

**RESOLUTION NO. 2007-18**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**IN THE MATTER OF CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR  
THE HISTORIC OLD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING RENOVATION PROJECT AND, SUBJECT  
TO CONDITIONS, APPROVING THE PROJECT**

**WHEREAS**, the State Center Community College District ("District"), is proposing to undertake the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project ("Project"), which consists of the renovation and operation of the Old Administration Building located on the Fresno City College Campus in the City of Fresno, County of Fresno, California; and

**WHEREAS**, the District has determined that the Project is needed to restore the historically significant Old Administration Building and to provide adequate space for educational and related functions on the Fresno City College Campus; and

**WHEREAS**, the District determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was necessary for the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.); and

**WHEREAS**, as the Lead Agency for the project, the District has caused a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") to be prepared for the Project to analyze and evaluate the environmental effects of the Project as required by CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, the Draft EIR was made available for public review and comment in conformance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines and was received by the California State Clearinghouse on March 9, 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, written comments were received on the Draft EIR during the public review period; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 27, 2007, the District Administration conducted a public hearing on the Draft EIR, the purpose of which was to take testimony on the Draft EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, responses to those comments have been prepared and presented to this Board for its consideration as a part of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Final EIR consists of one document containing two parts: Part One, Comments and Responses, and Part Two, Annotated Draft EIR: and

**WHEREAS**, on August 7, 2007, this Board conducted a public hearing for the Project, the purposes of which were to take testimony on the project and the Final EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, all interested persons expressing a desire to comment on the Final EIR or the Project, or object thereto, were given the opportunity to do so; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, prior to approving the Project, the Board must certify the Final EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091, 15092, and 15093, because the Final EIR identified that the Project will have significant environmental effects, in approving the Project, the Board must make certain findings regarding those effects, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure that mitigation measures incorporated in the Project are implemented, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided; and

**WHEREAS**, this Resolution sets forth the basis for certifying the Final EIR for the Project, for adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, for making the required findings, for adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and for approving the Project; and

**WHEREAS**, this Resolution incorporates by reference the Board Item No. 07-63 entitled, “Public Hearing and Consideration to Adopt Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project and, Subject to Conditions, Approving the Project, Fresno City College” (“Board Item No. 07-63) and the attachment to this Resolution entitled, “Attachment to: Resolution No. 2007-18 Before the Board of Trustees, State Center Community College District – In the Matter of Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project and, Subject to Conditions, Approving the Project” (“Attachment”); and

**WHEREAS**, changes and alterations have been incorporated into the project or will be required as conditions of approval that will avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts identified in the Final EIR as described in the staff report and attachment to this resolution; and

**WHEREAS**, it is in the best interests of the District to proceed with approval of the Project; and

**WHEREAS**, upon approval of this Resolution, the District shall be authorized to proceed with the Project in accordance with the substantive provisions set forth herein.

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Trustees of the State Center Community College District as follows:

**Section 1.** The Board of Trustees of the District finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct.

**Section 2.** The Board of Trustees hereby certifies that:

- (A) The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and
- (B) The Final EIR was presented to this Board and the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project; and
- (C) The Final EIR reflects the District's and this Board's independent judgment and analysis.

**Section 3.** The Board hereby incorporates into the Project all mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and authorizes their implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, prepared in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and presented in the Attachment to this Resolution, is hereby approved and adopted.

**Section 4.** The Board hereby makes the findings required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Said findings are presented in the Attachment to this Resolution and incorporated herein by this reference.

**Section 5.** The Board hereby finds that certain significant unavoidable adverse environmental effects resulting from the implementation of the Project have been identified in the Final EIR. CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines require the Board to balance the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable adverse impacts in determining whether to approve the Project. The Board hereby finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable environmental effects for the reasons presented in the Attachment to this Resolution and adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

**Section 6.** The proposed Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project is approved, subject to conditions set forth below, and District staff is authorized and directed to take all steps necessary or convenient to carry out the Project in accordance with the Final EIR, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the findings in the Attachment to this Resolution. Conditions to Project approval are: (1) design approval, as required, by the Division of State Architect; and (2) the availability of state and/or local funding for development and construction of the Project.

**Section 7.** The District Chancellor, or his designee, is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination for the Project in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

**Section 8.** The Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration, is hereby designated as the custodian of the public record with respect to the Project (Address: District Administration Office, 1525 E. Weldon Ave., Fresno, CA 93704).

**Section 9.** The Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was adopted by the Board of Trustees of the State Center Community College District at a meeting of the Board held on August 7, 2007:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

---

Isabel Barreras, President  
Board of Trustees  
State Center Community College District

Certified as a true and correct copy:

---

William J. Smith, Secretary  
Board of Trustees  
State Center Community College District

**Attachment to:**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2007-18**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**In the Matter of Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for  
the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project and,  
Subject to Conditions, Approving the Project**

---

**Content**

1. Introduction	1
2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	3
3. Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for Significant Impacts	4
4. Alternatives Findings	19
5. Statement of Overriding Considerations	22

---

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 Purpose**

This Attachment contains the findings, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the Board of Trustees (“Board”) of the State Center Community College District (“District”) for the Historic Old Administration Renovation Project (“project”). The requirements for findings, mitigation monitoring and reporting programs, and statements of overriding considerations are contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and in Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (“State CEQA Guidelines”). Pertinent sections from the State CEQA Guidelines are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

## **1.2. Findings**

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a):

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

## **1.3. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting**

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d):

(d) When making the findings required in subsection (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These

---

<sup>1</sup> All documents and other material that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which this document is based are available for public review at the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration, State Center Community College District, 1525 East Weldon Avenue, Fresno, CA 93704.

measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreement, or other measures.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a) and (d):

(a) This section applies when a public agency has made the findings required under paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 15091 relative to an EIR or adopted a mitigated negative declaration in conjunction with approving a project. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

(d) Lead and responsible agencies should coordinate their mitigation monitoring or reporting programs where possible. Generally, lead and responsible agencies for a given project will adopt separate and different monitoring or reporting programs. This occurs because of any of the following reasons: the agencies have adopted and are responsible for reporting on or monitoring different mitigation measures; the agencies are deciding on the project at different times; each agency has the discretion to choose its own approach to monitoring or reporting; and each agency has its own special expertise.

#### **1.4. Statement of Overriding Considerations**

State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15093(a) and (b):

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The Statement of Overriding Considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

## **2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

### **2.1. Purpose**

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) and Sections 15097(a) and (d). The purpose for the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) are implemented.

### **2.2. Lead Agency**

The District will undertake the project and is the Lead Agency for the project.

### **2.3. Mitigation Reporting Coordinator**

The District Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration, or his designee shall act as the Project Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Coordinator ("Coordinator").

### **2.4. Reporting and Monitoring Procedures (RMP)**

#### **2.4.1. Design and Construction Mitigation Measures (RMP 1)**

The reporting and monitoring procedures for project design and construction mitigation measures shall be as follows:

- (a) The Coordinator shall provide a copy of all project design and construction mitigation measures to the project architect, engineer, and contractor for incorporation in the project plans, construction specifications, permits, and contracts, as appropriate.
- (b) Prior to award of bid, the Coordinator shall determine that all design and construction mitigation measures under the District's control have been incorporated in the project plans, construction specifications, permits, and contracts, as appropriate.
- (c) During construction, the Coordinator shall inspect the project site regularly to ensure all work complies with the design and construction mitigation measures. If a discrepancy is identified and is not corrected within a reasonable period, the Coordinator shall report the discrepancy to the Board of Trustees for final disposition. The Coordinator may order work to cease until the Board of Trustees has addressed the discrepancy.
- (d) Prior to the District accepting the project improvements, the Coordinator shall determine and report to the Board of Trustees that the project has been designed and constructed following all design and construction mitigation measures.

#### **2.4.2. Operational Mitigation Measures (RMP 2)**

The reporting and monitoring procedures for operational mitigation measures shall be as follows:



- (a) Before the project becomes operational, the Coordinator shall determine that all operations-related mitigation measures have been incorporated in the project operational plans and procedures.
- (b) During the first three years after each phase of the project becomes operational, the Coordinator shall submit an annual report to the Board of Trustees documenting the status of all operational mitigation measures applicable to that phase. The report shall address the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and any changes that should be made by the Board of Trustees if a measure is less than effective.

### **2.4.3. Other Agency Mitigation Measures (RMP 3)**

The reporting and monitoring procedures for mitigation measures that must be implemented by agencies other than the District shall be as follows:

- (a) The Coordinator shall refer the measures to the agencies and shall coordinate with the agencies to implement the measures.
- (b) As part of the annual report described under RMP 2(b), the Coordinator shall report to the Board of Trustees on the actions taken by the agencies to implement the measures

## **3. Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for Significant Impacts**

This section presents the significant effects of the project, the mitigation measures identified to avoid or reduce the significant effects, the mitigation monitoring and reporting program requirement(s) applicable to each mitigation measure, and the finding(s) adopted for each significant effect.

The reporting and monitoring procedure(s) for each mitigation measure is indicated at the end of each measure by a reference to the applicable procedure in Section 2.4. The references are as follows:

- RMP 1: See Section 2.4.1, Design and Construction Mitigation Measures
- RMP 2: See Section 2.4.2, Operational Mitigation Measures
- RMP 3: See Section 2.4.3, Other Agency Mitigation Measures

(The numbering used below to identify each impact is from the Draft EIR.)

**Impact 4.1:** The presence of the construction staging area will temporarily degrade the visual character of the OAB environs.

### **Mitigation Measures**

- 4.1(a) The proposed staging area fence shall be at least six feet in height and shall be maintained in good condition. (RMP 1)

- 4.1(b) The construction site shall be kept clean and free from rubbish and debris. Rubbish and debris shall be removed the day it appears. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 4.1(c) The public roads and private properties near the OAB shall be kept free from construction-related rubbish and debris. Rubbish and debris shall be removed the day it appears. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 4.1(d) Construction equipment and supplies shall be stored within the OAB or the construction staging area. (RMP 1)
- 4.1(e) Portable restrooms shall not be located outside the OAB or the construction staging area. (RMP 1)
- 4.1(f) Construction materials and equipment shall be removed from the site as soon as they are no longer necessary. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 4.1(g) Construction materials and equipment shall not be stored on public streets. (RMP 1)
- 4.1(h) Excess excavated material shall be removed from the site immediately. (RMP 1)
- 4.1(i) Any graffiti on the construction staging area wall or elsewhere on the construction site shall be removed the day it appears. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 4.1(j) Upon completion of construction, the staging area shall be returned to landscaped open space and maintained as landscaped open space. (RMP 1)
- 4.1(k) Construction workers shall park on-campus, either in existing parking spaces designated for the workers or within the construction staging yard. (RMP 1 & 2)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 4.1 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 4.1(a) through 4.1(j) have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting information for finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 4, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 4.2:** Operation of the OAB and related facilities will create new sources of light in the area.

### **Mitigation Measures**

- 4.2(a) Any new parking lot lighting shall employ full cut-off type fixtures. A full cut-off type fixture is a luminaire or light fixture that, by design of the housing, does not

allow any light dispersion or direct glare to shine above a 90-degree horizontal plane from the base of the fixture. Full cut-off type fixtures must be installed in a horizontal position as designed. (RMP 1)

4.2(b) All external signs and lighting shall be lit from the top and shine downward except where uplighting is required for safety or security purposes. The lighting shall be shielded to prevent direct glare and/or light trespass. The lighting shall also be, as much as physically possible, contained to the target area. (RMP 1)

4.2(c) Exterior building lighting shall be full cut-off or a shielded type designed to minimize any upward distribution of light. (RMP 1)

4.2(d) Non-essential lighting shall be turned off by 10:00 p.m. (RMP 2)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 4.2 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 4.2(a) through 4.2(d) have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 4, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 4.3:** Modifications to Parking Lots K and L will improve the existing visual character of the OAB environs.

**Mitigation Measures:** See Mitigation Measure 4.2(a) and Mitigation Measure 6.1(g).

**Level of Significance:** Impact 4.3 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 4.2(a) and 6.1(g) have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapters 4 and 6, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 5.1:** Under cumulative conditions (year 2025), without and with the project, the intersection of Blackstone and University Avenues will operate at Level of Service E.

## Mitigation Measure

- 5.1(a) The City of Fresno should monitor accidents and/or public complaints related to the intersection of Blackstone and University Avenues and prevent eastbound and westbound left-turn and through movements if necessary. No other mitigations are recommended for this intersection or for adjacent intersections in the event that eastbound and westbound left-turn and through movements are prevented. (RMP 3)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 5.1 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measure.

**Finding:** Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measure 5.1(a) has been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to facilitate its implementation. The mitigation measure, if followed by the City of Fresno, will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 5, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 6.1:** The FCC campus does not have adequate on-campus parking to accommodate the parking demand that would be generated by the project, and the project would result in increased on-street parking in neighborhoods near the OAB.

## Mitigation Measures

### *Parking-Responsive Campus Growth and Development Policy*

- 6.1 (a) On-campus parking availability and off-campus parking impacts shall be fundamental considerations in any District decisions that would permit additional enrollment growth on the FCC campus. New construction that would accommodate additional enrollment should only be considered when adequate on-campus parking will be available for the enrollment. (RMP 1)

### *Parking Operations Enhancement Programs*

- 6.1(b) Parking-related signage shall be improved and augmented throughout the FCC campus to better identify where parking lots are located, routes to parking lots, and least used parking lots. (RMP 1)
- 6.1(c) Use of the currently underutilized 237-space Parking Lot Q shall be encouraged through implementation of the following measures:
- 6.1(c)(1) Frequent shuttle transportation shall be provided between the main campus and Parking Lot Q during the first four weeks of each semester, when parking demand is the greatest. The shuttle service

shall be extended beyond this period if warranted by demand and funding. (RMP 2)

- 6.1(c)(2) A reduced parking fee shall be charged for Parking Lot Q. Students and staff shall be advised of the availability of the reduced fee when they apply for a parking permit. (RMP 2)
  - 6.1(c)(3) The District shall evaluate security conditions for Parking Lot Q, including but not limited to, fencing, lighting, emergency telephone access, and police patrolling, and shall implement measures that may be identified through the evaluation as necessary to maximize security for students and staff using the parking lot. (RMP 2)
  - 6.1(c)(4) A safe walking path shall be provided between Parking Lot Q and the main campus. Development of this path shall include making any improvements necessary to ensure a safe pedestrian crossing of Blackstone Avenue. (See also Mitigation Measure 6.1(i)(2)) (RMP 1, 2 & 3)
  - 6.1(c)(5) The District shall encourage District employees that are on-campus throughout the workday to use Parking Lot Q. The encouragement may encompass the frequent shuttle service, enhanced security, reduced parking fee, and other measures that may be identified by the District. (RMP 2)
- 6.1(d) A parking management plan shall be developed that will provide adequate parking for events held in the OAB auditorium and FCC gym. The plan shall be based upon the principle that adequate on-campus parking must be available for every event scheduled in the gym or OAB. The plan shall be subject to a public hearing and adoption by the Board of Trustees and shall be implemented before the OAB auditorium is opened. At minimum, the plan shall determine: (RMP 1 & 2)
- 6.1(d)(1) The number of parking spaces required for the different types of events that will be held in the OAB auditorium and FCC gym; (RMP 1 & 2)
  - 6.1(d)(2) The specific on-campus locations where the parking will be provided; (RMP 1 & 2)
  - 6.1(d)(3) How vehicles will be directed to the parking; (RMP 1 & 2)
  - 6.1(d)(4) The need for shuttle service between the parking and the OAB auditorium or gym; (RMP 1 & 2)
  - 6.1(d)(5) How the District will remove any litter resulting from event-related off-campus parking by 10:00 AM the day following the event; (RMP 1 & 2)

- 6.1(d)(6) How any temporary event-related lighting will be located and designed to prevent direct glare and spill over lighting into nearby neighborhoods; (RMP 1 & 2)
- 6.1(d)(7) The need for parking attendants to direct traffic to available parking, provide a presence in nearby neighborhoods during events, and clean up any litter after events; (RMP 1 & 2) and
- 6.1(d)(8) How ongoing communications will be maintained between FCC and its neighbors for event-related parking issues. (RMP 2)
- 6.1(e) The District shall encourage the City of Fresno to provide additional parking enforcement officers for the neighborhoods near the campus. (RMP 3)
- 6.1(f) The District shall monitor on- and off-campus parking conditions as each OAB phase opens to determine the effectiveness of the parking mitigation measures and to allow adjustments to the measures as necessary to address parking demand. (RMP 2)

*Modifications to Existing Parking Lots*

- 6.1(g) Parking Lots K and L (see Figure 2-2) shall be modified as necessary to improve the efficiency and safety of vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the parking lots. The specific modifications shall be determined after the OAB-related vehicular and pedestrian use characteristics of the parking lots have been determined through Mitigation Measure 6.1(f) and shall be completed within three years of completion of the final OAB renovation phase, including the auditorium. (RMP 1)

The modified parking lot design shall be based upon the following considerations:

- 6.1(g)(1) Provide efficient, safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation;
- 6.1(g)(2) Maintain the parking lots within the same general area encompassed by existing Lots K and L, provided the modified lots may extend west of the existing lots if necessary to achieve an efficient, safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation pattern and to maintain approximately the same number of parking spaces currently within Parking Lots K and L. In no event shall the parking lots extend into the area west of the OAB;
- 6.1(g)(3) Minimize the number of driveways from Weldon Avenue;
- 6.1(g)(4) Avoid conflicts between vehicles using the parking lots and those accessing the cafeteria service area;
- 6.1(g)(5) Provide visual screening between the parking lots and the cafeteria service area;
- 6.1(g)(6) Provide landscaping within the parking lots;
- 6.1(g)(7) Increase the width of the walkway along the north side of the OAB;

- 6.1(g)(8) Provide a safe, attractive walking route through the parking lots from Weldon Avenue to the OAB;
- 6.1(g)(9) Provide a passenger-loading zone near an OAB north entrance;
- 6.1(g)(10) Provide a tram stop near an OAB north entrance;
- 6.1(g)(11) Provide bicycle parking near an OAB north entrance; and
- 6.1(g)(12) All new parking lot lighting shall have full cut-off type fixtures. A full cut-off fixture is a luminaire or light fixture that, by design of the housing, does not allow any light dispersion or direct glare to shine above a 90-degree plane from the base of the fixture. The lighting fixtures shall be architecturally compatible with the OAB.

*Construction of New Parking Lots*

- 6.1(h) A parking lot shall be developed on the District-owned unimproved lot located northwest of the Allied Health Building and Parking Lot N, along the east side of the railroad tracks. This will add approximately 50 fully improved spaces to the FCC campus parking supply. The parking lot shall be available when Phases I and II open.

Implementation of this mitigation measure will result in the same types of construction-related noise, air quality, and aesthetic impacts as described for the modification of Parking Lots K and L. The mitigation measures described for those impacts shall also be applied to construction of the subject parking lot.

Use of the parking lot will not result in new significant traffic impacts because the lot is already used in its unimproved state for parking. (RMP 1)

- 6.1(i) If warranted by further study, the District shall construct a new parking lot on District-owned land east of Blackstone Avenue. The District has determined that up to approximately 300 spaces could be developed in this area.

Before deciding to construct the parking lot and determining how many spaces it should encompass, the District should determine if the parking lot would receive sufficient use to justify its development. Based on the EIR parking study, the existing Parking Lot Q receives relatively little use. Unless the use of Parking Lot Q can be substantially increased through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.1(c), there would be little justification for developing additional parking east of Blackstone Avenue.

Development of parking east of Blackstone Avenue, therefore, shall be subject to the following: (RMP 1, 2 & 3)

- 6.1(i)(1) A parking lot shall be developed only if the potential for substantial utilization of the parking can be verified by a subsequent parking study, which shall include consideration of information developed through the parking monitoring program described in Mitigation Measure 6.1(f) and surveys or other research that would allow

projections of potential utilization. The subsequent study shall be undertaken after Mitigation Measure 6.1(c) has been implemented and Phase I and Phase II have been completed. The actual number of spaces that shall be developed, if any, and the timing for development of the spaces, shall be determined based upon the study.

- 6.1(i)(2) A vehicular access and pedestrian safety evaluation shall be performed to identify measures that the District shall incorporate into the parking lot design and improvements that will ensure safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian access to the parking lot. The District shall coordinate with the City of Fresno in developing the study and implementing the project. The additional parking shall only be developed after implementation of adequate safety measures is assured.
- 6.1(i)(3) Shuttle service shall be available to serve the parking lot as described for Parking Lot Q in Mitigation Measure 6.1(c)(1).

*Maximize Alternative Transportation*

- 6.1(j)(1) The District shall encourage the City of Fresno to provide additional bus routes to the FCC campus and more frequent service for the campus. (RMP 2 & 3)
- 6.1(j)(2) The District shall work with the City of Fresno to provide discounted fares or free passes on the Fresno bus service for FCC students and staff. (RMP 2 & 3)
- 6.1(j)(3) The District shall identify and evaluate possible programs to reduce the amount of single occupancy vehicle employee traffic to and from Fresno City College. The identification and evaluation process shall be conducted in coordination with employee representatives. If a program is identified that may be effective, it shall be implemented when the Phase I of the project opens. (RMP 2)

**Level of Significance:** This impact is significant and unavoidable on a project and cumulative basis. The mitigation measures will reduce the significant parking impacts of the project, but not to a level that can be considered insignificant. The FCC campus has insufficient on-campus parking to meet the existing parking demand during peak hours, and the mitigation measures will not result in sufficient additional parking to satisfy the existing demand or the additional demand resulting from the OAB.

Most of the existing on-campus parking and all of the new parking that might be developed under the mitigation measures is not near the OAB. Development of additional parking near the OAB is not recommended in this EIR because the only locations where the parking could be located without removing existing FCC facilities or structures would be west of the OAB, in the West Lawn area, or next to the FCC gymnasium. Development of parking within the West Lawn is not recommended because this area is historically significant (see Draft EIR Chapter 3). Development of parking near the gym



is not recommended because it would result in additional daily traffic on the local streets providing access to the residences within the Porter Tract.

Without additional on-campus parking near the OAB, the project will result in increased use of on-street parking in this area. Student and staff parking are prohibited north of the OAB, within the Porter Tract, during peak demand hours. Therefore, the increased use of on-street parking can be expected west and northwest of the campus and the OAB.

**Finding 1:** Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding 1:** Mitigation Measures 6.1(a) through 6.1(j) have been incorporated in the project. These mitigation measures will reduce the significant parking impacts of the project, but not to a level that can be considered insignificant.

The specific considerations that make infeasible the project alternative identified in the Final EIR are presented in Section 4 of this Attachment. The Statement of Overriding Considerations for this impact is presented in Section 5.

**Finding 2:** While the District will provide encouragement and cooperation to the City of Fresno, such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City and not the District. Such changes have been adopted by the City or can and should be adopted by the City.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding 2:** Mitigation Measures 6.1(e), 6.1(j)(1) and 6.1(j)(2) must be implemented by the City of Fresno.

**Supporting Information for Findings 1 and 2:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 6, and this Attachment, Sections 2, 4, and 5.

**Impact 7.1:** Project construction activities may result in significant short-term emissions of airborne particulate matter.

### **Mitigation Measure**

7.1(a) Demolition and construction activities shall comply with all applicable SJVAPCD regulations, including but not limited to Regulation VIII for the control of fugitive dust emissions and Rule 4002 for identification of asbestos-containing building materials to be removed prior to demolition. Actual measures to be implemented for the control of fugitive dust emissions would be dependent on the specific construction activities conducted. SJVAPCD-recommended dust control measures potentially applicable to the proposed project include, but would not necessarily be limited to, the following:

7.1(a)(1) All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover. (RMP 1)

- 7.1(a)(2) All onsite unpaved construction roads and offsite unpaved construction access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(3) All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(4) When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(5) All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden). (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(6) Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surfaces of outdoor storage piles, piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(7) Excavation and grading activities shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 20 mph. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(8) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(a)(9) Limit visible dust emissions to 20% opacity. (RMP 1)
- 7.1(b) Obstruction of traffic on adjacent roadways by construction equipment and activities shall be minimized. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 7.1(c) The District will consider implementing the following mitigation measures to the extent they may be feasible for the proposed project:
  - 7.1(c)(1) Diesel engines on construction equipment should be shut off when not in use to reduce emissions during idling. (RMP 1)
  - 7.1(c)(2) Fossil-fueled equipment shall be replaced with electrically driven equivalents (provided they are not run via a portable generator set). (RMP 1)
  - 7.1(c)(3) Construction may be curtailed during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations; this may include ceasing of construction

activity during the peak-hour of vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways and “Spare the Air Day” declared by the District. (RMP 1)

7.1(c)(4) Activity management may be implemented (e.g. rescheduling activities to reduce short-term impacts). (RMP 1)

7.1(c)(5) The construction period may be lengthened during the smog season (May through October) to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. (RMP 1)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 7.1 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measure.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measure 7.1(a) has been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure its implementation. The mitigation measure avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 7, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 7.2:** Project construction activities may result in significant temporary cumulative contributions to regional air quality degradation.

**Mitigation Measure:** See Mitigation Measure 7.1(a).

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 7.1(a) has been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure its implementation. The mitigation measure avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 7, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 8.1:** Project construction noise may result in significant short-term noise impacts to on-site and off-site noise-sensitive receptors.

### **Mitigation Measures**

8.1(a) Noise generating construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturdays. No noise generating construction activities shall occur on Sundays or major holidays. (RMP 1)

- 8.1(b) Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. (RMP 1)
- 8.1(c) When not in use, motorized construction equipment shall not be left idling. (RMP 1)
- 8.1(d) Exterior windows of the OAB that are within line-of-sight of the adjacent New Administration, Student Services, Business Education, and Social Science buildings shall be covered during periods when interior renovation activities within adjacent wings would involve the repeated use of noise-generating construction equipment. Window coverings may consist of vinyl noise-attenuation curtains (minimum STC-rating 22), wood sheeting (minimum ¾ inch thickness), or other material with similar sound-attenuating properties. Window coverings shall be placed so that no visible air gaps are detectable around the perimeter of the windows. (RMP 1)
- 8.1(e) Noise-generating construction activities associated with the relocation of the existing compactor shall be scheduled during periods that would minimize noise-related impacts to nearby classrooms, such as on Saturdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (RMP 1)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 8.1 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 8.1(a) through 8.1(e) have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 8, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 8.2:** Noise generated by the central plant (and the trash compactor and emergency fire pump generator) may result in a significant long-term noise impact to off-site noise-sensitive receptors.

### **Mitigation Measures**

- 8.2(a) Noise from the central plant shall not violate the City of Fresno Noise Ordinance. (RMP 1 & 2)
- 8.2(b) A post-construction acoustical analysis shall be conducted by a qualified consultant to determine the operational noise levels associated with the central plant. The acoustical analysis shall evaluate operational noise levels in relation to

the City of Fresno Noise Ordinance. If the plant violates the Noise Ordinance, additional noise-reduction measures or operational restrictions shall be implemented to ensure the plant will not violate the Noise Ordinance. (RMP 1 & 2)

8.2(c) The bid specifications for the central plant and other equipment shall require that the noise generating characteristics of the plant and equipment are substantially the same as the equipment that was used as the basis for the noise modeling conducted for this response. (RMP 1)

8.2(d) Operation of the trash compactor shall be limited to 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday, and from 7 am to 5 pm on Saturdays. The compactor shall not be operated beyond these times or on Sundays or major holidays unless required to maintain sanitary conditions. (RMP 2)

8.2(e) Testing of the emergency fire pump generator shall be limited to 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday. Testing shall not occur beyond these times or on Saturdays, Sundays, or major holidays unless required for emergency maintenance purposes. (RMP 2)

**Level of Significance:** Impact 8.2 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** Mitigation Measures 8.2(a) and 8.2(b) have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 8, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Impact 8.3:** Short- and long-term cumulative increases in ambient noise may result from the project.

**Mitigation Measures:** See the mitigation measures under Impacts 8.1 and 8.2.

**Level of Significance:** Impact 8.3 will be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures.

**Finding 1:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation/Rationale for Finding:** The mitigation measures under Impacts 8.1 and 8.2 have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. The mitigation

measures avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Supporting Information for Finding:** See Draft EIR, Chapter 8, and this Attachment, Section 2.

**Additional Mitigation Measures:** The following additional mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project and the District has adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure their implementation. (The mitigation measures are listed here because they do not fit under any of the specific significant impacts identified in the Final EIR.)

**Neighborhood and District Relations Mitigation Measure:** Prior to initiation of OAB construction activities, the District shall appoint an ombudsman to provide a direct and informal avenue of communications between the District and the owners and residents of properties near the Fresno City College campus. The ombudsman will serve as the contact through which residents and property owners can seek solutions, independent explanations, reviews, and recommendations on issues resulting from OAB construction activities.

The specific roles and responsibilities of the ombudsman will be defined by the District. In general, however, the Ombudsman will:

- Maintain impartiality
- Listen to complaints and concerns
- Assist visitors in exploring options and potential informal resolutions to complaints and concerns
- Facilitate a difficult conversation or negotiation
- Facilitate contacts with District administrators and offices
- Clarify policies and practices and provide information
- Identify trends to alert the District to systemic problems and potential solutions
- Identify other resources at the District available to the visitor

The Ombudsman will provide an initial response to a construction-related complaint within 24 hours of receiving the complaint.

The Ombudsman will be available to assist Fresno City College staff and students who have concerns about the OAB construction activities.

Prior to initiation of OAB construction activities, the District will provide notice of the Ombudsman's availability. The notice will be published in the Fresno City College newspaper, posted on the District and Fresno City College web sites, and mailed to all residents and owners of property located within the same geographic area used for

notices required for this EIR. The notice will describe the roles and responsibilities of the Ombudsman, how to contact the Ombudsman, and anticipated construction activities and schedules. (RMP 2)

**OAB Signage Mitigation Measure:** The signage program for the OAB shall comply with Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. (RMP 1)

**Caltrans Fee Mitigation Measure:** The District shall pay to the California Department of Transportation a fee not to exceed \$9,729 to mitigate the impact of the OAB project on the Freeway 41/McKinley Avenue interchange. (RMP 1)

## **4. Findings for Alternatives (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3))**

### **4.1. Purpose, Project Objectives, and Significant Impacts**

#### **4.1.1 Purpose**

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), this section presents specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations identified by the Board of Trustees, which make infeasible the “no project” alternative described in the Draft EIR.

#### **4.1.2. Project Objectives**

The project objectives, as described in the Draft EIR, Chapter 2, are as follows:

- To renovate the OAB in a manner consistent with the building’s inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places;
- To ensure the OAB is structurally safe, energy efficient, and universally accessible;
- To recognize the practical need for the OAB on the FCC campus by facilitating the usefulness of the building for classroom, office, administrative, and related uses;
- To recognize and protect the West Lawn as the only remaining FCC campus area that reflects the OAB’s historical setting;
- To facilitate more efficient use of existing parking, develop new parking, and implement new parking operations programs to address the additional parking demand resulting from the project;
- To renovate and operate the OAB in a manner compatible with the residential neighborhoods in its vicinity.

#### **4.1.3. Significant Impacts**

The significant impacts of the project are described in Section 3.

### **4.2. No Project Alternative**

#### **4.2.1. Description of Alternative**

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, the EIR addressed the No Project alternative. The No Project alternative reflects the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation for the EIR was published as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.



Under the No Project alternative, the OAB would not be renovated for classroom, office, and other uses. It would remain vacant and, most likely, would continue to deteriorate. It is reasonable to expect that the building eventually would have to be removed.

The significant environmental effects identified in the EIR would not occur under the No Project alternative. However, with the exception of parking, all of the identified environmental effects can be reduced to insignificance.

If the OAB were removed, based on past District plans, it is likely the building site would be developed with a building (or buildings) housing the same types of classroom, administrative, and office uses proposed for the project. The environmental impacts associated with constructing and operating the new building would be similar to those described for the OAB in the EIR, with the possible exception that the building could be sized to accommodate fewer students, which would result in a lesser demand for parking. If this were the case, the unavoidable parking impact resulting from the project could be reduced, if not avoided, but would be replaced by the unavoidable impact of removing a building listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

#### **4.2.2. Finding for Alternative**

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the no project alternative.

#### **4.2.3. Explanation/Rationale for Finding**

The OAB has been recognized as an integral part of the social and historical fabric of Fresno and the nation through its inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. As described by the National Park Service,

The National Register of Historic Places is the Nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources. Properties listed in the Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture.

...

National Register properties are distinguished by having been documented and evaluated according to uniform standards. These criteria recognize the accomplishments of all peoples who have contributed to the history and heritage of the United States and are designated to help state and local governments, Federal agencies, and others identify important historic and archeological properties worthy of preservation and of consideration in planning and development decisions. (<http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/about.htm>)

If the no project alternative were adopted, the building would not be renovated or made structurally safe, energy efficient, or universally accessible. As previously noted, the OAB would continue to deteriorate and, most likely, would eventually have to be removed because of its unsafe condition and to allow room for the construction of additional classroom, administrative, and office space on the Fresno City College campus.

Because of the significant extent to which the project impacts can be mitigated and because the no project alternative would result in the removal of a building on the National Register of Historic Places, the no project alternative cannot be considered superior to the proposed project and, therefore, is considered infeasible and will not be implemented.

#### **4.2.4. Supporting Information for Finding**

See the Draft EIR, Chapter 12, and the Statement of Overriding Consideration in this Attachment, Section 5.

### **4.3. Alternative Locations**

The identification and evaluation of alternative locations for the project was not undertaken in the EIR because the project involves an existing historically significant building that cannot be moved.

### **4.4 Alternative Project Designs**

The identification and evaluation of alternative designs for the OAB was determined to be inappropriate and infeasible because of the historic significance of the building design.

The identification and evaluation of alternative locations for the central plant, trash compactor, electrical transformer, and emergency fire pump generator required for the OAB was undertaken in the Final EIR. The District evaluated four possible locations for the central plant: (1) at the northwest corner of the cafeteria (the initial proposed location), (2) at the southwest corner of the cafeteria, (3) in the OAB basement, and (4) in conjunction with the existing main Fresno City College central plant. In addition, an alternative central plant mechanical system was evaluated. After evaluating each alternative based primarily on noise considerations, the District determined that the central plant should be placed at the southwest corner of the cafeteria and other equipment should be placed at the locations shown in the Final EIR on Figure C.4.2. The project description for the OAB EIR was revised accordingly.

## **5. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 Statement of Overriding Considerations**

### **5.1. Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

The Final EIR identified one significant unavoidable effect resulting from the project: the FCC campus does not have adequate on-campus parking to accommodate the parking demand that would be generated by the project, and the project would result in increased on-street parking in neighborhoods near the OAB.

### **5.2 Statement of Overriding Considerations**

#### **5.2.1. Finding**

As described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a), “CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered ‘acceptable’.”

Based upon substantial information in the record and the reasons set forth below, the District has determined that specific economic, social, and other benefits of the Historic Old Administration Building Renovation Project outweigh the parking-related unavoidable adverse effects of the project. The Board, therefore, considers the parking-related adverse environmental effect acceptable.

The specific reasons that support the Board’s action are based on the Final EIR and other information in the record. These reasons are described in Section 5.2.2.

#### **5.2.2. Support for Statement of Overriding Considerations**

##### **(a) State Center Community College District Background**

The State Center Community College District serves a population in excess of one million residents and is headquartered adjacent to the Fresno City College campus in Fresno. The District operates two community colleges, Fresno City College and Reedley College, and four educational centers: Madera Center, Clovis Center, Oakhurst Center, and the Vocational Training Center in southwest Fresno.

In addition to the existing facilities, the District is developing two new educational centers. The Willow/International Center is under construction in northeast Fresno, and a site for a new educational center has been acquired in southeast Fresno. The first phase of the Willow/International Center will open in 2009 and the Southeast Center is expected to open in 2011.

The Historic Old Administration Building is on the Fresno City College campus. California’s first community college operates on a 99-acre campus in south-central Fresno. For the fall semester 2006, FCC had approximately 20,126 full- and part-time students and 1,048 full- and part-time faculty.

(b) Parking Impact

One of the District's objectives for the project is "to facilitate more efficient use of existing parking, develop new parking, and implement new parking operations programs to address the additional parking demand resulting from the project." (DEIR, p. 2-5) This objective reflects the District's understanding that the FCC campus has insufficient on-campus parking to meet the existing demand during peak hours, that development of sufficient additional parking to satisfy the existing demand or the additional demand resulting from the OAB would be difficult, but that every reasonable effort must be made to satisfy the existing and anticipated additional demand.

To address the objective, the District commissioned a comprehensive parking study for the EIR and incorporated into the EIR mitigation measures resulting from the parking study and additional research. Seven categories of mitigation measures were identified to address parking impacts resulting from the project. The categories include: (1) adoption of a parking-responsive campus growth and development policy; (2) development and implementation of parking operations enhancement programs; (3) modifications to existing parking lots; (4) construction of new parking lots; and (5) maximization of alternate transportation options. Under the mitigation measures, up to approximately 350 new parking spaces could be developed (in addition to 70 new spaces now under construction). The OAB, when fully operational, will generate a peak parking demand of 483 vehicles.

Additional parking could be developed at two locations near the OAB: within the West Lawn Area immediately west of the building and in an open area near the gymnasium. Development of parking within the West Lawn was not proposed by the District or recommended in the EIR because this area is historically significant (see the Draft EIR, Chapter 3). Development of parking near the gym was not proposed or recommended because it would result in additional daily traffic on the local streets providing access to the residences within the Porter Tract.

In conclusion, the parking mitigation measures will facilitate the project objective of more efficient use of existing parking, development of new parking, and implementation of new parking operations programs to address the additional parking demand resulting from the project. They will not completely mitigate the long-standing parking problems at Fresno City College, but represent a major effort toward addressing the problem. Moreover, they reflect the common interest of the District and community of not developing parking within the historic West Lawn area or within areas that would induce additional traffic into the historic Porter tract.

(c) Social Benefits: Honoring the Community's Support and Vitality

Renovation of the Historic Old Administration Building enjoys widespread community support. In November 2002, State Center Community College District (District) voters approved Measure E, a \$161 million dollar bond measure intended to enable the District to refurbish aging facilities, build new facilities to accommodate enrollment growth, and purchase needed equipment for classrooms. Thirty-million dollars were included in the bond for renovation of the OAB. Passage of the bond, of which renovation of the OAB

was a major component, demonstrated major community's support for the project. This support is based on the building's historical significance, but more importantly – on its promise of future contributions to student learning and the San Joaquin Valley's cultural and social vitality.

The community's support for the project is further evidenced by the following recent editorial in the Fresno Bee:

**Editorial: Preserving a treasure  
The Fresno Bee**

07/16/07 13:50:11

For many years, this community has been in the habit of tearing down our past, removing the artifacts that once defined Fresno and the Valley in favor of something -- anything -- that's new.

But at least one success story emerges from this catalogue of shortsightedness: the Old Administration Building on the Fresno City College campus. The building has been saved, but it still needs the community's help.

Construction began in 1915 and opened the next year. It was the first permanent structure on what was then the Fresno Normal School campus, the predecessor of California State University, Fresno. It served generations of students, faculty and staff.

But the building was shuttered in 1976 because it didn't meet the state's standards for earthquake safety in school buildings. It languished for years, falling into disrepair and decay. Administrators sought to demolish it to make way for newer, more modern — and less attractive — buildings. Preservationists and other supporters of the building fought to save it.

After dodging the wrecking ball on several occasions, a reprieve finally came when voters passed Measure E in 2002. Among the provisions of that bond measure was \$30 million in funds for restoration of the Old Administration Building.

The cost of restoring the building to full use — about 100,000 square feet of classroom, office, research and meeting space — is around \$41 million. Some of the difference will come from state funds, but the funding will still fall short of what's needed.

An internal fundraising campaign, in which faculty and staff at the campus are asked to donate one hour's pay each month to the cause, seeks to raise \$1 million. But the project still needs to raise about \$4 million locally.

That's where the community comes in. A vigorous fundraising effort is under way. It's a very worthy cause. The building is an important part of our history, and now stands poised to serve an equally important role in our future. It deserves support.

**(d) Educational Benefits: Serving Existing and Future Classroom, Office, and Administrative Space Needs**

The educational benefits to be derived from the OAB project are significant. The District has determined that resurrecting the OAB is an essential anchor for the future of the FCC campus and will provide much needed physical capacity for FCC. The campus has had to limit enrollment in certain classes and deny students space for activities. FCC is in need of more lecture halls and student activity spaces. More classes are required in math, engineering, the arts, and social sciences. To fulfill its mission FCC also needs to provide students and the community an enhanced performance venue for music and dance concerts as well as studio-theater productions. In addition to fulfilling these needs, the

OAB will offer a courtyard environment in which the college and community can host culturally significant social gatherings.

(e) Historical Benefits: Saving a National Treasure

The benefits of restoring the OAB far outweigh its continued deterioration, its unsafe condition, and its potential demolition. The historical significance of the OAB is addressed in the Draft EIR, Chapter 3. The building was entered in the National Register of Historic Places effective May 1, 1974. If the project does not proceed, the building will continue to deteriorate and, most likely, will eventually have to be removed because of its unsafe condition and to allow room for the construction of additional classroom, administrative, and office space on the Fresno City College campus.

It is also obvious that the evolution of Fresno State Normal School into Fresno State Teacher's College into Fresno State College and into Fresno City College and California State University, Fresno, has greatly contributed to the intellectual, cultural, physical, and economic development of the community. In this sense, the Old Administration Building complex, as the first permanent structure on the Fresno State Normal School campus, thus serves as a symbol linking the accomplishments of the past with the hopes for the future through Fresno's commitment to higher education. *(Excerpt from the Old Administration Building National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination)*

(f) Project Benefits: Conclusion

Based on the information in this Statement of Overriding Consideration, which is supported by substantial information in the record, the District has determined that the social, educational, and historical benefits of the OAB project outweigh the parking-related unavoidable adverse effects of the project.