CSUMB Comprehensive Master Plan
Summarized Responses to Public Comments Received 2/6/17 - 3/6/17
& Committee Review

1. **What level of detail does a Comprehensive Master Plan cover?**

This Comprehensive Master Plan (Master Plan) guides the physical development and future actions of the campus through 2035, the identified planning horizon of the Master Plan. It presents a vision for the future over set horizons with long-range goals and strategies to achieve them. The physical campus plan interrelates buildings, mobility infrastructure, open space, site ecology, and energy and stormwater management. Each chapter addresses current conditions and the goals and recommendations for the buildout of the plan. The Master Plan includes a few Special Area Plans, more detailed site specific plans, to guide the development of a few prominent campus spaces. Still in development, the Policy chapter will include specific actions, which will help the campus meet the intent of the goals in this plan. Furthermore, the Master Plan also recommends the drafting of several separate, more detailed plans, such as a parking management plan, to fully meet the objectives of the plan.

2. **How was physical space (building gross square feet (GSF)) allocated and land needs (acreages) determined? What about a performance hall, wellness center or the size of the athletics area?**

This Master Plan outlines the space needs for 12,700 FTE students and 1,490 FTE staff and faculty, which was determined by using the following formulas, input from the campus community and the goal of maximizing the best and highest use of a specific site.

The plan identifies a Campus Arts & Auditorium building (82,291 GSF), Wellness Center (30,769 GSF) and community integrated athletics and recreation area (70 acres), among other specific uses. Land needs for building footprints are based upon following a floor area ratio 1.0 for non-residential building and 0.75 for residential buildings with a campus wide building heights from 3 to 5 stories of occupied space.

Two formulas were used to determine space needs. The CSU system's **State University Administrative Manual** (SUAM) projects space needs for academic, administration and support facility based on enrollment and other factors. CSU awards capital funding based on SUAM's space needs methodology. The **Council of Education Facility Planners International** (CEFPI) standards are nationally recognized space planning metrics which were used to project space needs not addressed by SUAM, such as non-state funded facilities like student life, recreation and community space.

The formulas determined the needs for several different building use types on campus. The formulas yielded a need for 34 acres of athletics and recreation space yet acknowledged the

campus' desire to potentially create an athletic area shared with the larger community, thus, 70 acres were identified. A corporation yard space (1 acre) identifies the space required for facilities operations and associated storage. Individual program storage space is included in the formulas, which determine building size. Note that all calculations were done for future buildings and their associated storage space not for current storage needs. Despite an acceptable building condition, the Reading Center (bldg. 59) was removed in order to further densify the campus. Space for a future Reading Center is included in the calculation for future academic building space.

3. **Why aren't specific proposed projects identified? Several projects have been talked about such as an eco-hotel, tiny houses, expanding the Professional Growth and Counseling Center, a wellness center, a performing arts center, childcare center and an athletic complex?**

The Master Plan does identify specific projects in its Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (2016-2017 through 2020/2021). These projects are listed in Chapter 4, Program (Table 4.4) and include academic and support, campus life, recreation and housing projects. This table specifically lists two academic buildings, Panetta Institute of Public Policy, student union, childcare center, recreation center (phase 1), and two housing projects. Specific locations for some of these projects are being considered at this time. Such locations will be included in the Final Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report. The locations will conform with the appropriate designations found on the Master Plan Land Use Plan (Figure 5.3) and Building Use Plan (Figure 5.4). Other proposed projects, can be accommodated in the Master Plan in the future as the plan allows for projects to be developed consistent with the building program and underlying land use designation (i.e.

4. **How will this Master Plan create a physical environment that engages with the community?**

This Master Plan moved the Institutional Partnership land use category to the periphery, specifically along 2nd Avenue and Colonel Durham Roads in order for future projects to better partner with and be accessible to the surrounding communities. For example, the Panetta Institute for Public Policy has been moved from the location identified in the 2007 Master Plan to 2nd Avenue in this Master Plan. Additionally, CSUMB is interested in the idea of creating a community serving and facing athletics and recreation complex.

Campus staff were involved in the creation of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG), which establish standards for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signage, and other matters of visual importance (Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan, p.61). The Plan recognizes CSUMB's commitment to adhere to the RUDG to the maximum extent possible and help make 2nd Avenue a bike and pedestrian oriented street.

5. **How were the future total number of students, staff and faculty determined? What are the growth projections for staff and faculty?**

The administration set the full time equivalent (FTE) student population at 12,700 for this Master Plan. The Plan projected out the 2014-15 ratio of staff/faculty to students to create a future staff and faculty FTE total of 1,490. See Tables 4.1 and 4.2 for more information.

6. **This plan has a lot of visionary goals, recommendations and strategies. Where is the commitment to specific actions?**

A Policy Chapter is in development. It will incorporate the current plan recommendations and create language which allows the campus to achieve its Master Plan goals. It will also keep relevant policies from the 2007 Master Plan and create specific policy language that reflects the intent of each chapter. The policies will include specific actions to be implemented by the campus and timing requirements of such actions, where relevant. Additionally, some of the policies may institute monitoring requirements to track the implementation of certain actions and programs.

7. **The campus should only build on previously developed sites.**

This Master Plan removes buildings identified in the 2004 and 2007 Master Plans sited in the oak woodlands area south of Divarty Street and ringing the crescent. These and additional new buildings are now located onto existing parking lots within the campus core or along 2nd Avenue. All campus buildings are planned to be built on previously disturbed land.

A 50-acre development site located west of 8th Avenue, included in the approved 2004 and 2007 Master Plans, is still identified as the site for future staff and faculty housing beyond the 2035 planning horizon for this Master Plan Given that, this site is identified as development reserve. This land has been cleaned to residential standards by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority led Early Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) program, which addresses cleanup/remediation of Army Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) as a part of the cleanup of 3,340 former Fort Ord acres. Twenty of the 50 acres have had all trees removed as a part of this process, which is why the prior Master Plans and this Master Plan identify this site for future staff and faculty housing.

8. **Why is there a focus on parking and a commitment to alternative and active forms of transportation?**

The Mobility Chapter of this plan outlines an ambitious transportation strategy. This strategy was supported during the public outreach process and committee meetings to be the best approach to meeting the future growth demands of campus through sustainable practices that enhance the safety of the campus community. Transportation demand management (promoting alternative transportation) relies heavily on managing parking, creating a safe environment for bicyclists and pedestrians and providing alternatives to single occupant vehicle travel.

As required, CSUMB will evaluate the final Master Plan during the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process. This analysis will determine if implementation of the plan creates any significant impacts. If significant impacts are identified, the campus will mitigate (or reduce) these

impacts, where feasible. The transportation strategy presented in the Master Plan seeks to minimize the increase in single occupant vehicle travel and increase other modes of travel, such as transit, bicycling, and walking. Such an approach would reduce the need for off-campus mitigation measures, such as intersection improvements. Off-campus mitigation measures are expensive and add capacity to the roadway network, which can result in an increase is roadway volumes. Reducing single occupant vehicle travel also helps to achieve the sustainability objectives of this Master Plan.

9. How does CSUMB know the 1035 AFY allocation really exists? This is just paper water.

As noted in the 2004 and 2007 Master Plans, CSUMB is committed to developing the campus within its given water allotment. The 2007 and currently proposed Master Plan identify campus total water demand as substantially less than the existing allocation. The Marina Coast Water District is responsible for water supply management that is addressed in five-year Urban Water Management Plans prepared by the district. If water supplies become constrained, the campus will more aggressively implement strategies to further reduce demand. This Master Plan goes beyond previous plans by including aggressive water conservation goals and recommendations for treatment and reuse of wastewater onsite (grey water and black water), and stormwater collection and reuse. The strategy of pursuing on-campus water treatment will take into account regional efforts to provide recycled water compared to the costs/benefits on on-site treatment[1] over time.

10. How does the plan integrate and address the use of recycled water?

Using recycled water reduces dependence on groundwater sources. CSUMB has been allocated 87 AFY of recycled water to be provided by the Marina Coast Water District. As required, the campus is currently installing recycled water line specific pipe for irrigation in all new construction sites and will be ready to use recycled water when it becomes available. The Master Plan also includes site-specific recommendations in the Water Chapter, aimed to reduce water use (laundry to landscape, dual plumbing, etc.).

11. How will the campus manage its stormwater, especially in areas that flow to neighboring jurisdictions?

This Master Plan builds on and expands the CSUMB's 2006 Storm Water Master Plan. In addition to planning to percolate all stormwater within the campus boundary, the Master Plan proposes strategies that integrate stormwater management areas within the connecting landscape open space areas, trails and capture stormwater within those connected areas. The stormwater management areas will use Low Impact Design (LID) best management practices (BMPs) to effectively manage stormwater and contribute to the character of the campus setting.

[1] Living Community Challenge (LCC) sustainability framework considered for this plan would require net positive water. Pursuing LCC would still require the campus to complete a cost benefit analysis and take into account regional efforts. Occasionally scale-jumping can be achieved if it makes more sense to pursue a regional strategy over a small scale effort, as long as resiliency would still be achieved.

Figure 8.10 identifies areas within campus property to infiltrate water and describes the location of stormwater percolation on-site.

The Master Plan language will be revised to further clarify where stormwater historically flows to neighboring jurisdictions.

12. How do building siting and design guidelines integrate sustainability?

New campus buildings will be sited within the existing Main Campus core and adjacent parcels, achieving a level of urban infill which prioritizes vibrant, interactive and safe spaces, decreasing the demand for distributing energy, heating, cooling, water and waste. Building in the campus core will keep most in-between class walks under 10 minutes. Remaining campus core parking lots will be built upon and parking will move to the periphery, reducing the disturbance to natural areas while also strengthening community connectivity. Specific building sustainability design standards are addressed in detail within the Master Plan Design Guidelines in measures such as using the natural character of the landscape to shape building form and design and voluntarily including the Fort Ord RUDG.[2] Language from definitions of Sustainability at CSUMB drafted at previous Master Plan Sustainability Committee meetings is used to support the strategies mentioned above.

13. How and to what extent will this plan integrate native landscaping?

The Master Plan references landscaping in the Design Chapter by open space type. The Master Plan does not provide a high level of detail regarding landscaping. More detail is available (as referenced in the plan) in the 2008 Landscape Maintenance Plan and the campus acknowledges the voluntary application of the Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) and its corresponding plant pallet will be incorporated where appropriate.

14. How does this plan address accessibility?

This Master Plan addresses accessibility through Mobility Plans and Universal Design (UD) Principles, which refer to broad-spectrum ideas meant to produce buildings, products and environments that are inherently accessible to older people, people without disabilities and people with disabilities. The focus on pedestrian and bicycle safety within the core of campus directly supports the equal need for improved pathways and accessible connections across roads and into buildings.

Specific design elements, such as door push plates and increased benches for fatigue-challenged community members have been identified, however the foremost benefit of this plan to accessibility related topics is the reinforced commitment made to incorporate Universal Design into projects, and identify the specific plans needed to further outline the application of these

[2] Living Community Challenge requires buildings to incorporate biophlic design charrettes, which would support integrating connection with nature into the building. In addition, both LCC and LEED ND require place to be considered, siting of building, transportation connections, etc., as does current CSU policy.

accessible/universal design standards. The Master Plan also identifies areas in great need of attention, such as the state of para-transit services on campus by including strategies for improving on campus pathways and transit services that prioritize both accessibility services to and from all campus locations, as well as convenience and reliability, all while retaining the plan's goals to increase core campus building density. See Circulation Plans in Chapter 7 Mobility.

15. **How does this plan address health and well-being? (Including providing healthy food and promoting social interactions by using active design and landscaping).**

The Master Plan incorporates health and well-being through the place-making and stewardship tenets, which focus on connecting people to open spaces via an expanded network of pedestrian walkways. This is realized through building design and landscaping (Design Guidelines Chapter) but also described in the pedestrian focused mobility recommendations (Mobility Chapter).

Master Plans do not traditionally include food (with the exception of land use designations for food production if that is relevant). However we do recognize that food is an important social activity and is especially important to commuter students.

This plan identified the Sustainability Commons as an area to incorporate elements of urban farming and/or aquaponics, as well as space for other activities and programs that support healthy living and social interaction in a living learning lab type environment.

Language will be incorporated to further expand upon this Sustainability Commons vision in response to comments received here.

16. **Several comments suggested the need for more childcare and to combine childcare with other types of care (eldercare, after school care center, etc.)**

The Master Plan identifies a new Childcare Center (23,000 GSF) in the same location of the existing facility.

The plan will be modified to include the concept of creating a childcare center that includes elder care, after school care for school age children and partnering with academic programs.

17. **How will CSUMB connect to Fort Ord Recreation Trails and Greenway (FORTAG) and other trails?**

Bicycle and pedestrian trail access is a fundamental component of the off-campus connectivity improvements called for in the Master Plan. In most cases, these pathways will be separated from vehicle travel, paved, wide enough for two cyclists to ride side by side and include infrastructure such as lighting and landscaping, as well as additional amenities as appropriate. The FORTAG trail system is incorporated into this plan and connects the campus to the Fort Ord National Monument to the Fort Ord Dunes State Park and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail. Connections to these

existing and proposed pathways from the periphery of campus will support regional commuter travel, as well as recreational travel. Future plans are proposed to update wayfinding plans on campus that will direct cyclists and pedestrians towards the trailheads and routes to surrounding destinations. See Master Plan maps Figure 7.10 & 7.11.

18. How will people get to the appropriate building after parking or getting off the bus?

The plan calls for improved wayfinding to allow visitors and new students to easily navigate the campus. It also recommends updating the campus wayfinding plan to adapt to the new Master Plan layout (Master Plan Figure 7.15). Updated signage will direct users to the appropriate locations on campus. Bike and pedestrian pathways, accessibility improvements, roads closed to through traffic and bike sharing options will help facilitate non-vehicular travel around campus.

19. How will bicycles connect from CSUMB to neighboring communities (Seaside, Marina, Multi-modal corridor)?

Enhancing bicycle and pedestrian routes to neighboring jurisdictions is a fundamental component of the off-campus connectivity improvements called for in the Master Plan. The surrounding jurisdictions of Marina and Seaside have identified bicycle routes in their city plans that will connect to internal campus pathways. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County has identified these bicycle and pedestrians connections and others, as well as identified a Marina-Salinas Multi Modal Corridor, which has proposed stops at Imjin Parkway and Imjin Road and 9th St and Hwy 1. This plan identifies access to these proposed, and existing transit routes via bicycling and walking. Access to these pathways, from the periphery of campus, will support regional commuter travel, as well as recreational bike travel. Future plans will further develop wayfinding on campus, which direct cyclists and pedestrians towards surrounding destinations. See Master Plan Figures 7.10 & 7.11.

20. Does CSUMB plan to close or limit access to General Jim Moore Boulevard and Inter-Garrison Road? How will it address associated impacts?

The Master Plan goal is to house 60% (7,600) students on the Main Campus near General Jim Moore Boulevard and Inter-Garrison Road. In order to prevent bicyclist/pedestrian and car collisions and improve the safety of the campus community, CSUMB will limit through traffic along these roadways. This supports the campus goal of developing a campus safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. The plan identifies limited access points at the north end of General Jim Moore Boulevard and at either end of the identified transit/pedestrian malls. The plan does not currently identify what specific measures will be applied at these sites to limit access to vehicular traffic. During the plan's environmental review process we will work closely with our traffic consultants to identify the best option for limiting access on this roadway. The surrounding jurisdictions have been

consulted on these topics, and the Master Plan supports the routing of regional traffic around campus on periphery roads, rather than routing through campus.

21. How does this Plan integrate with regional roadways? Why is Eastside Parkway shown on the map, it is not an approved project?

The proposed Eastside Parkway was identified as a new regional connection in the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Master Plan shows the most recent available alignment for Eastside Parkway, which is not a formal commitment to this alignment.

As requested by Marina and Monterey County, CSUMB will update Master Plan Figure 2.1 to more clearly show the CSUMB's geographic relationship to regional roadways.

Creating an updated wayfinding plan is identified in the Master Plan as a strategy for improving regional roadway connections, facilitating through traffic and helping visitors navigate their approach to and around campus.

Additional language will be added to the Master Plan to reinforce this focus on the visitor experience and the need to work with surrounding jurisdictions to improve off-campus wayfinding.

22. How will parking be addressed in the Master Plan?

The University has decided to support an ambitious transportation scenario and corresponding transportation demand management strategy that reduces the campus' impact on regional traffic, assists in achieving our 2030 carbon neutrality goal, and ensures the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists on campus. Consolidating small parking lots to the periphery creates a safe car-free campus core for pedestrians and cyclists. Adding buildings to previous smaller lots decreases the walk time between buildings. Parking lots will support multimodal (pedestrian, bicyclist, transit etc.) connections and travel to, from and around the campus. Once parked on the periphery, drivers will have several options to reach their final destination safely on campus. See Master Plan Figure 3.11 & the Vehicular Circulation Plan in Chapter 7 Mobility.

- **Why isn't designated staff/faculty parking addressed?** The Implementation Chapter indicates the need to develop a Parking Management Plan (PMP). The PMP could, among other things, identify the true costs of the current parking arrangement and evaluate the costs/benefits of developing stall designations by permit type. (Permit type refers to permits for staff/faculty, as well as permits for East Campus residents on main campus).

- **Will this Master Plan eliminate my parking benefit?** Employees do receive low cost parking (among the lowest in the CSU).

  Parking is not an official employee benefit, and rates are negotiated via collective bargaining. Language will be updated in the Master Plan to clarify this.

23. How and to what degree will electric vehicle charging stations be incorporated into the plan?

Electric vehicles (EV) are an example of alternative fuel vehicles, which are supported by this Master Plan as one of the modes of transportation that will help us reach our 2030 carbon neutrality goal. The Policy Chapter and/or PMP will identify how EV charging stations will be incorporated into parking lots. Furthermore, the University will continue to look beyond its borders to support a regional system-wide approach to EV charging stations.

24. What plan elements support International Students and other car free populations?

The ambitious transportation strategy proposed by the Master Plan provides multiple travel options to all campus populations. The campus plans to continue the universal transit pass (free boarding on any MST line with a CSUMB ID) program and increase frequencies and transit routes as the campus grows. Restricting through campus vehicular traffic and simultaneously improving pedestrian and bicycle connections will greatly benefit the safety and well-being of all campus inhabitants, particularly campus residents and International Students, many of whom also live on campus. Several other alternative transportation strategies are proposed to support car-free populations, including expanding the car-sharing Zipcar service and creating a bike sharing program.

25. How will this campus support the East to Main Campus connections?

Shuttle and regional transit service will continue to serve East Campus as the campus grows. Improved and expanded trail connections will provide safer travel by bike and walking. The Master Plan also incorporates the FORTAG, which includes a separated path connecting these two areas of campus.

26. How will the campus insure housing is affordable? How will this be defined?

CSUMB inherited approximately 1,200 units in East Campus Housing (ECH) and several hundred beds of dormitory style housing on the Main Campus. These ECH units are already offered at below market rental rates. Student housing at CSUMB is provided at multiple price levels. Financial aid (through student loans) also provides low interest loans to cover the cost of housing. This Master Plan encourages on campus housing in part to provide convenient and affordable housing options to students, faculty and staff. however specific affordable housing policy language is not currently included within this plan but could be addressed in the policy chapter.

27. How much outreach and engagement has occurred as a part of the Master Plan development?

As detailed in Chapter 1, the Master Plan process involved discovery, exploration and synthesis phases. The Master Plan and consultant team led over 26 meetings during the **discovery phase** where staff met with key stakeholder groups, individuals and campus community members. An event was held in the Student Center which allowed students to contribute to the plan development. Three major campus committees were formed to guide the discussions and direction of the Master Plan which met between May and November 2015. A presentation was made to the FORA Board in June 2015 to further engage with local jurisdictions.

During the **exploration phase** the consultants conducted two public workshops on alternative master plan concepts as well as an open house forum which saw over 100 staff, faculty, students and community attendees. Campus Planning staff also developed an online engagement portal on their website to accept comments on the plan throughout the majority of the planning process.

The **synthesis phase** began with the presentation of the May 2016 administrative draft plan. After staff review and edits, a public draft plan was made available for public review between February 6 and March 6th 2017. During this review period the campus received approximately 255 comments and conducted 26 meetings with on and off campus stakeholders and held 3 three committee meetings to further gather input. Off campus stakeholder engagement included staff meetings with the cities of Marina and Seaside, Monterey County and community partners such as the Transportation Agency of Monterey County, Monterey-Salinas Transit, LandWatch, and FORTAG proponents. This document is a summary of the answers to comments received during this phase of the project.

28. How will the plan incorporate Public Art (locations, permanent and temporary, sculpture gardens, etc.?)

Both the Design Guidelines and Open Space Frameworks call for adding art to the campus, but do not identify specific sites. We recognize there are additional options that should be explored to further integrate art (temporary and permanent installation, etc.).[3]

Identifying locations for public art or other landmarks will included a strategy to improve the wayfinding and visual experience when traveling onto campus.

29. How was the economic analysis by Strategic Economics incorporated?

Strategic Economics evaluated the economic impacts of the campus to date; it did not evaluate the impacts at build out. Strategic Economics analysis leads to the expansion of the concept of using public private partnerships (P3s) from academic mission serving partnerships to partnerships that can fund sustainable water and energy infrastructure improvements and housing.

[3] The Living Community Challenge has a petal dedicated to Beauty and Spirit as well as Inspiration and Education. Although the framework does not determine what is beautiful is does require that beauty and spirit be considered during the design process. It also requires a major (visible from 60 meters away) installation for every 500 residents and a minor (visible 10 meters away) installation for every 100 residents.

30. **How is the Watershed Institute building addressed? It has been removed from the map.**

The current Watershed Institute building has been identified for removal based on its poor condition (5.4). All buildings in poor condition were proposed to be demolished (5.2). A new future academic building (5.3) has been located in its place. As a non-state funded program, additional space for a new building would be included in the CEFPI space formula. A specific location for the Watershed Institute building was not identified.

31. **How is the plan preserving and addressing sociological, cultural, technological, economic and psychological aspects of the campus?**

Place making Tenet - human health and happiness – (Sociological/psychological). **Also see response #4.**
One of the three Master Plan's founding principles is to create "an interesting, pleasurable and welcoming community spaces that attract people, encourage interaction or allow movement at a comfortable pace while promoting health, happiness and well-being" (3.8). The land use plan densifies development within the existing built environment and connects people to nature via the open space framework and expanded bike and pedestrian trail network with the intent of creating a more vibrant community by fostering more faculty, student and staff interactions. Special Area Plans provide new concept level redesigns of the Main Quad and Divarty Street areas in order to further create public spaces that foster increased opportunities for social interactions. The Mobility chapter calls to "Create a transportation system that fosters health and wellness. Create a bicycle and pedestrian centric campus that encourages physical movement, connection to the outdoors and community interaction" (7.2).

Partnership Tenet – economic well-being – (Economic)
Another founding principle of the Campus is to "Support the redevelopment of Fort Ord by actively fostering partnerships and supporting high quality economic development opportunities….CSUMB will expand its attractiveness as an economic partner and will work with others to develop mutually beneficial amenities and economic returns for the campus and Fort Ord community" (3.10). The plan acknowledges Institutional Partnerships (as defined by the CSU Public Private Partnership Executive Order) locations and places them on the campus boundary as a way to further engage the community in the development of the campus. The Planning Context also describes the jobs lost due to base closure and the role higher education is to play as a catalyst for the economic revitalization of the region. It further describes CSUMBs commitment to supporting and enhancing the local economy.

Text will be added to acknowledge faculty lead projects such as FORTAG, the sustainable hospitality program, and proposals for ecotourism as a way to further and actively create jobs in the region (Master Plan page 3.6).

Cultural heritage – The Master Plan acknowledges the Rumsen Indians as early inhabitants and as a branch of the Costanoan (or Ohlone) language family and provides a brief history of the former Fort Ord (page 2.4). The Design Guidelines chapters discusses adding art to engage viewers and promote inspiration under Natural Open Spaces (page 10.36) and Formal Open Spaces (page 10.39). Goal #3 in the Open Space Framework is to "Integrate learning opportunities into open spaces. Use open spaces as learning laboratories that contribute to the campus learning environment and develop educational opportunities that expand the knowledge of local habitats and Fort Ord history (page 6.2). As required by law, CSUMB would maintain the confidentiality of sacred Native American sites if encountered. ~~and contact the designated local tribe representative if any artifacts are encountered.~~

Language will be added to both sections that encourages preserving and creating art that represents the historic and cultural aspects of the Monterey Bay and educates the campus population.

32. The plan is silent on the technological aspects such as LEED and their effect on people in their living and working spaces.

As noted on 9.3, the CSU requires that buildings be designed to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver equivalency standards. CSUMB has 4 LEED certified buildings (Tanimura and Antle Library, Joel and Dena Gambord Business and Technology Building, Dining Commons and the Otter Express).

Language will be updated on pages 2.15 and 9.3 to enhance existing LEED language and acknowledge that inhabitants experience well documented benefits from green building design standards that include enhanced indoor air quality and natural day lighting.

Language will also include reference to CSUMB's fiber optic cable.