

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
Fresno, California 93740

Campus Planning Committee
Minutes
November 10, 2011

Members

Present: Deborah Adishian-Astone, Amy Armstrong, Robert Boyd, Kiranjit Dhanjan, Rick Finden, Paul Halajian, John Kriebs, Patrick Newell, Jan Parten, Virginia Sellars-Erxleben, Cynthia Teniente-Matson, Richard Vaillancour and Gary Wilson

Absent: Charles Boyer, Lisa Kao, Dennis Nef and Bernard Vinovski

Guests: Dave Fey, Cindy Lee, Eric McLain, Adam Mohler, Lori Pardi, Christy Roberts and Tina Summer

1. Approval of the November 10, 2011, agenda.

It was MSC to approve the November 10, 2011, agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the October 13, 2011, meeting.

It was MSC to approve the minutes of October 13, 2011.

3. Shaw Avenue Corridor Plan (*Informational*) – Dave Fey

Acting Chair Robert Boyd introduced Mr. David Fey, Deputy City Planner accompanied by Ms. Tina Summer, Community Development Director with the City of Clovis (City) who provided a summary of the Shaw Avenue Corridor Plan, the project area, the goals and partners for the project. The Shaw Avenue Corridor Plan is a component of the City's General Plan update and funded by Proposition 84. The project area is flanked by Copper Avenue on the north end, Academy Avenue on the east, Ashlan and Dakota Avenues and the rural canal on the south end, and Willow Avenue on the west.

The City is taking a balanced approach to planning. The goal with this plan is to create something that will satisfy the market, which is typically the outward growth and greenfield, but they are also looking at the infrastructure and the investment that the city and property owners have made in developed areas. It is with that focus that they are looking at the Shaw Avenue corridor and trying to determine constraints and explore assets and opportunities.

Other focus areas include: 1) Clovis Avenue, between the city limits (down by Tarpey Village) and up to Shepard Avenue; 2) Herndon Avenue Corridor; 3) The existing Research and Technology Park; and 4) Old Town.

The Shaw Avenue plan has been refined. The previous map extended out to about Armstrong. The grant funded program, which includes Fresno State as one of its partners, is going to focus on an area that extends from the city limit by CA-168 all the way to Clovis Avenue. It is going to focus on the corridor, a very important arterial street that runs through town, but it is also going to address a very important secondary item which is the neighborhoods behind it. If they can recreate, refresh and revitalize Shaw Avenue, there is an obligation to make sure that the refreshment is also contagious. That it actually helps the property values, quality of life, and improve basic civic values.

Some definite goals include developing a focused land use plan. This involves considerable outreach to property owners, tenants and businesses. They are also going to look at Housing & Transportation and Economic Development Strategies.

The project partners include Fresno State, Housing Authority, Fresno COG, the EDC, Clovis Chamber of Commerce and also the Fresno Department of Public Health. Fresno State will be participating with dollar value, information and cooperating with outreach. They would also like to develop a targeted survey for students, staff, and faculty to identify market opportunities.

The City is looking at a 13 month project schedule, which will probably be more like 20 months after all the pieces are put together. They will start to work towards a regulatory plan that can be put into place as a component of the general plan update with the understanding that it may take 10, 20 or 30 years to actually result in the instate.

The paradigm they been using is Old Town Clovis. They have two photos of Old Town. One is from 1980 and the other more recently taken in spring 2010. The first photo illustrates a desecrated place. Today, it is a place that invites you to be there.

A similar vision is in place for Shaw Avenue. Ms. Summer stated that this has a lot to do with practicality and usability. For example, when the Old Town project started in 1981 it was over 50 percent vacant. Today Old Town has virtually no vacancy rate. That is what they want to do with Shaw Avenue. They want to create a place that has nodes of very healthy, exciting and vibrant retail, office and residential activity.

Ms. Summer also added that they will be exploring partnerships with the university. Initially they are looking at opportunities for entertainment, restaurant, housing, shopping, bus systems and headways. They are looking at uses and projects that would create good synergies between the goals for Shaw Avenue and the mission of the university.

4. Chestnut Avenue pedestrian crossing enhancements (*Informational*) – Deborah Astone

Ms. Astone briefed the committee on Chestnut Avenue pedestrian crossing enhancements. A couple of weeks ago she and Chief David Huerta had a meeting with Scott Mozier, who is with the Department of Public Works for the City of Fresno. Chestnut Avenue is a city street and designed to city standards when it was widened. Now that there are residents living at Palazzo, the university wants to make sure that pedestrians, cyclists, individuals on skateboards and scooters all have a safe crossing. The challenge is that folks are not using the crosswalks that are currently in place.

Scott Mozier is going to work with his team to return some recommendations that might include enhanced signage, enhanced road delineators, possibly reducing the speed limit on Chestnut Avenue between Barstow and Shaw Avenues, etc.

Chief Huerta has also had his staff observing the area to determine traffic and pedestrian patterns. This will better help us determine what kinds of improvements need to be done to encourage folks to walk over to the location that provides a safe walk across Chestnut Avenue.

Recommendations will be forwarded to the Traffic and Safety Subcommittee for review before these return to the Campus Planning Committee.

The purpose of this communication is to ensure that Campus Planning is aware that there is dialogue on the issue and which parties involved. There is no problem with the design of the road but there are some enhancements that need to be made to improve that access and connection back to the campus and with the campus Master Plan.

5. AT&T Cell Tower Installation (*Action*) – Robert Boyd

Mr. Eric McLain provided a quick review of the AT&T cell tower installation and expressed that the intent of this review is to address some of the concerns expressed during the last meeting and to seek committee approval on an 86 ft. tall monopine design for the cell tower.

Jerrold T. Bushberg, Ph.D. was invited to the meeting to address concerns regarding radio frequency (RF) emissions as well as any questions the committee might have regarding the report on the proposed cell tower installation.

Ms. Christy Roberts of AT&T elaborated on the following three key points:

- It was decided to go with an 86 ft. tall cell tower to accommodate 3 wireless carriers, one of them being AT&T Wireless;
- Invited experts to address some of the questions expressed during the last meeting, particularly in the area of health and safety;
- And to share the preliminary engineering drawings, extensive photos of the before and after, and the landscape plan provided by the university's landscape architect.

Mr. Vaillancour provided additional details regarding the landscape plan for that area. These included the style of monopine selected, additional trees in the area, and screening and softening the pump house and infrastructure with new plant material.

Ms. Parten asked what benefit does Fresno State gain from this project. Chair Matson stated that there would be remuneration to the university.

Dr. Bushberg addressed the RF issues. The level of emissions is very low because the antennas that are used focus their energy out towards the horizon. He provided the example of a lighthouse. A lighthouse at night has a very intense light up at the top. It illuminates well in the area and out towards the horizon, but you really can't see anything at the bottom unless there is other ambient lighting in that area.

These kinds of cell towers operate very much the same way, most of the energy is out at the level of the antennas and very little of the RF energy is directed downward immediately where the facility is located. The RF exposure is typical of the ambient levels of RF exposure that already exist for AM/FM broadcasting, TV, etc.

Ms. Parten, ADA coordinator for the campus, expressed that the university has already received several complaints regarding cellphones and wireless use on campus. She asked Dr. Bushberg if there is some sort of exponential factor that should be considered when adding additional sources of RF exposure to the campus as would be the case with this tower.

Dr. Bushberg understands that some people might have the perception that adding a cell tower adds another layer of RF exposure. This is not the way it works for a couple of reasons. This cell tower would add very small additional exposure of RF energy at this location. However, it has other impacts that actually reduce the amount of RF exposure that actually comes from cellphone usage and from being around other cellphone users.

The exposure from cellphone usage is usually hundreds, sometimes thousands, of times greater than the exposure from cell towers. All cellphones have what is considered an adapter power control. This adapter controls the amount of RF energy that your phone is emitting. Your phone is capable of expending a predetermined maximum amount of energy. It does so when it is outside of the coverage area. The cell site sends a signal to your cellphone to increase its energy to whatever that maximum is.

Conversely, when you have good coverage in an area, the cell site only wants to see signals within a certain range. Therefore, it will send a signal to the cellphone to turn down its power so that it is within that range. This is due to the design specifications of the cell tower, but also to save battery life in the phone. So the net result of having good coverage drastically reduces the population exposure to RF emissions.

That is why all these epidemiological studies looking at the biological effects of RF energy are studying people who use cellphones, not people who live around cell towers.

Mr. Kriebs asked if consideration has been given to review the temporary site near Bulldog stadium and perhaps increase capacity for that site and cover the areas mentioned in this proposal.

AT&T responded that they are looking at a plan to eliminate the need for one of cell sites on wheels near Bulldog stadium. If a cell facility were placed at the light post at Bidden field it would be too far away to reach the areas included in this proposal.

Mr. Wilson expressed that his preference would be to have a regular tower. He believes that an artificial tree would look out of place on this campus and would not sit well with the Arboretum Committee. He believes that people have grown accustomed to seeing cell towers and perhaps will find a monopole more acceptable.

Mr. Vaillancour agreed that, although he originally did not think about it from that perspective, Mr. Wilson had a valid point and that if acceptable to the university, they could look at a plan that is geared in that direction.

At this point, Ms. Astone moved to approve the proposed 86 ft. faux tree cell tower, Cedar style as presented in the proposal, at the proposed location as presented in the site plan in addition to the landscape modifications that were proposed by Robert Boro's office. The motion also includes the graphic representation/rendition and proposed physical enhancement to the pump house building. Motion was seconded by Ms. Armstrong.

Ms. Dhanjan expressed that she personally found the monopole cell tower to be more educational and a better fit for the campus.

There was further discussion. Mr. Boyd called the question. There were four ayes, nine nays and no abstentions. The motion did not pass.

Dr. Newell moved that in lieu of a faux tree, the university go with the monopole concept for the cell tower. The motion also included the other suggestions in the proposal with the exception of the bulldog mural on the pump house. Motion was seconded by Ms. Dhanjan.

Ms. Astone expressed concern over the monopole choice. There are a number of facilities near the proposed site, such as Programs for Children and the childcare facility. A monopole would definitely stand out and there are going to be complaints. She stressed that this is a substantial structure, not something thin that we will be able to see through. The university has a lot of visitors and guests that come to the dining facility and to the residents' halls. Scott Avenue is its main thoroughfare.

Chair Matson expressed her opposition to the monolithic structure as was being proposed. The metal structure has nothing to do with the campus Master Plan. It would not line up with the university's Wayfinding plan or our values as an arboretum. The area is right along a main walkway and view shed to the Henry Madden Library. From her perspective, this would be a major mistake and it is a long term decision that cannot be reversed.

Mr. Halajian echoed what Mr. Wilson said. The campus is an arboretum; it is an amazing aspect of the campus. There is something completely wrong with embedding an artificial tree in an arboretum.

Mr. Vaillancour agreed with Mr. Halajian, but clarified that aesthetically the monopine, even though it is not real, is probably a better alternative to the monopole structure.

There was further discussion. Mr. Boyd returned to the motion on the floor and called the question. There were three ayes, five nays and five abstentions. The motion did not pass.

Ms. Astone again moved to approve the proposed 86 ft. faux tree cell tower, Cedar style as presented in the proposal, at the proposed location in addition to the landscape modifications that were proposed by Robert Boro's office. The physical enhancements to the pump building and graphic elements will be determined at a later date.

Mr. Boyd called the question. The motion passed with eight ayes and five abstentions.

6. North Gym landscape improvements (*Informational*) – Richard Vaillancour

This project was written by the Kinesiology department. Kinesiology does not have an all-weather shelter for their outdoor classes. They need a space to house 20-30 students while they are waiting for classes in inclement weather.

Mr. Vaillancour provided the details and specs for the project. The proposed site is on the west side of the north gym. The plan includes a prefabricated shade structure, new turf and some new trees.

Other items that are being addressed are accessibility to the west entrance of the gym near the parking lot that is currently not compliant with ADA requirements. They are going to rip out that concrete and drop in a new ramp and new paving to bring that up to code. A drinking fountain will be added to the area as well.

Mr. Boyd suggested doing something to ward off birds from the roof of the structure. He also requested a price comparison between real grass and artificial grass. Mr. Vaillancour will return the item for action.

7. Nursing canopy at McLane Hall (*Informational*) – Paul Halajian

Mr. Halajian provided a quick summary of the project and what the area is used for. The site for this project is near McLane Hall. Nursing students come to this classroom and go through a battery of tests. They go to this area to wait for the results of their tests. The patio was developed with a previous project and now it was decided to add shade to the area. The building will be used to support one side of the slope roof canopy and four concrete columns, that mimic the round concrete columns in McLane Hall, will be added. He illustrated pictures of before and after. No additional landscaping required and the area is already ADA compliant. It should take about 30-40 days to complete.

Mr. Boyd proposed that they visit an LED lighting solution for that area. The architect will provide suggestions for lighting. The university will install these. He also suggested they cover the gutter to keep the leaves out. This item will return for action.

8. Other Business

The 2012 meeting schedule was distributed for review. Contact Esther Gonzalez with any concerns.

Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.