

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting:** 12:45 p.m., Tuesday, May 18, 2021  
Virtually via Teleconference

Jane W. Carney, Chair  
Lateefah Simon, Vice Chair  
Larry L. Adamson  
Jack Clarke, Jr.  
Anna Ortiz-Morfit  
Krystal Raynes  
Romey Sabalius  
Peter J. Taylor

**Consent** 1. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of March 23, 2021, *Action*  
**Discussion** 2. California Environmental Quality Act Report, *Information*

**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**

**March 23, 2021**

**Members Present**

Jane W. Carney, Chair  
Larry L. Adamson  
Jack B. Clarke Jr.  
Anna Ortiz-Morfit  
Krystal Raynes  
Romey Sabalius  
Peter J. Taylor

Lillian Kimbell, Chair of the Board  
Joseph I. Castro, Chancellor

Trustee Jane W. Carney called the meeting to order.

**Public Comment**

Public comment occurred at the beginning of the meeting's open session prior to all committees. No public comments were made pertaining to committee agenda items.

**Consent Agenda**

The minutes of the January 26, 2021, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds were approved as submitted.

**California State University, Northridge Sierra Annex Schematic Design Approval**

This agenda item requested the California State University Board of Trustees approve schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge Sierra Annex project.

**\*PLEASE NOTE: Due to the Governor's proclamation of a State of Emergency resulting from the threat of COVID-19, and pursuant to the Governor's Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20 issued on March 12, 2020 and March 17, 2020, respectively, all members of the Board of Trustees may participate in meetings remotely, either by telephonic or video conference means. Out of consideration for the health, safety and well-being of the members of the public and the Chancellor's Office staff, the March 23, 2021 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees was conducted entirely virtually via Zoom teleconference.**

Following the presentation, trustees commented that Sierra Hall is one of the few buildings remaining to be renovated since the 1994 Northridge earthquake damaged various structures.

A question was asked about the long-term nature of construction decisions and how campuses are planning to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Assistant Vice Chancellor Vi San Juan explained that it is a long-term process which is dependent on project prioritization and funding availability. She provided examples of technologies and strategies that campuses are adopting to reduce the use of natural gas and increase electricity use in central plant systems.

Trustees commented that extra project costs are bundled together and seem high, and it was requested that the cost breakdown summaries of future projects separate fees, services, and contingencies to provide greater delineation between the various costs.

Trustees also commented that 40 percent of the space in this design is open and unassigned, and it was suggested that future projects increase usable space, such as classrooms, to ensure projects maximize efficiency and value.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-21-02).

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

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

### **California Environmental Quality Act Report**

#### **Presentation By**

Steve Relyea  
Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Financial Officer

Elvyra F. San Juan  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

#### **Summary**

Pursuant to the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees' policy, this item provides a report on the CSU's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) certification actions for environmental impact reports (EIRs) and other CEQA documentation. Attachment A provides an overview of changes to CEQA that has impacted the CSU and Attachment B identifies the certification actions that have been acted upon by the Board of Trustees for the period from July 2017 through June 2020<sup>1</sup>, consistent with its responsibility as the Lead Agency under CEQA.

#### **Background**

The goal of CEQA is to inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed projects and efforts to prevent significant damage to the environment through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures. Under CEQA, and as it applies to the CSU, a “project” is typically either a specific building or facility planned for construction, or a programmatic action such as approval of an updated campus master plan that is prepared to guide long-range campus development. CEQA compliance is required for activities directly implemented or financed by a governmental agency as well as for private activities requiring approval from a governmental agency. Per State CEQA guidelines, the type of CEQA action depends on the environmental impact of the project and primarily includes the following:

- **Categorical Exemption** applies to classes of projects which have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment (e.g., interior renovations).
- **Negative Declaration** applies to projects which will not have a significant effect on the environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> This information item has typically been provided to the board every two years (biennial) but was delayed due to the pandemic.

- **Mitigated Negative Declaration** include projects with potentially significant effects, but revisions in the project or mitigation measures will avoid or reduce effects to a point where no significant effects would occur.
- An **EIR** is completed for projects that could result in unavoidable significant environmental impacts.
- A **Supplemental EIR** may be prepared when it is necessary to provide additional information to make a previously certified EIR adequate for a project as modified. It focuses only on new project information, changed circumstances, new or substantially more severe impacts, and new or updated mitigation measures.
- An **Addendum to an EIR** may be prepared if there are minor technical changes or additions to a project which were included in a previously certified EIR.

### **Role of the CSU**

A “Lead Agency” is defined in CEQA as the public agency that has principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. The Board of Trustees is the Lead Agency for CSU projects and typically considers CEQA documentation at the time of a project’s schematic design approval or approval of a significant change to a long-range physical master plan. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the CSU Board of Trustees must find that certification of an environmental document reflects the Board of Trustees’ independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

The Board of Trustees is responsible for ensuring that EIRs and other CEQA documents that may be submitted for consideration and approval are prepared in a timely manner and comply with all legal requirements; are properly noticed and circulated for public review when applicable; and public comments are considered and responses prepared, when required. Attachment A summarizes the changes to the environmental assessment process with respect to CEQA and environmental compliance. When the Board of Trustees considers a project for approval, it must first certify the associated environmental document as legally adequate. At that time, the Board of Trustees must also adopt the following documents:

- **Findings of Fact:** A summary of written findings for each significant impact identified in the environmental document, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Findings must conclude for each significant impact: 1) that changes have been incorporated into a project that avoid or lessen an impact, 2) that such changes are outside of the Board of Trustees’ authority and have been or should be adopted by another agency with jurisdiction and responsibility, or 3) that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations render proposed mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible.

- **Statement of Overriding Considerations:** Prepared for projects with unavoidable significant impacts – that is, impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. The statement is a summary of the circumstances and benefits of the project that outweigh the identified potential unavoidable significant impacts, as supported by evidence contained in the project’s administrative record. If the benefits are concluded to outweigh the impacts, those impacts may be considered “acceptable.”
- **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:** A summary of the mitigation measures required to reduce or avoid environmental impacts, identification of the entity responsible for implementing the mitigation, the timing of implementation, and identification of the entity responsible for monitoring implementation of the mitigation.

Under authority delegated to the chancellor, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC) is authorized to approve minor changes to a campus master plan and to approve specified CEQA documents (i.e., Categorical Exemptions, Negative Declarations, and Mitigated Negative Declarations) for capital projects that are not architecturally significant, are non-controversial, and/or are below a certain dollar value.

### **Summary of CEQA Actions**

Attachment B lists CSU CEQA actions for major projects during the reporting period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020. In addition, 185 categorical exemptions were filed during the reporting period for campus projects. Some project highlights of the reporting period are summarized below.

Notably, the CSU Board of Trustees considered and approved changes to campus Master Plans and the associated EIRs certified during the reporting period: CSU San Bernardino (September 2017), California Maritime Academy (July 2018), CSU Dominguez Hills (September 2019), and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (May 2020). The Board also approved the EIR, master plan and acquisition for the San Diego State—Mission Valley site (January 2020).

Beyond the reporting period, Master Plan EIRs were approved for CSU Fullerton (July 2020) and CSU Chico (November 2020). The EIR for the campus Master Plan Update for CSU Monterey Bay is currently in progress and anticipated to come before the Board in 2021; several other campuses (CSU Long Beach, CSU Sacramento—Placer Center and CSU Sacramento—Ramona Center) are in varying stages of master plan updates and will commence public outreach and CEQA review over the next two years.

## **CEQA Judicial Action Updates**

Summarized below are recent court decisions or updates involving CSU CEQA actions.

### **City of Carson v. CSU Dominguez Hills**

The City of Carson objected to the designation of the CSU as the lead agency for the CSU Dominguez Hills Master Plan. This is the second lawsuit in which the City attempted to get a court order declaring the City the lead agency, and to stop the CSU from proceeding with Master Plan activities (e.g., the University Village EIR). The court denied the City's attempt to get a temporary restraining order. The California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) subsequently issued a letter finding that the CSU was the appropriate lead agency for the CSU Dominguez Hills Master Plan. The City thereafter amended its complaint to include the OPR. After receiving and considering all the evidence, briefs, pleadings, and arguments presented by the parties at the June 20, 2018 hearing on OPR's and CSU's judgment on the pleadings, and the November 7, 2018 hearing on the merits, the court denied the City's writ petition and requests for declaratory relief and dismissed the action. Judgment was entered in favor of OPR and CSU.

### **City of Hayward v. CSU East Bay #1**

The City of Hayward filed a CEQA challenge to the 2009 CSU East Bay Master Plan Environmental Impact Report, claiming the University failed to adequately analyze impacts on public services, including police, fire, and emergency services. The City demanded that the University provide funding for additional fire facilities.

The Hayward Area Planning Association (HAPA) and Old Highlands Homeowners Association (OHHA), two local residential homeowners' associations, filed a second CEQA challenge to the 2009 CSU East Bay Master Plan EIR, alleging shortcomings in nearly every aspect of the environmental findings, with an emphasis on the University's alleged failure to consider bus and other improvements to public transit access to the campus. On September 9, 2010, the trial court ruled in favor of the petitioners on nearly every issue and enjoined the University from proceeding with construction. The University appealed.

In June 2012, the Court of Appeal ruled the CSU East Bay Master Plan EIR is adequate, except for failing to analyze impacts on local recreational facilities. The Court's ruling includes a finding that CSU's determination that new fire protection facilities will not result in significant environmental impacts was supported by substantial evidence. Importantly, the Court also held that the obligation to provide adequate fire and emergency services is the responsibility of the City of Hayward, and the need for additional fire protection services is not an environmental impact that CSU must mitigate. The City and HAPA/OHHA filed a petition for review with the California Supreme Court.

Following the California Supreme Court's decision in the earlier *City of San Diego* matter, on October 14, 2015, the Court transferred the case back to the Court of Appeal. After further briefing, the Court of Appeal largely reissued its original decision, reiterating that the obligation to provide adequate fire and emergency services is the responsibility of the City of Hayward, and the need for additional fire protection services is not an environmental impact that CSU must mitigate.

In January 2016, the City filed a new Petition for Review with the Supreme Court. This petition was denied. The parties have subsequently agreed to a peremptory writ of mandate, consistent with the directives issued by the Court of Appeal.

In accordance with the writ of mandate, CSU East Bay conducted an additional parklands analysis and reconsidered the sources of funding for its proportional fair share contribution for traffic mitigation measures. Regarding parklands analysis, CSU East Bay prepared and circulated for comment a Partial recirculated Draft EIR. CSU East Bay identified alternative sources of funding of its proportional fair share contribution for traffic mitigation measures. Despite multiple meetings with the City, CSU East Bay was unable to come to an agreement regarding the proportional fair share mitigation payments and moved forward to complete the additional parkland analysis as required by the court.

In January 2018, the Board of Trustees decertified the previous EIR and findings and adopted the new EIR and findings. After review of submitted CSU documents, in May 2018, the court entered an order stating that the 2009 action was fully resolved subject to the court's consideration of the City's request for reimbursement of attorney fees.

## **City of Hayward v. CSU East Bay #2**

On March 2, 2018, the City of Hayward filed a new CEQA challenge. The City alleged that CSU's approval of the revised EIR did not comply with CEQA because (i) CSU did not update its traffic mitigation funding amount (to account for inflation), and (ii) the parklands analysis was inadequate. City representatives stated that the reason they filed a second lawsuit was to ensure that CSU continued to negotiate an additional MOU to address the amount and logistics of CSU's fair share payments for off-site traffic improvements, as set forth in the revised Master Plan EIR. Although not required by CEQA or the revised Master Plan EIR, the City desired to receive immediate payment of the full amount of all traffic mitigation measures (more than \$2.4 million) whether or not any or all of the contemplated Master Plan projects are developed and constructed.

The administrative record was certified and filed on September 20, 2018. Written briefing by both sides was completed on November 21, 2018. A hearing on the merits was scheduled and continued several times by the court. Before scheduling a final hearing date, the court issued a tentative ruling in CSU's favor, setting forth a preliminary analysis indicating that the court was inclined to deny the City's writ petition, but also requested supplemental briefing on two narrow procedural CEQA

issues. The hearing and oral argument occurred in September 2019. Thereafter, the court denied the City's petition and dismissed the action. The court's order acknowledged and accepted CSU's commitment to pay its fair share of off-site traffic mitigation costs when warranted by development and construction of Master Plan projects.

On November 20, 2019, the City filed an appeal of the superior court's decision. CSU filed a cross-appeal. After several meetings and negotiations, the matter was settled in September 2020, and the appeal was dismissed with prejudice. The terms of the settlement agreement reaffirm CSU East Bay's commitment and obligation to act consistent with the Fair Share Statements made in the final EIR and in the earlier litigation. CSU East Bay shall pay its fair share of the cost of off-site traffic mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program on a project-by-project basis as and to the extent that individual Master Plan projects and their corresponding traffic mitigation measures are undertaken. CSU, as the lead agency for the Master Plan, shall determine the amount of its fair share costs as supported by then-current technical analyses and construction costs, and will take into consideration fair share discussions with the City. The CSU also agreed to pay the City's attorneys' fees and costs of \$204,562.00, incurred in the earlier 2009 litigation as required by law and court order. The City released all claims for attorneys' fees in the second lawsuit and released all claims with prejudice. Should there be any future disputes with respect to these matters, the parties also agreed to submit such disputes to mediation and binding arbitration.

### **Alcala, et al. v. CSUN**

At its July 2018 meeting, the Board of Trustees considered and adopted the Final Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration and the corresponding Master Plan Revision involving a proposed project, which generally includes the demolition of the existing facility and construction of a hotel on a 2.75-acre site located on the California State University, Northridge campus. On August 23, 2018, Mark Anthony Alcala, Walter Rivers and Northridge for the Environment and Equitable Development filed a CEQA action in Los Angeles Superior Court challenging the CSU's project approvals.

In April 2019, the parties executed a non-monetary settlement agreement. In exchange for petitioners' dismissal of the action, and covenant of non-opposition to all project approvals, including their agreement not to require, comment on, or oppose future CEQA actions, permits, entitlements or approvals, the campus agreed to implement various additional project measures related to reduction of potential air quality impacts, and additional project design features and fixtures related to reduction of potential greenhouse gas impacts. CSU Northridge also agreed to additional measures related to mobile emissions, and potential construction noise impacts. The matter has been dismissed.

**Juaneno Band of Mission Indians, Acjachemen Nation, Belardes and California Cultural Resources Preservation Alliance, Inc. v. CSU (Long Beach)**

A CEQA challenge was filed over the University's temporary storage of soil excavated from the Parkland North Housing project site on an undeveloped 22-acre portion of campus of archaeological and tribal cultural significance and listed on the National Register. This lawsuit is ongoing at this time.

**Campus Support**

CSU CEQA Handbook - The CSU published a comprehensive update to the handbook in April 2019. Detailed discussions are provided for such topics as Legal Challenges and the Administrative Record, Public-Private Partnership (P3) projects, and Climate Action Plans. Another update is in process to provide comprehensive guidance to campuses in identifying and documenting historic (built environment) resources for the purposes of providing inventories of those resources and undertaking consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer/State Office of Historic Preservation regarding preservation activities and project impacts on such resources, as required by Public Resources Code §§ 5024 and 5024.5.

CSU Transportation Impact Study Manual – An update to the manual was completed in March 2019 in response to the change in the CEQA Guidelines concerning VMT. The Manual also provides comprehensive guidance regarding project transportation analysis and report contents and agency coordination and consultation. The Manual is shared with campus Planning and Facilities staff and environmental consultants, including traffic engineers, for the purposes of ensuring compliance with the updated CEQA Guidelines and consistency of technical approaches to analysis in environmental documents across the CSU. The 2019 Transportation Impact Study Manual is used in conjunction with the CSU's 2013 Transportation Demand Management Manual to develop effective campus trip reduction strategies.

Climate Action Plans – A Quick Start Guide to Climate Action Planning has been recently developed and made available to campuses to support the development of Climate Action Plans. Climate action plans are essential tools for assessing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and developing a plan to achieve emission reduction targets. Eleven CSU campuses have published a campus-level climate action plan, with most setting a goal to achieve carbon neutrality by effectively reducing their net GHG emissions to zero.

Administrative Efficiencies – Each campus has Planning or Facilities Development staff with responsibility for and experience overseeing CEQA compliance for campus projects, retaining environmental consultants to prepare the related technical documentation, and ensuring the implementation of best practices campuswide with respect to environmental stewardship. To facilitate campus access to consultants, systemwide master enabling agreements (MEAs) have

been executed for CEQA experts that the campuses may use in considering a project's environmental impacts and supporting implementation of mitigation measures. In addition, MEAs are in process for firms that focus on transportation demand management and planning to assist campuses with strategies to reduce single rider vehicle use to campus and promote campus mobility solutions.

## **Changes to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements and Guidelines**

### **CEQA Guidelines Update**

A number of important changes concerning CEQA legislation and State CEQA guidance that affect how environmental analysis is conducted and how the CSU complies with CEQA took place during the reporting period.

The first major comprehensive series of updates to the State CEQA Guidelines since the late 1990s was implemented in December 2018. The CEQA Guidelines are administrative regulations governing implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.), are prepared by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and reviewed and adopted by the California Natural Resources Agency. Among other things, the CEQA Guidelines provide direction regarding the activities subject to environmental review, the steps involved in the environmental review process, and the required contents of environmental documents. The CEQA Guidelines apply to all public agencies in California.

The most notable CEQA Guidelines updates, including for CSU’s purposes, concern Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs), Transportation, Water Supply, and Wildfire as they are addressed in environmental documents, and include updates to the CEQA Guidelines “Environmental Checklist Form.” Many California public agencies, including the CSU, use this checklist as the basis of significance thresholds and criteria (together with regulatory standards) in environmental documents. The updates were prepared in response to several factors, including new legislation, climate change and adaptation, published case law, and public input. Key updates are briefly summarized below.

**Energy** - The 2018 CEQA Guidelines update added Energy as a standalone checklist topic and clarified that the analysis of energy impacts must address not merely building design and energy demand, but also the environmental impacts of energy demand associated with project location, project-related transportation, equipment use, and other relevant factors.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs)** changes provide additional guidance for assessing impacts in response to legislation as well as case law. Amendments include clarifying that lead agencies are required to (1) evaluate and determine the significance of a project’s GHG emissions under CEQA; (2) quantify the effects of emissions on climate change through the assessment of a project’s “reasonably foreseeable incremental contributions”; and (3) consider short- and long-term emission effects and address the project’s incremental contribution to climate change given the State policies and greenhouse reduction goals.

**Transportation** - Perhaps the most important change made in 2018, the CEQA Guidelines update the checklist to eliminate the word “Traffic” in favor of “Transportation,” reflecting a fundamental shift away from considering traffic – specifically, roadway and intersection capacity, vehicular delays (levels of service or LOS), and other measures of traffic congestion – as an environmental impact in its own right. Instead, initial travel choices and the influences thereon – that is, the decision to drive in the first place, and the lack of adequate transit options or other alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle use – are treated as the source of potential environmental impacts on the local and regional transportation systems. Vehicle Miles Traveled, or VMT, was defined as the new metric of transportation-related impacts of land use projects. VMT formally replaced LOS (congestion delays) in July 2020 as the official basis for determining transportation impacts under CEQA.

Under the new Guidelines, campuses are still obligated to engage in consultation during the preparation of environmental documents with local jurisdictions and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) regarding their concerns about mobility, access, and other issues important to their constituencies. However, those may no longer be considered CEQA impacts or the basis for required mitigation except for safety-related impacts (which remains a required topic for evaluation under CEQA). This largely eliminates, for example, CEQA-related requirements for campus fair-share payments to local jurisdictions for off-campus roadway improvements, which will result in considerable cost savings over time, and the ability of campuses to invest in their own mobility solutions and infrastructure instead.

Campus environmental documents are now required to evaluate how campus VMT is affected by a given project or a program such as a Master Plan update in comparison to a selected regional benchmark, and how a campus project affects the regional VMT. CSU campuses are traditionally commuter-oriented, as opposed to residential, in nature, and may draw students, staff, faculty, and visitors from relatively large “commute-sheds.” As a result, campuses typically generate relatively high VMT per campus population, although this varies according to location, the amount of student housing on campus, and other factors. To reduce trip generation and parking demand at the source, campuses are required to develop customized Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs that implement alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle use and related parking demand. Campuses are also required to monitor and report on the effectiveness of measures over time, to ensure they have the intended effect.

**Water** - Updates clarified that an environmental document must analyze a proposed project’s water supply sources over the course of the project’s lifetime “as well as the environmental impacts of supplying that water to the project.”<sup>1</sup> Analysis must address uncertainty in water supply sources, as well as alternatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> State of California. Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, “Proposed Updates to the CEQA Guidelines,” November 2017.

**Wildfire** - A new addition as a standalone environmental topic in the checklist. Environmental documents are now required to evaluate a project’s potential to (1) impair an adopted emergency or evacuation plan; (2) exacerbate wildfire risks and expose occupants to uncontrolled wildfire spread or associated pollutant concentrations; and (3) require infrastructure that could exacerbate fire risk or expose downslope or downstream populations to landslides or flooding as the result of post-fire changes.

**Tribal Cultural Resources** - In 2015, the State Legislature passed AB 52 into law, which elevated and formalized the engagement of California Native American Tribes in the CEQA review process to avoid project impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources. Such resources include sites, features, cultural landscapes, sacred places, for example, with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are included on or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources or a local register of historical resources, and that are determined by a lead agency to be significant. AB 52 requires lead agencies (for CSU purposes, a campus) to engage in formal consultation early in the environmental review process for certain projects in the geographic area which a Tribe has a traditional and cultural affiliation.

CSU campuses, with the support of qualified consultants, have conducted numerous consultations with California Native American Tribes since 2015, for such varied projects as comprehensive campuswide Master Plan updates, new facilities construction, infrastructure improvements, and off-campus open space management programs, and have jointly developed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts on resources. Many campuses regularly engage Native American construction monitors and, where the potential to encounter known or unknown resources exists, have developed artifact collection and treatment plans in accordance with required environmental document mitigation obligations.

**The California State University  
 California Environmental Quality Act Report  
 July 2017 through June 2020**

This summary reflects CEQA actions considered by the CSU Board of Trustees for major capital outlay projects or master plan revisions. It does not include the 185 categorical exemptions for lower dollar value (\$752,000) projects filed during the reporting period for campus projects.

CAMPUS & PROJECT	CEQA Action					
	Finding of Consistency	Exempt	MND/ND	Addendum	EIR	BOT Approval
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHANNEL ISLANDS</b>						
University Glen Ph. 2 Housing and Master Plan Revision					√	July 2017
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO</b>						
Siskiyou II Science Replacement (Seismic) Building				√		January 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS</b>						
Student Housing Ph. III	√					May 2018
Innovation and Instruction Building	√					May 2018
Master Plan Update/Revision					√	September 2019
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY</b>						
Decertify 2009 FEIR for Master Plan Update/Revision; Certify partial recirculated EIR for Master Plan Update/Revision including Pioneer Height and Parking Structure					√	January 2018
CORE Building - Library Replacement (Seismic)				√		May 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO</b>						
Student Union			√			September 2019

CAMPUS & PROJECT	CEQA Action					
	Finding of Consistency	Exempt	MND/ND	Addendum	EIR	BOT Approval
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON</b>						
Student Housing Ph. 4	√					July 2020
Master Plan Update/Revision					√	July 2020
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES</b>						
Parking Structure E	√					November 2017
Student Housing East (part of North Campus Project)				√		May 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH</b>						
Housing Expansion Ph. I - Parkside North Housing, Addendum No. 1				√		July 2019
Housing Expansion Ph. I - Parkside North Housing, Addendum No. 2	√			√		November 2019
Housing Expansion Phase I - Hillside Housing Administration & Commons					√	November 2019
<b>MARITIME ACADEMY</b>						
Real Property (Motel 6) Acquisition and Master Plan Revision						January 2018
Master Plan Update/Revision					√	July 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE</b>						
G6 Parking Structure	√					July 2017
Hotel					√	July 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO</b>						
Recreation/Wellness Center Expansion, Ph. 2	√					July 2017
South Campus Student Housing Project - A			√			January 2019
Placer Center Gift Agreement Acceptance & MOU Execution						January 2019

CAMPUS & PROJECT	CEQA Action					
	Finding of Consistency	Exempt	MND/ND	Addendum	EIR	BOT Approval
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO</b>						
Student Union Renovation and Expansion	√					November 2017
Master Plan Update/Revision					√	September 2017
Palm Desert Off-Campus Center & Master Plan Revision					√	January 2018
College of Arts and Letters/Theater Building Renovation and Addition	√					September 2020
<b>SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY</b>						
New Student Residence Hall					√	November 2017
Aztec Recreation Center Expansion		√				May 2019
Recertify 2007 Campus Master Plan Update EIR as modified by 2018 Additional Analysis					√	May 2018
Mission Valley Master Plan, Property Acquisition and Site Development, and Multi-Use Stadium					√	January 2020
<b>SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY</b>						
Interdisciplinary Science Building			√			July 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS</b>						
Extended Learning Building and Parking Structure					√	January 2018
<b>CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO</b>						
Fermentation Sciences Complex			√			September 2017
Science and Agriculture Teaching and Research Complex					√	January 2019
Master Plan Update/Revision					√	May 2020
<b>EXEMPT</b>	<b>Categorical Exemption</b>					
<b>MND/ND</b>	<b>Mitigated Negative Declaration / Negative Declaration</b>					
<b>EIR</b>	<b>Environmental Impact Report</b>					
<b>BOT Approval</b>	<b>Meeting Date Action Taken</b>					