

**AGENDA**

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

**Meeting: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 29, 2003**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
William Campbell  
Murray L. Galinson  
Harold Goldwhite  
Erene S. Thomas

**Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 12, 2002

1. Amend the 2002/2003 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*
2. Annual Report on Completed Capital Projects, *Information*

**Discussion Item**

3. Status Report on the 2003/2004 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—  
Governor's Budget, *Information*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF  
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Trustees of The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California**

**November 12, 2002**

**Members Present**

Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Murray L. Galinson  
Harold Goldwhite  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor  
Erene S. Thomas

**Members Absent**

William D. Campbell

**Other Trustees Present**

Debra S. Farar  
Bob Foster  
M. Alex Lopez  
Frederick W. Pierce IV

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Louis Caldera, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Pesqueira called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Chair Pesqueira noted the significance of the voters approving Proposition 47 by almost a 59 percent margin. The CSU now has funding for the trustees-approved 2002 and 2003 capital programs. These capital projects are critically important to the CSU mission, and because of everyone's efforts, we can move forward.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The revised minutes of September 17, 2002, were approved as submitted.

### **Amend the 2002/2003 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-02-16).

### **California State University Seismic Review Annual Report**

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 2 as a consent information item.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

This item proposed the approval of the schematic plans for CSU Channel Islands—East Campus Residential Development Town Center and CSU Monterey Bay—North Quad Student Housing, Phase I.

With the use of a slide presentation, Mr. Patrick Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. Mr. Drohan noted that with respect to the CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB) project, a revised resolution was before the trustees for their approval. The revision involved the placing of the word, Mitigated, in front of Negative Declaration.

In addition, Mr. Drohan placed before the trustees a letter from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) that was received after the public comment period regarding the CSUMB project. He indicated that staff had analysed the contents of the letter and advised that the information contained in the letter was not different from what Caltrans provided in its original analysis of the traffic conditions around the initial campus master plan. Since this project will have the net effect of reducing traffic, general counsel and staff did not believe that the conclusions in the Caltrans letter were significant enough to change the actions of this committee. Staff will be working with the campus to prepare a response to Caltrans to that effect. Mr. Drohan recommended the project as proposed.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution, as revised (RCPBG 11-02-17).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

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

**Amend the 2002/2003 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

**Presentation by**

J. Patrick Drohan,  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

This agenda item requests approval to add seven projects to the 2002/03 nonstate funded capital outlay program.

**1. Humboldt State University**

<b>Recreation Center and Field House Renovation</b>	<b>PWCE</b>	<b>\$4,065,000</b>
---	-------------	--------------------

Humboldt State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Student Recreation Center and Field House Renovation project. This will be the first phase of the Forbes Complex Renovation and Expansion project. The project will renovate the existing Field House into a 30,000 gross square foot (GSF) multi-purpose activity space and add a 9,800 GSF fitness center to the southern end of the building. As construction bids are received, the campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance the construction. The debt service will be funded from fees collected from the Student Union program.

**2. California State University, Northridge**

<b>Parking Structure II</b>	<b>PWCE</b>	<b>\$20,345,000</b>
-----------------------------	-------------	---------------------

CSU Northridge wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Parking Structure II project. The university needs additional parking for the growing campus population. A parking feasibility study by Kaku Associates recommended construction of two new structures to meet current and future needs. The first structure, Parking Structure I with 1,300 spaces, bid successfully and is currently under construction for a total project cost of \$14,000,000. The proposed Parking Structure II will be constructed on the western edge of the campus on existing surface lots and will serve major classroom buildings in the Sierra Complex. It will contain 2,200 spaces for a net increase of 1,500 spaces. As construction bids are received, the campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide

Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance the construction. The debt service will be funded from the fees collected from the Parking program revenue.

**3. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Innovation Village Infrastructure Improvements, Phase I PWC \$3,000,000**

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the site development and infrastructure for the Innovation Village, a 65-acre mixed-use technology park (#217 on the campus Master Plan). This project will enable the immediate development of the proposed American Red Cross Regional Headquarters on 15 acres within the Innovation Village site and establish a framework for future projects. The scope of work in the infrastructure includes the extension of Kellogg Drive into the site as its primary means of access. This extension will require the construction of a bridge for vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian access, and signalization improvements. The utility systems will be extended, which includes sewer, water, reclaimed water, storm drain, as well as electrical power, telephone, and cable television. The project will be funded from university foundation reserves.

**4. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
American Red Cross Regional Headquarters PWCE \$41,600,000**

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona wishes to proceed with the American Red Cross design and construction of their new Regional Headquarters on 15 acres within the approved 65-acre Innovation Village site (#217 on the Campus Master Plan). The proposed project will provide laboratory space, administrative office space, materials processing and storage space, a blood donor area and space for future expansion within a proposed 230,000 GSF two-story structure. The project also includes the construction of parking and vehicle circulation to accommodate 920 parking spaces. The American Red Cross will fund the entire project.

**5. California State University, San Bernardino  
Student Union Expansion PWCE \$15,000,000**

CSU San Bernardino wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Student Union Expansion project. The project will renovate 22,000 GSF of space in the existing Student Union, and construct an addition of 40,000 GSF. Renovation of existing areas shall include functional modifications, and code upgrades such as compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, fire alarm systems, and structural work. The additional space will include lounge/study areas, a small 200-seat theater, meeting rooms, club and organization workspace, retail space, a radio station, and office space. Part of the existing building will be demolished for functional space arrangements and proper circulation. Portions of the new expansion will be built on top of the existing one-story building. The new addition will complement the existing building in use of

material and space arrangements. The project's schematic plans are also being presented for approval at this meeting. As construction bids are received, the campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance the construction. Funding will also be provided from Student Union reserves.

**6. San Diego State University**  
**Student Health Services Building** **PWCE** **\$25,000,000**

San Diego State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Student Health Services (SHS) project. A new SHS building will be constructed to replace the existing facility in order to provide an adequate level of health care, medical services and health education to an expanding student population and to prepare for future growth in student health services. The proposed SHS building will contain approximately 74,762 GSF on four floors over a single level parking garage for approximately 90 vehicles. A surface parking lot containing 90 additional spaces will be constructed just north of the new building as part of this project. The project will be constructed in part on an existing campus parking lot. The SDSU Foundation will secure the title to the remaining portion of the site. The foundation will then donate the property in fee to the university. The campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance the project cost of all but approximately \$4.5 million which will be provided from parking and health facility reserves. The debt service will be funded from health facility fees at the campus.

**7. San Francisco State University**  
**Real Property Acquisition** **A** **\$19,058,000**

San Francisco State University wishes to acquire approximately 8.14 acres, commonly known as part of the Villas, which is a residential community located directly Southwesterly of the campus. This property consists of 16 apartments; a baseball field; 4 tennis, 4 basketball and 6 racketball courts; a 1-story parking garage with 42-spaces and a preschool. The opportunity to purchase this property will allow the campus to address long term planning and program goals. The campus has completed a preliminary title report, environmental assessment and improvement assessment of the property, and has determined that property and improvements being acquired are consistent with goals of the California State University. The acquisition will be funded from other campus trust funds on hand and from debt issued through the Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program with the related debt service paid from housing rental income.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 2002/03 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: 1) \$4,065,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the Humboldt State University, Recreation Center and Field House Renovation project; 2) \$20,345,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Northridge, Parking Structure II project; 3) \$3,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Innovation Village Infrastructure Improvements, Phase I project; 4) \$41,600,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, American Red Cross Regional Headquarters; 5) \$15,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, San Bernardino, Student Union Expansion project; 6) \$25,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the San Diego State University, Student Health Services Building; and 7) \$19,058,000 for acquisition of Real Property for San Francisco State University.

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

**Annual Report on Completed Capital Projects**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

This is the third annual report that provides a summary of completed CSU capital outlay projects. It covers the projects completed in the period from 10/1/01 to 9/30/02 (see Attachment A). This report includes performance data for all major capital construction projects regardless of fund source (state and nonstate). The report also contains a comparison with the two previous annual reports as a way of indicating performance trends.

- Within this year's reporting period seventeen (17) projects were completed. Six (6) are state funded and eleven (11) nonstate funded. The total cost of these completed projects was approximately \$211 million dollars.

<b>Completed Projects</b>	<b>State Projects</b>	<b>Nonstate Projects</b>	<b>Total Projects</b>
99/00	9	12	21
00/01	3	6	9
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>

This report provides an analysis of the following performance indicators:

1. Project Budget Performance
2. Project Schedule Performance
3. Project Architect/Engineer Performance
4. Project Contractor Performance

It is necessary to qualify the results of this report in the context of earlier reports and a data collection process that was in development and implemented subsequent to the start of the older projects that are now being completed. Trends shown here are reflective of the last three years of data. While these trends generally support expectations (see individual trend discussions) a strong showing by one or two projects can still distort reported averages. Such statistical aberrations will require additional time and data to smooth out. We have worked to identify such

occurrences in the trend analysis of each section. With improved record keeping on current projects, distortions that may have been introduced by earlier missing data will diminish. CPDC continues to work to improve periodic project review, simplify data collection, and refine our analysis of project data. Report comparisons reflect project completions between October 1 and September 30 for each reporting year.

### 1. Project Budget Performance

Ideally, we would look for budget performance to improve over time and the overall averages follow this expectation; however, the average for the current year state projects represents an exception. Extraordinary 1-year state results in the (99/00) year were realized by lower actual costs when compared to budgets on several seismic improvement projects. This compares to the current (01/02) year state results where two projects drove up reported percentages. In evaluating these data it is also important to note that comparisons against (00/01) are somewhat skewed because the data pool contained only three state projects.

<b>Budget Performance (Actual/Planned)</b>	<b>Average of State Projects</b>	<b>Average of Nonstate Projects</b>	<b>Overall Average</b>
99/00	83.00%	126.10%	106.70%
00/01	103.33%	114.31%	110.65%
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>105.70%</b>	<b>106.59%</b>	<b>106.28%</b>

In the instances of budget overruns, actual final costs have been augmented with state, campus and/or donor funds as applicable.

**State Analysis:** For the six (6) **state** projects reporting for this period ‘actual project cost’ for (3) projects matched within 1% of planned budget cost. For the remaining three projects ‘actual project costs’ exceeded planned budgets by 105, 107 and 121% respectively.

As referenced above, two projects impact current year state results. On one, the Los Angeles Engineering & Technology Renovation project reported total project costs at 107% of budgeted. This overage was due to delays in the project construction funding and extra costs to correct a failed mechanical design. Litigation seeking cost recovery is currently underway. On the other, the Fullerton Langsdorf Hall project included campus funded additional site improvements that resulted in a 121% actual, versus planned cost.

**Nonstate Analysis:** For the eleven (11) **nonstate** projects completed in this period a broader range of cost values has been reported. Total project cost for five projects came in below planned budget in a range from 92 to 99%. The remaining six projects exceeded planned budgets in a range from 106 to 130%.

This broad range is due to the increased scope and budget flexibility available to a campus when utilizing nonstate funding sources. Donor funded projects provide more opportunity for projects to be altered during design and construction. This leads to more changes in project scope than would be found in state funded projects. Campus fundraising efforts can also greatly impact the actual versus planned schedule.

**2. Project Schedule Performance**

Schedule Performance (Actual/Planned)	Average of State Projects	Average of Nonstate Projects	Overall Average
99/00	133.94%	162.99%	150.54%
00/01	93.92%	150.92%	131.92%
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>136.98%</b>	<b>140.46%</b>	<b>139.16%</b>

Overall, an average of **139%** of actual versus planned time was necessary to complete projects within this reporting period. Project schedule performance indicated above is calculated starting from the time funding is requested in a given budget year and ending with the Notice of Completion. Planned schedule dates are established far ahead of intended actual project start dates. The discrepancy between planned and actual schedule performance reveals that the period early in the pre-design planning/budgeting of a project that is used to estimate performance schedules is flawed due to many variables that cannot be predicted at the time of budget preparation.

For the six (6) **state** projects reporting for this period two projects came at or within 3% of planned schedule. The remaining four projects reported actual completion times at 118, 142, 174, and 184% respectively over original schedule. Design errors, rejected or inadequate design schemes and the associated time to correct the designs were key contributors to the actual schedule exceeding the planned schedule times. In evaluating current year state results keep in mind that, in the (00/01) year, one of the three state projects making up the average came in at 78% of schedule and caused the overall average for that year to fall sharply.

Ten (10) **nonstate** projects exceed planned schedule. Four projects exceeded planned schedules by 106 to 112 %. Six projects exceeded planned schedule in a range from 133 to 226%. Nonstate project delays were chiefly due to campus design changes, mostly during construction. The most extreme delay, nonstate Pomona Agriscapes at 226%, was due to a donor funding delay and design changes.

In order to provide a more relevant assessment of campus management, design team and contractor performance, and more accurately reflect the time period where a campus is able to affect project results, on future API reporting CPDC will use the architect/engineer agreement

date as the starting point for a project. Project completion would continue to use the Notice of Completion filing date.

**3. Project Architect/Engineer Performance**

**3a. Architect/Engineer Errors and Omissions as a Percentage of Final Construction Costs:**

For this reporting period a systemwide average of **2.39%** of design errors and omissions (E&O's) as compared to the final construction cost was tallied. Historically, three percent (3%) has been used as an internal threshold flagging closer scrutiny. Below this level, construction costs incurred are considered within the industry's standard of care and, aside from corrective design work at no additional cost, damages are typically not sought from the design service provider. Internally, we consider E&O statistics in context of project type (e.g., renovations can be expected to be more problematic than new construction), project size, and prior performance by the service provider.

Architect/Engineer E&O Rates	Average of State Projects	Average of Nonstate Projects	Overall Average
99/00	5.63%	1.89%	3.47%
00/01	0.86%	2.77%	2.06%
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	<b>1.90%</b>	<b>2.39%</b>

For the current year, several individual project ratings reported at a level below 1% of Architect/Engineer errors and omissions, a very respectable performance. In both state and nonstate projects one or two poorly performing projects act to inflate overall values.

For Architect/Engineer errors and omissions above three percent our systemwide tracking and ranking of sub-par performance acts as a powerful and self-correcting mechanism. Underperforming firms are aware that they will have to answer to past performance to justify consideration for future commissions by showing a credible action plan to avoid past mistakes.

There is one project reporting this period that requires special notice.

- **Los Angeles Engineering & Technology (11.03%):** On this project greater than 11% of project costs we feel were attributable to gross mechanical design errors. Because of this we are seeking damages through litigation. While this is a rare instance for the CSU, we feel it is justified in this instance. The campus is funding the litigation effort.

For this year, good results on two design-build projects and one Construction Manager (CM) at Risk project contributed to a decrease in the average nonstate E&O rate. Typically, we would expect to see lower E&O rates on design-build projects. In a design-build project the developer/construction manager assumes most responsibility for architect/engineer errors and omissions. In design-bid-build the owner generally assumes this responsibility. Due to complex academic program requirements on state funded projects design-build is rarely used. Design-build works best on projects with relatively repetitive and quantifiable requirements such as housing and parking structure projects.

**3b. Architect/Engineer Performance Evaluations:**

Architect/Engineer evaluations are ranked on a 1-low to 5-high scale. A median ranking of ‘3’ indicates the Architect/Engineer ‘achieved expectations’. The overall report value at **3.41** for all projects in the period reflects results above expectations. For professional service providers we use a ranking of ‘2’ (needs improvement) or less as a threshold for consideration of sanctions against a service provider. At the other end of the scale, rankings of ‘5’ (Outstanding) are individually challenged to confirm that the rating was indeed appropriate.

Architects’ Evaluation (Scale of 1-5)	Average of State Projects	Average of Nonstate Projects	Overall Average
99/00	3.22	3.48	3.36
00/01	4.18	3.21	3.53
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.41</b>

On the nonstate side one project rating of ‘5-outstanding’ tended to mask lower ratings by the design-build projects. The 5-rated project was the San Bernardino Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center that was constructed using a CM at Risk delivery method. CPDC has been evaluating this method and is in the process of implementing a broader trial program using the CM at Risk delivery method on future projects.

**4. Project Contractor Performance:**

**4a. Change Orders as a Percentage of Final Construction Costs**

<b>Contractors' Change Order Rates</b>	<b>Average of State Projects</b>	<b>Average of Nonstate Projects</b>	<b>Overall Average</b>
99/00	9.28%	7.23%	8.09%
00/01	3.64%	5.50%	4.80%
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>10.76%</b>	<b>4.51%</b>	<b>6.86%</b>

Ideally, we would look for both state and nonstate change order rates to trend downward over time. While this held true for nonstate projects, the trend and rate for state projects grew from the prior (00/01) period. Two state projects, Los Angeles Engineering and Technology Renovation at 12% (design defects litigation pending) and San Diego Imperial Valley Campus (IVC) Auditorium Seismic Upgrade at 32% (major unforeseen conditions) skewed the current year state average significantly upward.

In these project reports no weighting has been given to project size. Thus, the relatively small \$1,009,987 San Diego IVC Auditorium Seismic Upgrade project that encountered a \$192,000 unforeseen site development cost had an outsized effect on the overall project reported average. Had this cost been amortized over a larger project the results would not have been as noteworthy. We feel reporting on these exceptions as they may occur provides a more informed picture and that weighted averages would tend to obscure smaller project reporting.

Use of design-build, with its inherent lower change order rates, contributed to lower nonstate averages for this period. Increased use feasibility studies and future use by both state and nonstate projects of alternate delivery methods, such as CM at Risk, should, over time, result in lower and more uniform state and nonstate contractor change order rates.

**4b. Contractor Evaluations:**

<b>Contractors' Evaluation (Scale of 1-5)</b>	<b>Average of State Projects</b>	<b>Average of Nonstate Projects</b>	<b>Overall Average</b>
99/00	3.56	3.58	3.57
00/01	3.77	2.38	2.84
<b>01/02 &lt;current report&gt;</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.50</b>

As with the architectural evaluations contractor evaluations are ranked on a 1-low to 5-high scale. A median ranking of 3 indicates that the contractor 'achieved expectations'. For the

current reporting year the overall average **(3.50)** indicates a general level of satisfaction/acceptance of overall contractor performance.

At the high end, contractor Swinerton & Walberg awarded the San Bernardino Coachella Off-Campus Center, Phase I project received a '5-excellent'-performance ranking from the San Bernardino campus. This high satisfaction rating is one of the reasons we are pursuing increased use of the CM at Risk project delivery method. The low ranking was for Allen Bender, Inc., ranked by the Chico campus at 2.0 on a problem plagued renovation and expansion of the Bell Memorial Union.

Contractor evaluations are used as a component of the systemwide contractor prequalification process. Due to the requirements of public contract law under which CSU projects must be awarded and the requirement to accept the lowest qualified bid, the prequalification process and prior performance ratings are relied upon as an important tool to improve the overall quality of contractors on CSU projects. Ratings of less than '2-improvement needed' are used by CPDC as a basis for contractor disqualification. For this reporting period no contractor ratings fell below this threshold.

### **Claims and Litigation**

- **Chico Bell Union Renovation:** Contractor petitioned CSU Claims Review Board for settlement. Claim was settled in favor of contractor in the amount of \$2,000,000.
- **Los Angeles Engineering & Technology Renovation:** The CSU is currently pursuing litigation seeking damages from Architect/Engineer design team for design errors and omissions (mechanical system). Approximate claim amount is \$1,400,000.

**SUMMARY ROLLUP REPORT  
 2001/02 Annual Report  
 Completed Capital Outlay Projects**

**For the Project Reporting Period 10/01/01 to 09/30/02**

Number of Projects: **17**      Total costs of completed projects: **\$211,134,994**

**Project Budget Performance**

*Actual final project cost as a percentage of original budgeted cost*

	Average	Range
Total cost including design, construction and management cost	<b>106%</b>	<b>91.66% to 130.12%</b>

**Project Schedule Performance**

*Actual time to complete as a percentage of original planned schedule*

Total project duration from funding to completion	<b>139%</b>	<b>99.77% to 226.29%</b>
---	-------------	--------------------------

**Project Architect/Engineer Performance**

Errors and Omissions as a percentage of final construction cost	<b>2.39%</b>	<b>0.03% to 11.03%</b>
---	--------------	------------------------

A/E evaluation campus composite rating	<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.80 to 5.00</b>
--	-------------	---------------------

5 = Outstanding; 4 = Exceeded Expectations; 3 = Achieved Expectations; 2 = Needs Improvement; 1 = Unsatisfactory  
 This is a composite score combining evaluations of design quality, user group satisfaction, sub-consultant performance, responsiveness, timeliness and other issues.

**Project Contractor Performance**

Change orders (non-owner request), as a % of final construction cost	<b>6.86%</b>	<b>0.43% to 32.12%</b>
--	--------------	------------------------

Contractor evaluation campus composite rating	<b>3.50</b>	<b>2.00 to 5.00</b>
---	-------------	---------------------

5 = Outstanding; 4 = Exceeded Expectations; 3 = Achieved Expectations; 2 = Needs Improvement; 1 = Unsatisfactory  
 This is a composite score combining evaluations of project staff, fairness in pricing change work, schedule performance and other issues.

2001/02 Annual Report  
 Completed Capital Outlay Projects  
 EXPANDED SUMMARY DETAIL REPORT  
 For The Project Reporting Period  
 10/01/01 to 09/30/02 (01/02 Yr. Projects)

01/02 ALL PROJECTS

Campus	Project Identification	Project Funding S N/S	A/E E&O	A/E Evaluation	Contractor E&O	Contractor Evaluation	Project Type	Delivery Method	Project Budgeted Cost
CH	Bell Memorial Union Exp & Reno	NS	7.15	3.00	10.38	2.00	Remodel/Add	DBA	\$27,410,158
DH	Nat Sci & Math Bldg.HVAC Upgrade	S	2.04	2.91	8.84	2.25	Remodel	DBA	\$3,919,000
FU	Seismic Upgrade, Langsdorf Hall	S	2.05	3.80	4.80	3.63	Remodel	DBA	\$4,181,000
LA	Engineering & Tech Bldg Renovation	S	11.03	2.29	12.56	3.25	Remodel	DBA	\$25,444,000
LB	University Office Building	NS	0.13	5.00	7.90	4.00	New	DBA	\$992,000
PO	Technology and Training Center	NS	0.85	4.20	2.38	4.13	New	DBA	\$9,158,800
PO	Collins Hospitality Ctr. Phase II	NS	3.67	2.80	3.67	2.75	New	DBA	\$6,283,000
PO	Agriscapes	NS	3.90	2.60	3.90	2.83	New	DBA	\$5,483,197
SA	Thermal Energy Storage Expansion	S	1.10	4.20	3.20	3.13	Remodel	DBA	\$1,356,957
SB	Student Housing Phase I	NS	0.35	4.40	3.06	3.38	New	DBA	\$11,286,000
SB	Coachella Off-Campus, Phase I	NS	0.36	5.00	5.87	5.00	New	CM@R	\$10,145,000
SD	Seismic Upgrade, IVC Auditorium/Classrm	S	0.50	3.60	32.12	4.88	Remodel	DBA	\$1,000,000
SD	Athletics Admin. Hall of Fame	NS	2.43	2.09	5.43	2.50	New	DB	\$14,985,275
SD	Res Suites/Res Dining Complex	NS	0.10	2.54	0.43	4.38	New	DB	\$35,884,000
SD	Parking Structure 6	NS	-	-	-	-	New	DB	\$17,080,000
SJ	University House	NS	0.03	1.80	2.12	4.38	Remodel	DBA	\$3,024,442
ST	Educational Services Building	S	2.62	4.40	3.05	3.50	New	DBA	\$24,409,000
<b>Totals</b>			<b>2.39</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>6.86</b>	<b>3.50</b>			

<b>6</b>	State Projects	3.22	3.53	10.76	3.44
<b>11</b>	Nonstate Projects	1.90	3.34	4.51	3.54
<b>17</b>	Total	<b>2.39</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>6.86</b>	<b>3.50</b>

2001/02 Annual Report  
 Completed Capital Outlay Projects  
 EXPANDED SUMMARY DETAIL REPORT  
 For The Project Reporting Period  
 10/01/01 to 09/30/02 (01/02 Yr. Projects)

01/02 ALL PROJECTS

Campus	Project Identification	Actual Total Cost	% of Original Cost	Proj Start Date	Planned Duration (Days)	Actual Duration (Days)	% of Original Schedule
CH	Bell Memorial Union Exp & Reno	\$29,443,787	107.42%	11/26/1996	1007	1800	178.75%
DH	Nat Sci & Math Bldg.HVAC Upgrade	\$3,921,558	100.07%	1/1/1999	974	1151	118.17%
FU	Seismic Upgrade, Langsdorf Hall	\$5,059,268	121.01%	7/1/1997	883	1627	184.26%
LA	Engineering & Tech Bldg Renovation	\$27,230,095	107.02%	7/15/1996	1020	1453	142.45%
LB	University Office Building	\$1,262,270	127.24%	12/21/2000	345	386	111.88%
PO	Technology and Training Center	\$8,395,371	91.66%	3/14/1998	1158	1494	129.02%
PO	Collins Hospitality Ctr. Phase II	\$6,237,437	99.27%	12/15/1998	762	1218	159.84%
PO	Agriscapes	\$5,411,876	98.70%	7/1/1997	700	1584	226.29%
SA	Thermal Energy Storage Expansion	\$1,426,031	105.09%	3/26/2001	432	431	99.77%
SB	Student Housing Phase I	\$12,841,437	113.78%	10/1/1999	670	752	112.24%
SB	Coachella Off-Campus, Phase I	\$10,759,347	106.06%	1/1/2000	609	810	133.00%
SD	Seismic Upgrade, IVC Auditorium/Classrm	\$1,009,987	101.00%	6/30/2000	397	692	174.31%
SD	Athletics Admin. Hall of Fame	\$19,498,549	130.12%	1/18/2000	530	729	137.55%
SD	Res Suites/Res Dining Complex	\$35,284,811	98.33%	3/31/1999	837	924	110.39%
SD	Parking Structure 6	\$15,672,608	91.76%	1/25/2000	583	616	105.66%
SJ	University House	\$3,271,562	108.17%	4/1/2000	579	na	na
ST	Educational Services Building	\$24,409,000	100.00%	7/1/1998	1278	1315	102.90%
		<b>\$211,134,994</b>	<b>106.28%</b>				<b>139.16%</b>

<b>6</b>	State Projects		105.70%				136.98%
<b>11</b>	Nonstate Projects		106.59%				140.46%
<b>17</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>106.28%</b>				<b>139.16%</b>

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

**Status Report on the 2003/2004 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

This item presents a comparison between the CSU 2003/2004 state funded capital outlay program request and the funding level included in the governor's budget.

**Background**

The California State University's Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2003/04 through 2007/08 was presented at the September 2002 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved a 2003/04 priority list totaling \$690.2 million. The priorities include the completion of previously funded projects, seismic strengthening, renovation, and growth projects for campuses to meet enrollment demands.

The governor's proposed budget will be published prior to the January board meeting. A handout will be presented at the meeting comparing the trustees' budget request with that of the governor's budget.

# Status Report on the 2003/04 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

January 2003



*The California State University*

---

### **Status Report on the 2003/04 State Funded Capital Outlay Program**

The California State University's proposed 2003/04 Capital Outlay Program and Five Year Capital Improvement Program 2003/04 through 2007/08 was approved at the September 17-18, 2002 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees' budget request contained 29 projects for correcting health and safety code deficiencies, seismic strengthening, building renovations to meet existing deficiencies and growth in campus student capacity. The capital program request for FY 2003/04 totaled \$690.2 million. With the passage of Proposition 47, it was anticipated that \$206 million would be available to fund the first ten priority projects in the program.

The governor's budget was published on January 10, 2003, and included \$198.2 million for nine CSU projects based on the following:

- Adjusted Project Budgets:
  - Minor Capital Outlay, reduced by \$5,806,000 to fund the general obligation bond reserve.
  - CSU Stanislaus, Science II Replacement Building (Seismic), reduced by \$705,000 to adjust the amount budgeted for inflation.
- Withheld recommendation on the California Maritime Academy's Land Acquisition project pending a scope visit and receipt of additional information.

Trustees' priorities 11 through 29 totaling \$484.2 million were not included in the governor's budget. They may be resubmitted for the Board of Trustees' consideration for the 2004/05 State Funded Capital Outlay Program pending the individual campus priority submittal for 2004/05.

## State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2003/04 Priority List

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index **4019** and Equipment Price Index **2564**

Rank Order	Category	Campus	Project Title	FTE	Trustees' Request		Governor's Budget	
					Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IB	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay Program		PWCE	12,000,000	PWCE	6,194,000 (a)
2	IB	Fresno	Science II Replacement	1,440	E	1,958,000	E	1,958,000
3	IB	Chico	Student Services Center	0	WC	32,840,000	WC	32,840,000
4	IB	Stanislaus	Science II Replacement Bldg. (Seismic)	680	WC	46,401,000	WC	45,696,000 (b)
5	IB	San Bernardino	Science Buildings Reno./Add., Phase II	0	PWC	21,786,000	PWC	21,786,000
6	IB	Sonoma	Renovate Darwin Hall	288	PWC	26,012,000	PWC	26,012,000
7	II	Maritime Academy	Land Acquisition	N/A	A	1,301,000	A	0 (c)
8	II	San Diego	Social Sciences/Art Gallery/Prkg. Structure 8 ◇	948	PWC	25,384,000	PWC	25,384,000
9	IB	Sacramento	Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase 2	N/A	PWC	18,691,000	PWC	18,691,000
10	IB	San Jose	Joint Library - Secondary Effect	1,731	PWC	19,633,000	PWC	19,633,000
<b>Totals</b>				<b>5,087</b>		<b>\$206,006,000</b>		<b>\$198,194,000</b>

**Notes: GOVERNOR'S PROPOSAL**

- (a) Amount reduced to fund bond reserve.
- (b) Amount budgeted for inflation reduced.
- (c) Recommendation withheld pending additional information.

- Categories:
- I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure
    - A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies
    - B. Modernization/Renovation
  - II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

◇ This project is dependent upon state and nonstate funding.

A = Acquisition    P = Preliminary plans    W = Working drawings    C = Construction    E = Equipment

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

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

#### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

#### **Summary**

Schematic plans for four projects are being presented for approval.

#### **1. California State University, Fullerton—Parking Structure I** *Project Architects: A.C. Martin Partners*

#### **Background and Scope**

The CSU Fullerton, Parking Structure I project has two major components of work including a new parking structure and refurbishment of Parking Lot C. The project will add 1,341 new parking spaces to the campus inventory. The project is located in the southwest portion of the main campus, immediately south of the Visual Arts Complex. The structure will be constructed on existing surface Parking Lot D and will contain a total of 2,500 spaces. To reduce vehicular traffic within the campus, vehicles will enter and exit the structure via a new campus entry road from State College Boulevard and through Lot C from Nutwood Avenue. The design focuses on security and safety in and around the structure. The facility will be four-stories including parking on the roof level for a total of five levels. The structure will be poured-in-place, post-tensioned concrete with a ductile moment frame. The project design envisions planting of trees and vine trellises on the east, south and west elevations. The north elevation facing the Visual Arts Complex includes translucent glass and stainless steel screening. The parking structure will complement the new Performing Arts Center addition. The project will also upgrade the existing Parking Lot C (294 spaces) located in the southwest corner of campus at the corner of Nutwood and State College Boulevard. Included in the scope of work for this refurbishment are new lighting, landscaping, slurry coating and re-stripping of the lot, along with a new access road into the Parking Structure from Nutwood Avenue.

#### **Schedule (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings  
Completion of Working Drawings

February 2003  
April 2003

Construction Start	June 2003
Completion of Parking Structure I	August 2005
Completion of Parking Lot C	August 2006

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area (Parking Structure)	775,081 square feet
Structure Parking Spaces	2,500 spaces

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019**

Parking Structure Building Cost (\$8,078 per space)	\$20,195,000
---	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 3.04
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$14.49
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 1.29
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 3.41

Site Development (includes landscaping)	2,252,000
Parking Lot C Refurbishment	<u>641,000</u>

Construction Cost	\$23,088,000
Fees, Contingency and Services	<u>5,112,000</u>

Grand Total	<u>\$28,200,000</u>
-------------	---------------------

**Cost Comparison**

The parking structure construction cost of \$8,078 (excluding site development) per space is comparable to the Northridge parking project approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2001 for \$7,699 per parking space and to the Sacramento parking project approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2000 at \$7,614 per parking space, when adjusted to CCCI 4019.

**Funding Data**

Project financing will be through the issuance of trustee revenue bonds, which will be serviced with parking fee revenue. Approval of the financing will be presented to the board at a future meeting.

### **California Environmental Quality Act Action**

An initial study has been completed and Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was sent to local agencies and filed with the State Clearinghouse on December 1, 2002. The public review period ended on January 1, 2003, and there were no significant comments.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the California State University, Fullerton, Parking Structure I project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures specified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration is hereby adopted as part of this approval of the California State University, Fullerton, Parking Structure I project.
3. With implementation of the adopted mitigation measures, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
4. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.
5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fullerton, Parking Structure I project are approved at a project cost of \$28,200,000 at CCCI 4019.

### **2. California State University, Los Angeles—Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory *Project Architect: Fields Devereaux Harley Ellington***

#### **Background and Scope**

The Board of Trustees' 2000/01 nonstate capital outlay program included the Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory at California State University, Los Angeles. The project is a collaborative effort between the campus, the City and County of Los Angeles, and the State of California. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Scientific Investigation Division, the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) Scientific Services Bureau, the California Forensic

Science Institute, and the university's Department of Criminal Justice will utilize the facility. The proposed 206,500 gross square foot (GSF) building includes individual spaces for separate use by the various agencies and common areas to be jointly used by the building occupants. The partnership benefits include a full service forensic laboratory for use by all parties; improved delivery of forensic science services for law enforcement and the criminal justice system throughout the Los Angeles area; continuing education and distance learning programs for police and forensic scientists throughout the state with the support of the California Department of Justice; and as indicated above will house CSULA's Department of Criminal Justice, which offers an MS degree in Criminalistics and is one of the few graduate forensic science degree programs in the western United States. There will be close operational collaboration between LAPD and LASD crime laboratories, and university departments (e.g. chemistry, biological sciences, psychology, anthropology, nursing and criminal justice). The sharing of expertise and technology will benefit the entire criminal justice community.

The five-story building will be located on 5.87 acres at the southwest corner of the campus with a single point of entry for university and crime lab staff plus visitors. It will include a separate and secure service yard and entry. The building exterior treatment includes spandrel glass and brick elements and is in keeping with the character of the Los Angeles campus, and will include views of the mountains, downtown Los Angeles, exterior landscaped areas and the campus. CSULA's Criminal Justice Department and the California Forensic Science Institute will occupy the majority of the first floor. The areas occupied by the County Sheriff and LAPD labs will be secured throughout the building. It is requested that the Board of Trustees approve the project site plan, exterior design, and interior plans for the university occupied space. The Joint Powers Authority will approve the schematic design later this month, and the State Public Works Board preliminary plan approval is planned for February 2003. The CSU will enter into a ground lease with the State Department of General Services (DGS) for the project construction. Subsequently, DGS will lease back the site and facility to CSU, who in turn will enter into an agreement with the Joint Powers Authority to lease and operate the site and facility for a term of 60 years with an option for an additional 15 years.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	February 2003
Completion of Working Drawings	December 2003
Construction Start	March 2004
Occupancy	September 2005

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	200,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	115,560 square feet

Efficiency 58 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019**

Building Cost (\$289 per GSF)	\$57,757,000
Construction Cost	\$64,713,000
Total Project Cost (\$483 per GSF)	\$96,571,000

**Funding Data**

Funding will be from State Lease Revenue Bonds. The project will be designed and constructed on behalf of the State Public Works Board and the Office of Criminal Justice Planning by the State Department of General Services in cooperation with the City and County of Los Angeles and the California State University. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning will then enter into contracts and subleases to facilitate the occupancy of the facility. Repayment of the bonds will be made by the state through appropriation made to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action**

The State Office of Criminal Justice Planning is the Lead Agency with respect to CEQA compliance. An initial study was prepared and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on September 27, 2002. The 30-day public review period ended on November 1, 2002 and no adverse comments were received during the review period. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was certified and adopted by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning and filed with the State Clearinghouse on December 23, 2002 in compliance with Section 21108 of the Public Resources Code.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The State Office of Criminal Justice Planning has certified a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The board concurs with the determination set forth in the Mitigated Negative Declaration that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment.
2. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures specified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration is required as part of this approval of the California State University, Los Angeles, Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory project.

3. The project will benefit the California State University.
4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Los Angeles, Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory project are approved at a total project cost of \$96,571,000 at CCCI 4019.

**3. California State University, San Bernardino—Student Union Expansion**  
*Project Architect: Cannon Design*

**Background and Scope**

The California State University, San Bernardino, Student Union Expansion project will renovate 22,000 GSF of space in the existing Student Union, and construct an addition of 40,000 GSF. Renovation of existing areas shall include functional modifications, and code upgrades such as compliance with the Americans with Disabilities fire alarm systems and structure work. The additional space will include lounge/study areas, a small 200-seat theater, meeting rooms, club and organization workspace, retail space, a radio station, and office space. The building will be a two-story, wood-framed structure with split face block/plaster exterior finish. The existing open courtyard will be covered by wood trusses, metal roofing and skylights, which will create a grand lobby, lounge, and circulation space at the hub of the building. Portions of the existing building will be demolished for functional space arrangements and proper circulation. Portions of the new areas will be built on top of the existing one story building, which will require structural upgrades. The new addition will complement the existing building in use of material and space arrangements.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	February 2003
Completion of Working Drawings	July 2003
Construction Start	October 2003
Occupancy	August 2005

**Basic Statistics**

	<u>New Construction</u>	<u>Renovation</u>
Gross Building Area	40,000 square feet	22,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	29,000 square feet	16,000 square feet
Efficiency	72%	73%

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

New Building Cost (\$214 per GSF)	\$ 8,551,000
Renovation Building Cost (\$84 per GSF)	1,858,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<u>New Construction</u> <i>(\$214 per GSF)</i>	<u>Renovation</u> <i>(\$84 per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 5.18	\$ 4.55
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 81.20	\$ 18.18
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 39.75	\$ 12.45
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$ 67.93	\$ 31.64
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 19.73	\$ 2.27
f. Special Demolition/Hazmat		\$ 15.36
 Site Development		<u>598,000</u>
 Construction Cost		\$11,007,000
Fees, Contingency and Services		<u>3,232,000</u>
 Total Project Cost (\$230 per GSF)		\$14,239,000
Group II Equipment		<u>761,000</u>
 Grand Total		<u>\$15,000,000</u>

**Cost Comparison**

The building cost of \$214 per GSF represents only new construction costs. The cost is comparable to the Hayward University Union Expansion at \$221 at CCCI 4019.

**Funding Data**

The student population on February 28 and March 1, 2001 approved a student fee referendum. Funding for the project will be provided through Student Union reserves, and through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action (CEQA)**

A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the California State University, San Bernardino, master plan revision that included the Student Union Expansion plans was certified by the Board of Trustees on January 27, 1999. A copy of the previously approved FEIR, which includes all comments received by California State University, San Bernardino on the Draft EIR, and responses submitted by CSU will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The FEIR was previously certified by the Board of Trustees on January 27, 1999, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. Prior to certification of said FEIR, the Board of Trustees reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR in relation to the California State University, San Bernardino, Student Union Expansion schematic plans and construction project and that the board continues to consider the information provided by the FEIR in its action on the project.
3. This board finds that the California State University, San Bernardino, Student Union Expansion project considered in this action is consistent with the project description and analysis previously reviewed in January 1999.
4. The project will benefit the California State University.
5. The mitigation measures and implementation of the recommended improvements contained in the FEIR certified by this board on January 27, 1999 for the master plan revision and the Student Union Expansion project are hereby incorporated by reference and made part of this approval of the California State University, San Bernardino, Student Union Expansion schematic plans.
6. The schematic plans for the California State University, San Bernardino Student Union Expansion are approved at a project cost of \$15,000,000 at CCCI 4019.

**4. California State University, San Marcos—Academic Hall II, Building 13**  
*Project Architect: A.C. Martin Partners Associates*

**Background and Scope**

The CSU San Marcos, Academic Hall II, Building 13 will be the home for the College of Business Administration, with interim tenancy by the Literature and Writing and World Languages Departments as the College of Business Administration grows to maturity. This new building will provide capacity for 3,064 full-time equivalent students and space for eighty-eight faculty offices, six department chair offices and the Dean's administration suite. The project is approximately 79,224 GSF and includes a variety of classroom sizes and configurations, including state-of-the art business case rooms, and eight senior experience rooms for teamwork on projects with area businesses. The building is designed to meet the high technology standards of today's colleges of business. The proposed exterior envelope is primarily a combination of

precast concrete panels and high performance insulated glass. The project will re-route an existing fire access road and proposes to use hardscape and landscape elements to create outdoor study space and connecting elements to adjacent buildings.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	May 2003
Completion of Working Drawings	March 2004
Construction Start	April 2004
Completion of Construction	January 2006

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	79,224
Assignable Building Area	48,506
Efficiency	61%

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019**

Building Cost (\$219 per GSF including Group I equipment)	\$17,386,000
<i>Systems Breakdown (\$ per GSF)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 5.08
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$86.49
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$33.80
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$82.68
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$11.41
Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>1,648,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$18,854,000
Fees, Contingency and Services	<u>5,181,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$247 per GSF)	\$24,215,000
Group II Equipment	<u>2,311,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$26,526,000</u>

**Cost Comparison**

The building exceeds the CSU cost guide of \$194 per GSF due to the inclusion of 8-tiered classrooms, which have increased the cost for interiors, and the exterior enclosure use of precast panels to extend the building life.

### **Funding Data**

State funding is from the issuance of lease revenue bonds as authorized in the Governor's Economic Stimulus package approved in March 2002.

### **California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was certified by the Board of Trustees on March 9, 1988. The Draft EIR was distributed for a 45-day public review period, and a public hearing on the Draft EIR was conducted at the San Diego State University, North County Center on August 28, 1987. The Final EIR evaluated several proposed buildings and related development projects for the California State University, San Marcos campus, including the proposed Academic Hall II, Building 13. No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the proposed Building 13. A copy of the certified Final EIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by California State University, San Marcos on the Draft EIR will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the previously approved Final EIR prepared for the California State University, San Marcos, campus master plan, the board finds that:

1. The Final EIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously approved by the Board of Trustees on March 9, 1988, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final EIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
3. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.
4. The project will benefit the California State University.

5. The mitigation measures and implementation of the recommended improvements specified in the Final EIR for the campus master plan relative to the main (academic) campus development projects are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the California State University, San Marcos, Academic Hall, Building 13.
6. The schematic plans for the California State University, San Marcos, Academic Hall, Building 13 are approved at a project cost of \$26,526,000 at CCCI 4019.