CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
Fresno, California 93740

Campus Planning Committee
Minutes
October 13, 2011

Members

Present: Deborah Adishian-Astone, Amy Armstrong, Robert Boyd, Charles Boyer, Rick Finden, Paul Halajian, Lisa Kao, John Kriebs, Dennis Nef, Jan Parten, Virginia Sellars-Erxleben, Cynthia Teniente-Matson, Bernard Vinovrski and Gary Wilson

Absent: Kiranjit Dhanjan, Patrick Newell and Richard Vaillancour

Guests: Keith Bergthold, Christine Kingsley, Cindy Lee, Eric McLain, Adam Mohler, Lori Pardi, Christy Roberts, Julie Tone and Scott White

1. Approval of the October 13, 2011, agenda.

   It was MSC to approve the October 13, 2011, agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the August 25, 2011, meeting.

   It was MSC to approve the minutes of August 25, 2011.

3. 2035 General Plan Update (*Informational*) – Keith Bergthold

   Chair Matson introduced Mr. Keith Bergthold assistant director with the City of Fresno's Development and Resource Management department. Mr. Bergthold is heading up the 2035 General Plan for the City of Fresno. The City of Fresno updates its plan about every ten years. The City of Fresno has raised about $8 million in grants in support of its General Plan. This illustrates the support and importance of getting this plan done.

   An analysis of the resource usage, land use, fiscal impact, etc., reveals that Fresno has grown quite unsustainable and choices about how we approach the future need to be made. The General Plan is a great vehicle for that. The sphere of influence the city is planning for covers a little over 100,000 acres. The downtown planning is area is about 7,300 acres and the General Plan covers the remaining 93,000 acres. If done correctly, the General Plan supports the downtown plan.

   The city is not only updating the 2025 plan and taking it to 2035, it is also completing a comprehensive revision of its development code which includes zoning and subdivision rules. The code has been tweaked a number of times, but it has been 54 years since its last revision. This new code is intended to relate to the General Plan, its concepts, policies and goals.

   The plan involves looking at changes in the population growth and density within developed areas, possibly expanding those areas, and changing working economies and resources.

   The elements that surround the plan are economic development, healthy communities, sustainability resources, fiscal analysis and impact analysis. The goal is to get the plan revised so that amendments require a higher level of inspection and fiscal analysis among other things; and to develop a policy structure so as to have a stronger factual base for evaluating development

while also looking at consistency to achieve desired metrics. This will allow the city to use the plan strategically to help achieve set goals and initiatives and to guide private development into public-private partnerships for these same goals. Fresno has not used its plan in this fashion previously.

Mr. Bergthold provided background information and referenced various maps, charts and blueprints and to illustrate how urban form has evolved in the city of Fresno up to his point. To provide perspective, Mr. Bergthold offered that Fresno has the same number of lane miles/streets as San Jose and San Jose is twice as big. So, Fresno actually has twice as many lane miles per capita as San Jose. The deferred maintenance on this is huge. This illustrates that we could use our streets differently and the room for improved efficiencies.

There is a hierarchy of land use planning in California: general plan, community plan and specific plan. The specific plans tend to trump everything because they tend to be codified by ordinance. These have a stronger rules structure than the general plan. However, the downtown neighborhood community plan and the full corridor plan will continue to move forward. Those plans will be adopted and approved before the city finishes up its General Plan. The environmental work will be completed right after that. Every other plan will be reviewed to see if it can be re-coordinated into more of a metropolitan network. The city is looking to develop metropolitan systems that create the kind of connectivity that other metropolitan areas have. These are designed and operated more efficiently on a number of different metrics.

Zoning is the city's most powerful regulatory tool to implement the General Plan. A new zoning ordinance is being planned that would allow the city to implement new districts that haven't been allowed before in a more creative and efficient manner.
The city spent two years collecting, analyzing and cleaning the data and facts driving the strategic discussions for this plan. Five working papers focused on: 1) Economic Development; 2) Urban Form; 3) Healthy Communities; 4) Transportation and Connectivity; and 5) Sustainability were developed. In these, they review the existing conditions and facts about Fresno, existing trends that have changed, and then explore some of the policy options that are available in the General Plan to deal with some of these issues. All this is being done in a discussion, learning and educational format with the general planning committee, via discussions with small groups, district committees and large public workshops.

Mr. Bergthold introduced the 'activity centers and corridors' concept by defining a multi-use activity center. He asked the committee to take centers like the university, the airport, downtown, Riverpark, etc. and to imagine them as fully integrated with office, housing, retail, entertainment, and other employment and service opportunities at a density or intensity level that would actually support transit use. This idea helped identified proposed/eventual bus rapid transit (BRT) routes - and maybe in 50 years a light rail - that would connect these activity centers efficiently and offer the opportunity for a higher mode split into transit versus cars.

BRT is being launched in Fresno now and will be active by 2013. The launch will be on the Blackstone corridor from downtown and then out to Ventura/Kings Canyon. The third phase of that is planned for Shaw Avenue. The city is working with a designer, Mark Steel, from San Diego who is starting to complete drawings of what it would look like to intensify the Blackstone corridor and Kings Canyon corridor.

A capacity analysis is being completed to develop the infrastructure necessary to support this type of intensification. If supported, one could add half a million people to Fresno and not change the sphere/the character of any existing neighborhoods. That would become a more efficient system and network of transportation and economic activity.

The fiscal aspect of this type of planning has never been addressed from a revenue generating perspective. The City of Fresno is running into a financial ditch and trying to reconsider how everything fits and works together and how it performs. Using land more efficiently, plugging into existing infrastructure and intensifying certain areas will play a major role as these plans develop. The goal is to change the business model so that land use is at least revenue neutral.

Chair Matson stated that the university's Master Plan will hit the EIR phase in a few weeks. As part of this plan the university does see a transit center partnership with the City of Fresno. The 20-year plan includes a parking structure by the library and a turnaround for the buses to come in right off of Shaw Avenue.

Students have expressed that part of the reason they do not use the bus system is because the drop off locations are not convenient. Students have to walk about another mile to come into the campus core which is where most of their classes are held. The new drop off location would place them right by the library into the campus core.

The university is also very interested in supporting the bus rapid transit system. She stressed the importance of returning this item to committee's planning agenda as part of the alternative transportation plan to support our students and employees. The Master Plan includes the need for eight parking structures over the next 20-25 years. Presently that is an unaffordable alternative for the university to consider. Reducing cars coming to the campus is another alternative, but we do not have a good mechanism with the current busing system or biking system. This is why current efforts are in place to connect them both actively with the City of Fresno and the City of Clovis.

Mr. Bergthold agreed that this is a very important time for the university to provide input on the Genera Plan and what it means to Fresno State and the community it serves. The city's current transit system is not functional. To make a transit system functional in the current working pattern you need an average density of about 10 units an acre, Fresno currently averages 5/acre. To really create a highly efficient transit system you need corridors that are very intense (15-20 units to the acre) and have a lot customers.

After all the alternatives analysis is complete, a preferred plan will be selected with follow up meetings to discuss that plan. Once the city council chooses a plan, then a policy frame work will be built around it along with a full general plan outline and that becomes the draft General Plan. The City of Fresno hopes to have this approved by June 2012 so that they can complete environmental work and potentially have a master EIR by December 2012. It hopes to have everything complete by June 2013.

Mr. Bergthold concluded by encouraging Fresno State and the people around the table, who are interested in making Fresno a better place, to speak up and organize to ensure that your voice is heard in multiple ways. Any ideas, comments and suggestions will be processed and looked at. Comments and suggestions should be submitted to Mike Scott, city manager, with copy to Mr. Bergthold. It's important to highlight constituencies that you represent or any interests that directly relate to the General Plan. This is the stage where various input and perspectives are needed.

Chair Matson asked if it would be appropriate to also provide input on the importance of El Dorado Park Neighborhood and neighborhood(s) around/near the campus. Mr. Bergthold agreed and encouraged it.

Chair Matson also stated the university is exploring the addition of a tertiary wastewater treatment plant that serves the Fresno State community, as well as our agricultural programs at the university farm laboratory. This will enable the university to decrease its reliance and strain on municipal sewer systems. There is also a need for better crosswalks and better street integration, mainly along Cedar, Barstow and Shaw Avenues, especially during athletic events.

Chair Matson thanked Mr. Bergthold for his time and reiterated that university would be forwarding comments and input to him and Mr. Scott. Additional information about the project, meetings/workshops, reports and working papers downloads are available at: **www.fresno.gov/newplan**

4. AT&T Cell Tower Installation (*Informational)* – Christy Roberts

Mr. Eric McLain briefly provided some background information on the need for improved AT&T coverage on the campus and introduced Christy Roberts with AT &T to provide the specific plans of this proposal.

In an effort to improve service coverage on the campus and to continue to improve various services supported by AT&T, AT&T is proposing the installation of a new wireless facility on the Fresno State campus. This wireless facility, or cell tower, as more clearly described will significantly aid in providing services with increased calling capacity, more accessibility to the web and video, faster internet browsing, increased data speed, increased coverage and provide the latest technologies with the most current products. The plan is designed to provide coverage in these specific areas: library, softball fields, some of the off-campus housing, tennis courts, baseball fields as well as the campus dorms.

AT&T has had three meetings with university personnel to discuss and collaborate on the two possible designs being proposed for one of these two locations:

- Scott Avenue Pump House area near the tennis courts and baseball/softball field
- Baker Hall area (adjacent to the dorms)

These two locations were specifically selected to help alleviate the need to build two antenna locations. The Scott Ave. location would have the least impact to the campus landscape and offers the maximum coverage. It is the preferred site for this project.

Ms. Roberts reiterated some of the benefits and further added that the proposed model is a two carrier antenna. This allows for two service providers, not just AT&T, providing an opportunity for added revenue. The proposal is not only to place an antenna facility on the proposed area but also to improve the surrounding areas.

Mr. Boyd provided additional description on the preferred location. The old pump house unit is located on Scott Avenue off of Cedar Avenue, goes east towards the university dining hall which is at the end of the street. It is an abandoned domestic well housed in a block construction building that is not currently in use. It is a good alternative for this project.

Ms. Roberts shared a picture of the pump house building and the two designs that are being proposed, one being a 70 feet monopole or a 70 feet stealth tree tower. The tower would be adjacent to the pump house building. AT&T is proposing a complete renovation of the building with signage and landscape improvements.

Mr. Boyd offered information on the Baker Hall option as well. This location was considered for its optimal coverage capability, the scarce occupancy of the home management facility and

because of all the tall redwood trees in that area. This option was viewed as less obtrusive. However, the reutilization of the old pump house was preferred and it also moves the tower and equipment away from Baker Hall and the childcare facility located near that vicinity.

Mr. Boyd further clarified how and why the potential locations were selected. The project was limited to a very small footprint basically surrounding the exterior of the University Dining Hall to be the most optimal placement of the tower.

Conceptual illustrations/simulations were provided of both the monopole and tree options with the surrounding landscape at the two proposed locations.

On behalf of the University Courtyard and Programs for Children, Ms. Astone offered that the university's preferred location by the pump house makes a lot more sense. From a pedestrian stand point, the pump location has definite advantages. The Baker Hall option has a lot more traffic from people, students and children. Ms. Roberts added that the pump house location is advantageous from a constructability standpoint as well.

Ms. Sellars-Erxleben asked if there was a difference in functionality between the monopole versus the tree and how fake does the tree look. Ms. Roberts replied that the functionality is the same. Ms. Tone added that the idea is that the tree option is aesthetically pleasing and the industry has come a long way in the type of material that is used for the tree tower. AT&T selected a tree that went along with the skyline in that particular area.

Ms. Parten asked a couple of questions relating to the safety and environmental impact of the cell tower. Ms. Roberts specified that from a structural standpoint the tower is designed to meet D.S.A standards. From an emissions standpoint, AT&T is required to comply with Federal safety standards. AT&T does not complete these reports. Outside companies perform a complete engineering analysis of the emissions. These sites are so high up they are well below the safety standards. A complete emissions report will be provided at the next meeting to illustrate that the proposed wireless facility/tower will be well below the safety standards.

Ms. Kao echoed Ms. Astone's comments in regards to the Baker Hall location and the unfavorable perception in regards to safety that would be gained if this location was selected.

Ms. Parten added that there are people on campus that are very concerned about these types of towers and that regardless of the reports the negative perception is out there.

Ms. Parten further stated she understood the benefit for Fresno State and asked AT&T if they could elaborate on how this project benefits them. Ms. Tone replied that Fresno State and AT&T share the same consumer population (majority of students, many faculty and staff). This project enables AT&T to offer and buy more services as technology changes and grows. It helps keep their customers happy and therefore provides for a better retention strategy. AT&T will have an opportunity to have improved services for their customers on campus and in the near vicinities. There will be benefits for both parties.

Ms. Tone added that this is over a $20 million investment for AT&T with no cost to the university. They have the capability to build around the campus, but acknowledge that it is not in the best interest of their company, the university or in the spirit of the partnership between the two.

Mr. Kriebs asked if consideration was given by the university to building a tower on its own and leasing it out to carriers. Mr. Boyd reported that this idea was considered and after much

research, discussion and due to the costs and reliability involved, the decision was to go with this alternative at this point. The agreement is currently being developed in a fashion that benefits both AT&T and the university and has not yet been finalized.

Mr. Halajian asked what AT&T's experienced has been with vandalism of these towers and equipment on a campus setting. Ms. Roberts reported that the slatted fence has served as a deterrent. They have these sites everywhere and have dealt with various types of vandalism. If approved, they do not foresee a big problem with vandalism at this location; however, AT&T would be responsible for the repairs and maintenance.

Mr. Wilson commented on the tower itself and his recommendation would be to go with the monopole option. His opinion is that the artificial option would be too tall and look more out of place. Ms. Roberts replied that additional pine trees would be planted around that area and as they grow the tower would blend in. But this option if for the committee to decide.

Mr. Boyd summarized in stating that the pump house site seems to be the committee's preferred site if the project is approved. The committee expressed interest in reviewing the RF studies, reports or data mentioned in the earlier part of the presentation. The committee is interested in looking at real or picture samples of the stealth tree tower so that it can further discuss the options. Mr. Boyd asked AT&T if they could return to the next meeting with items that could help address or answer some of these issues and concerns. Ms. Roberts and Ms. Tone confirmed that AT&T would return with these items at the next meeting.

5. Smittcamp Alumni House Sign (*Action*) – Mr. Paul Halajian

At the meeting held on August 25, 2011, Mr. Halajian presented information regarding the proposed Smittcamp Alumni House sign. Discussion and suggestions followed in regards to the height of the sign, proportion of the lettering and color of the concrete background wall.

Mr. Halajian returned to the committee with modified drawings reflecting the suggested changes.

The three options presented where in the following heights: 4'-0" tall, 3'-7" tall and 3'-0" tall. The scheme presented to Campus Planning Committee during the last meeting was the 3'-7" option. The lettering has been increased in size and is the same in all three schemes. A person was added to the renderings to provide a sense of scale. Additionally, the concrete panel matches the color of the Alumni House exterior walls as suggested.

There were many positive comments regarding 3'-0" tall sign option. Mr. Boyd, acting chair, asked if there were any questions or additional comments. Hearing none, he entertained a motion to approve. Ms. Armstrong moved to approve the proposed 3'-0" tall Smittcamp Alumni House Sign, Ms. Parten seconded, motion carried without opposition or abstention.

6. Bike Rack Locations (*Informational)* – Amy Armstrong

Ms. Armstrong presented information on the new bike racks that are being installed near the free speech area. The goal is to make the area friendly for pedestrians. Traffic Operations and Parking have received many complaints in regards to bicycles, scooters and skateboards that are used in this area. During the construction performed in the summer, the campus was able to take bike racks located in the free speech area and relocate them throughout various areas around the campus core.

A concern expressed by students is that there aren't enough bike racks near the library, the University Student Union and the free speech area. For this reason, an area was identified near the library, but away from the free speech area to accommodate the placement of bike racks.

A cement slab will be added adjacent to the walkway south of the library (across from parking lot D). The bike racks that will be installed are based on recommendations found in the Association of Pedestrians and Bicycle Professionals manual. The bike racks are designed to support and protect the bike from damage. These types of racks do not offer the density other racks provide, but the current plan will hold about 50 bikes, which is more than what was previously available or used in this space.

Ms. Parten expressed concern regarding the proximity of the bike racks to the main walkway that is used from parking lots D and E and asked if these would impede the use of this walkway. Mr. Boyd assured the committee that Mr. Rod Gleghorn, project manager, would review the specifications to ensure that the project in no way impedes with the traffic along this walkway. Another suggestion was to provide access from both pathways found in that area.

Ms. Armstrong thanked the committee for comments and suggestions.

7. Traffic and Safety Subcommittee Report (Informational) – Amy Armstrong

Ms. Armstrong briefed the committee on the different types of passes that are available for visitor parking to the campus community and what Traffic Operations and Parking is doing to accommodate university guests and make visiting the campus as easy as possible. There are three different types of passes:

- Coupon Code: This program is on its third year of implementation. It's been successful thus far and statistics show a significant increase in usage. Coupon code numbers are distributed prior to the date of the event via permit dispensing machines located throughout campus. These are not for use by students, faculty or staff.
- Event Pass: This pass is department issued and is only valid for the authorized event. The pass requires a specific date and time for the event. It allows departments the flexibility of issuing passes prior to the event date. This is the same pass that is used for athletic events. Each permit is tracked. Again, these are not for use by students, faculty or staff.
- Special Semester Pass: This pass is for use at multiple events per semester. It requires a minimum of 100 guests per event (e.g. Community Chorus). Replacement passes will not be provided. Each permit is tracked and not for use by students, faculty and staff.

These permits are available to departments through the Traffic Operations and Parking office.

8. Other Business - None

Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.