Animal House and Greenhouse as neighbors to the Recreation Center. Mr. Schlereth suggested that Dr. Goldstein and he put together a sub-committee to discuss the ultimate fate of the Greenhouses and Animal House. There was general committee agreement for this action.

Rick Luttmann asked that, if the new Skateboard/Bike/Scooter Policy restricts access through the Schulz plaza, there would need to be an ulterior bike path south of Schulz. The President asked that the Planning, Design, Construction Department look at the area for needed improvements.

