

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 4:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 14, 2000
San Jose State University
Student Union Ballroom

Ali C. Razi, Chair
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair
Debra S. Farar
Harold Goldwhite
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of January 25, 2000

1. Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
3. Categories and Criteria for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Action*
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
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

January 25, 2000

Members Present

Ali C. Razi, Chair
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair
Debra S. Farar
Harold Goldwhite
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Other Trustees Present

Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Martha C. Fallgatter
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 16, 1999, were approved as submitted.

Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Razi presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-01-00).

Purchase of Real Property

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-02-00).

Status Report on the California State University, Northridge—University Club

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Razi presented Agenda Item 3 as a consent information item.

Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor’s Budget

At Chair Razi’s request, Patrick Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, made reference to this item’s handout that represented a comparison of the trustees’ capital outlay request in September 1999 versus the governor’s budget that was published on January 10, 2000. He stated that the totals in both columns are the same, so that the governor has recognized the trustees’ priorities for all listed projects.

Mr. Drohan noted that the governor’s budget continues to support the CSU’s ability to streamline the approval and administrative processes for capital outlay projects.

Trustee Goldwhite inquired as to why a slight reduction in funding for the renovation of the physical sciences building at CSU Los Angeles occurred. Mr. Drohan responded that the issue of the fund adjustment centers on the construction implementation approach in designing the project. Through the preliminary plan phase, it was thought that construction would be phased. On the basis of staff’s discussions with the Department of Finance and suggestions for the potential of seeking one-time funding for occupant relocation through the construction period, staff decided to change course slightly. Mr. Drohan indicated that what is reflected in this item is a reduction in the fees that would have been required had we maintained a course of phasing the construction implementation of this renovation project.

Annual Report on Completed CSU Capital Outlay Projects

Assistant Vice Chancellor Patrick Drohan gave a visual presentation summarizing the key elements of the first Annual Report on Completed CSU Capital Outlay Projects as handed out earlier in the meeting. He commented that while the initial report is very positive, staff considers it a work in progress that will produce further refinements in subsequent reports. It was noted that the capital outlay projects being reported are those completed between October 1998 and September 1999. The report contains three basic elements: (1) Total Program: all projects completed in the reporting period and an analysis of their budget and schedule performance; (2) Continuously Funded Projects: all projects completed without interruption and an analysis of their budget and schedule performance; and (3) Interrupted (Stopped and Restarted) Projects: all projects that were interrupted and restarted and an analysis of their budget and schedule performance.

Overall, Mr. Drohan stated that the budget performance for the 17 continuously funded projects was slightly under budget in comparison to the actual cost versus the budgeted cost. In the eight interrupted projects, the figure was slightly over budget, which is a good figure considering the work that campuses had to undertake to value engineer these projects during the restart phase. Mr. Drohan continued by saying that typically these projects sit idle for three to five years; therefore, while bringing projects within this average figure is a good achievement, it is also reflective of the effects of the interruptive process.

Mr. Drohan explained that the same thing could be said about schedule performance. The noninterrupted projects were close to being on schedule while the interrupted projects reflected a much greater overrun in the time between planned and actual. Part of the overrun was a result of the impact to the schedule around the restart of design services for interrupted projects. Another part of it has to do with the reporting. Mr. Drohan said that staff is going to be refining the procedures to hopefully improve those performance measurements.

The architect's error and omission rate is a critical item as it pertains to change orders and added costs to a project. This is typically a result of poor coordination or oversight on the part of the design architects and engineers. For the 17 projects that were continuously funded, the average was 1.2 percent. The industry's errors and omissions average practice is approximately 3 percent. While the interrupted projects percentage of 2.9 was close to industry practice, much of it was the result of restarting the project after a considerable interruption of time.

Mr. Drohan indicated that the contractor change order rates relate to the average of all the contract change orders, without the owner-requested change orders, against the project-award amounts. He said that the CSU project budgets include a 5 and 7 percent project contingency for new starts and renovations. For the noninterrupted projects, the CSU is within that percentage figure and the interrupted projects were slightly over.

It was noted that all of the 17 projects came within the overall time frames that the CSU was given in meeting supplemental language. Mr. Drohan, however, stated that there are areas where we can improve.

In reference to the architects' and contractors' performances, the architects have performed well and the contractors, by and large, have performed above average.

Mr. Drohan pointed out that of the 17 continuously funded projects, only two were new projects. All of the other projects were renovation projects including some of the more difficult and complex renovations that we have to deal with, particularly utility infrastructure and those types of projects. Seismic retrofits have been a perpetual headache for us as they pertain to trying to contain costs around unforeseen conditions.

All in all, Mr. Drohan stated that the CSU performed very well as a system, and that the complete detailed report by project is available upon request.

Chair Razi thanked the staff for compiling this report. He stated that this is important information and serves as a performance card for the system. Chair Razi asked if next year's report could reflect a one-page matrix of all the campuses, showing budget vs. cost and those projects that had claims filed against them, if any.

Trustee Pierce commended Mr. Drohan and the campuses for the outstanding job in managing the construction projects. He suggested that it would be helpful if future reports could reflect renovation versus new projects. In addition, Trustee Pierce believed that in managing our relationships, it would be important to staff if this information was also sorted by contractor and by architect, since many of the contractors are working with multiple campuses. Over time, staff would be able to ascertain, for example, which contractors with over five years' experience have a 3 percent change order rate, or have a 9 percent change order rate, or are involved in litigation.

Mr. Drohan indicated that this request for information is contained within the detailed individual project sheets that do identify the individual contractors and architects. Another item that he believed the board would like to know is that staff has now changed the Contract General Conditions, with the concurrence of general counsel, to include a phrase that advises the contractors that they are going to be evaluated and the information will be coming to the Board of Trustees as a normal course of reporting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West emphasized that there are two things that are occurring. One is our relationship with the state, the legislature, and the governor with respect to how they fund our capital projects. He stated that it continues to be the CSU's intent to acquire lump sum funding for our capital projects. Mr. West mentioned that most people believe this is the way the CSU's projects are funded, but in fact, the state has never funded our projects that way. From a legislator's point of view, the funding approval and review of capital projects is a four-year process, i.e., the preliminary planning stage, the working drawing stage, the construction stage and the equipment stage. Mr. West explained that staff is trying to get this to a one-year process so we can proceed rapidly. He stated that we have received good support from the Department of Finance, the legislature, and the governor to get all of our projects into that category.

Mr. West explained that the second thing that is occurring is our delegation to the campuses for construction management. In this report there is a mixture of projects that Mr. Drohan's staff has managed in the traditional form and the campuses have managed under their delegation. Mr. West explained that this delegation is what drove a lot of the accountability associated with this report. We believe that it is the most effective way to get these projects completed, but we also believe that we have to monitor it very closely. Aside from this first report, there is a substantial amount of projects that are in design or under construction, and Mr. West is pretty confident that the CSU will receive similar results in the future.

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Student Housing Project at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Vice Chair Wang requested Patrick Drohan to present the item. With the aid of a map of the campus, Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda.

Trustee Stennis inquired if the previously approved parking structure project is under construction.

President Baker responded that the parking structure is ongoing and is scheduled for completion in April 2000.

Trustee Vitti asked if there are any negatives voiced by the campus community with respect to the campus master plan revision.

President Baker indicated that this project has been embraced fairly broadly due to the significant support in the community and on the campus to expand student housing. Currently, the campus has 2,800 beds, which does house the freshman class. He continued by saying that this proposed project would accommodate upper classmen, particularly second year students who wish to continue to live on campus. The housing situation in San Luis Obispo is critical since there is very little additional growth and a significant number of students coming in from other parts of the state to attend the community college. Both groups of students are contending for the same student housing. President Baker stated that over the past three decades, the private sector has built some 8,000 beds on the periphery of the campus in various forms, including apartments and condominiums, but not residence halls with dining facilities, etc., that are similar to what they have on the campus now.

To offset the potential negative views of the private sector around competition for housing, President Baker explained that the university is engaging the private sector more closely in discussions concerning the plan and the overall planning process. The quid pro quo for this effort would be the campus students would receive a higher priority for the off-campus housing and the facility would be treated more like on-campus housing, even though it is on land that doesn't belong to the university.

In reviewing the first phase of on-campus residential housing over the past 25 years and the current demand for an additional 1,400 beds, of which the proposed project will only provide 800, Trustee Wang inquired as to the campus's future plan to meet this need.

President Baker stated that next year the university plans to bring to the Board of Trustees a revised master plan that will include an enrollment revision as well. Several alternatives are being considered as an integral part of the prospect of doubling the housing program. He said that the alternatives will possibly include the potential for some private/public partnerships, along with an expansion or redevelopment of some of the area around the campus. President Baker emphasized that if the university expands the enrollment of the campus, it is clear that they will have to address the issue of student housing, otherwise the university will have a terrific problem in the community.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-03-00).

Approval of Schematic Plans

With the use of a computerized presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. This item proposes the approval of schematic plans for California State University, Fresno, Department of Justice Crime Lab, and California State University, Fresno, Event Center. He stated that the appropriate environmental impact information has been prepared for these two projects.

6
CPB&G

Trustee Wang commended the campus on its fundraising achievements for the event center.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolutions approving schematic plans for both projects (RCPBG 01-04-00).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1999/2000 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 amend the 1999/2000 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- | | | | |
|----|---|------|-------------|
| 1. | California State University, Northridge
Alumni Center at Sierra Hall Complex | PWCE | \$6,500,000 |
| 2. | California State University, Northridge
Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics | PWCE | \$2,425,000 |

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

This item amends the 1999/2000 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. California State University, Northridge | PWCE | \$6,500,000 |
| Alumni Center at Sierra Hall Complex | | |

CSU Northridge wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the alumni center at the Sierra Hall Complex (facility #36 on the campus master plan). The proposed project will be adjacent to Jerome Richfield Hall and is a 30,000 gross square foot (gsf) three-story facility. Minor modifications to Jerome Richfield Hall are also included in the project. The first floor consists of approximately 12,000 gsf of meeting space with food service areas, plus a 2,500 gsf three-story atrium connecting the building to Jerome Richfield Hall. The second floor contains 8,500 gsf for the alumni center offices and ancillary spaces. The third floor will house the university corporation offices and conference facilities. The Jerome Richfield Hall modification includes access on each floor to a new stairway and a new elevator, providing ADA compliance for both buildings. Landscaping will also be provided. FEMA earthquake restoration funds in the amount of \$1.1 million and tax-exempt bonds issued by the University Corporation in the amount of \$5.4 million will fund the project.

- | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|
| 2. California State University, Northridge | PWCE | \$2,425,000 |
| Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics | | |

CSU Northridge wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a one-story building to house the new Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics (facility #51 on the campus master plan). The proposed project is an addition to the physical education building. The new facility will contain approximately 10,000 gross square feet and will feature four therapeutic pools, a warm-water pool for spinal cord disabling conditions, a spa for soft-tissue and joint injuries, a cool-water pool for adults with neuromuscular disabling conditions, and a moving-floor pool which can adjust to accommodate children and people requiring different water depths. The facility will also include restrooms, changing rooms, reception space, office space, storage, and mechanical/electrical space. Funding for the project is from a \$925,000 federal appropriation and a \$1.5 million donation. Operating funds will come from user fees. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: (1) \$6,500,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Northridge, Alumni Center at Sierra Hall Complex; and (2) \$2,425,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Northridge, Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics project.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2
March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

The California State University's proposed 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 through 2004/05 were presented at the September 1999 Board of Trustees' meeting. Although the 2000/01 state funded request identified campus needs totaling \$505.5 million, the trustees approved a priority list totaling \$153.3 million based on the anticipated funding level from the 1998 four-year general obligation bond measure (Proposition 1A).

The governor's proposed 2000/01 budget maintained the \$153.3 million budget request with some adjustments to the program, which were reported at the January Board of Trustees' meeting. The Legislative Analyst's Office will publish the *Analysis of the 2000/01 Budget Bill* in February 2000. A comparison between the CSU 2000/01 state funded capital outlay program request, the funding in the governor's budget, and the LAO recommendations will be distributed at the meeting.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3
March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Categories and Criteria for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests the Board of Trustees' approval of the categories and criteria to be used for the 2001/02 state funded capital outlay program. The categories and criteria are proposed to remain unchanged from the 2000/01 program and have been reviewed by campus administrative staff.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3

March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Categories and Criteria for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

The Board of Trustees annually adopts categories and criteria that are used in setting priorities for the state funded capital outlay program. It is recommended that the proposed categories and criteria for the 2001/02 program remain unchanged from those approved by the Board of Trustees last year. The proposed categories and criteria have been reviewed by campus administrative staff and are included in Attachment A.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the Categories and Criteria for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, as contained in Attachment A of the trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2000, meeting of the Board of Trustees be approved; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is hereby directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program for The California State University. If this results in an "action year" (2001/02) request beyond reasonable expectation of available funding, the chancellor is delegated authority to adjust the number of campus projects submitted.

Categories and Criteria to Set Priorities for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

General Criteria

- A campus may submit a maximum of one project for the budget year, including health and safety projects. Exceptions to this limit will be considered on an individual project basis. Equipment, seismic strengthening and telecommunication infrastructure projects are excluded from this limit.
- For the four planning years, the campus may submit a maximum of three projects per year, including health and safety projects.
- Seismic strengthening projects will be prioritized according to recommendations from the Seismic Review Board.
- Campuses are to prepare their project requests for the five-year program using PWC lump sum funding for all new project starts. Campus requests for phased funding will be considered on an individual project basis. Approval of a phased project will require the project be completely funded (PWC) within the expected bond cycle. With the exception of equipment funds, requests for projects that received prior funding should use the lump sum method for the remaining funds required to complete the projects.
- Current trustee-approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus enrollment only. These numbers are to be used as the basis of comparison for justifying capital projects that address enrollment demand to be accommodated on campus. Enrollment estimates that exceed these figures are expected to be accommodated through distributed learning and other off-campus instructional means.

Individual Categories and Criteria

I. Funds for Projects of Systemwide Benefit

These funds are distributed among campuses for minor capital outlay projects, and planning for projects proposed in the five-year plan including: feasibility studies, master planning, utility master planning and/or energy studies.

II. Renovation

- A. These funds correct structural, health and safety code deficiencies by addressing life safety problems and promoting code compliance in existing facilities. Projects include seismic strengthening, correcting building code deficiencies, and addressing regulatory changes which impact campus facilities or equipment.

- B. These funds make new and remodeled facilities operable by providing equipment, renovating building systems, and replacing utility services to make buildings and the campus infrastructure operable.

- C. These funds meet campus deficiency needs by renovating or constructing new replacement buildings in response to academic and support program needs and deficiencies.

III. Growth

These funds eliminate instructional and support deficiencies, including new buildings, additions, land acquisitions, and site development.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4
March 14-15, 2000

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 the following projects will be presented for approval:

1. California State University, Monterey Bay—Science Academic Center
2. San Diego State University—Chemistry/Geology/Business Administration/Math Renovation
3. California State University, San Marcos—Field House/Student Union Offices

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolutions.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4

March 14-15, 2000

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

1. California State University, Monterey Bay—Science Academic Center

Project Architect: Anshen + Allen

Background and Scope

Since the establishment of CSU Monterey Bay in 1995, the Earth Systems Science and Policy, Mathematics, and Statistics programs have steadily grown from a combined total of 102 full time equivalent students (FTES) to 374 FTES in 1999. This growth is projected to increase to 1,081 FTES in 2005. The proposed Science Academic Center will consolidate these integrated programs into one facility and provide the capacity needed to serve the current and projected enrollment growth. The proposed project is a 65,151 gross square foot three-story facility that will provide fourteen lower and upper division wet and dry laboratories, six classrooms, faculty offices, preparation rooms, service areas, and storage space. The building is oriented to provide wind protection for an exterior teaching, demonstration, planting, and gathering space, in addition to the interior teaching spaces. The exterior building materials are concrete masonry units and cement board. This project is the first phase of a master planned science complex.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	June 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	January 2001
Construction Start	March 2001
Occupancy	December 2002

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	65,151 square feet
Assignable Building Area	40,095 square feet
Efficiency	61.5 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3909

Building Cost (\$206 per gross square foot)	\$13,393,000
---	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 3.93
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$73.85
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$37.49
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$90.29

Site Development (includes landscaping)	\$ 1,598,000
Group I Equipment	<u>1,647,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$16,638,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>3,496,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$309 per gross square foot)	\$20,134,000
Group II Equipment	<u>1,985,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$22,119,000</u>

Funding Data

Funding for the project will be a combination of state funds, grant funds and private donor funds. The two-thirds state funding for the construction phase is in the governor's proposed 2000 budget. The Packard Foundation provided \$2.25 million toward the project, a portion of which is being used for design development and working drawings. A capital campaign is in progress for the \$5.35 million nonstate funds required for the project. Private funding commitments are contingent upon approval of the 2000/01 state funding portion.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the California State University, Monterey Bay, Science Academic Center in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 2, 2000.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Monterey Bay, Science Academic Center has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. The project will benefit The California State University; and
4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Monterey Bay Science Academic Center are approved at a project cost of \$22,119,000 at CCCI 3909.

2. San Diego State University—Chemistry, Geology, Business Administration and Math Buildings Renovation
Project Architect: McGraw/Baldwin Architects

Background and Scope

The proposed Chemistry/Geology/Business Administration/Math Buildings Renovation project will enable the adaptive reuse of an existing 1960 hard science laboratory facility. The project renovates the interior and exterior of the chemistry/geology building and will provide faculty and staff offices; state-of-the-art soft labs, classrooms, computer labs, and teaching labs; and storage and non-capacity departmental support uses for the College of Sciences. The project also provides a major cleanup of hazardous conditions created by forty years of chemical lab use and corrects code and functional deficiencies. The exterior facade renovation of the chemistry/geology building will substantially benefit its energy efficiency by replacing the 1960 single-pane-operable windows with fixed insulated windows. Punched window openings will also provide architectural enhancement to the structure by visually reducing the building's mass. Math and computer science classes currently in the business administration/math building will be relocated to the chemistry/geology building and a modest renovation of the vacated space will occur.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	April 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	October 2000
Construction Start	March 2001
Occupancy	December 2002

Basic Statistics

Chemistry/Geology Building

Gross Building Area	109,600 square feet
Assignable Building Area	67,260 square feet
Efficiency	61 percent

BAM Building

Gross Building Area Renovated	38,925 square feet
-------------------------------	--------------------

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847

Building Cost (\$100 per gross square foot) \$14,827,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 2.85
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$27.50
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$33.05
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$36.40

Hazardous Materials Abatement \$ 329,000
Site Development (includes landscaping) 329,000
Group I Equipment (included in building cost above) 0

Construction Cost \$15,485,000
Fees & Contingency 4,050,000

Total Project Cost (\$132 per gross square foot) \$19,535,000
Group II Equipment 3,415,000

Grand Total \$22,950,000

Funding Data

Project funding is from November 1998 general obligation bonds.

California Environmental Quality Act Action (CEQA)

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the San Diego State University, Chemistry/Geology/Business Administration/Math Buildings Renovation project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on October 13, 1987.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the San Diego State University, Chemistry/Geology/Business Administration/Math Buildings Renovation project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. The project will benefit The California State University; and
4. The schematic plans for the San Diego State University, Chemistry/Geology/Business Administration/Math Buildings Renovation project are approved at a project cost of \$22,950,000 at CCCI 3847.

3. California State University, San Marcos—Field House/Student Union Offices
Project Architect: Robbins Jorgensen Christopher

Background and Scope

At the May 1999 meeting, the Board of Trustees amended the 1998/99 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to include the CSU San Marcos, Field House/Student Union Offices project. As a donor/student-fee funded venture, the campus will develop, construct, and operate the new 32,262 gross square foot facility on approximately two acres of campus land. CSU San Marcos has 4,312 full time equivalent students (FTES) and is growing at a projected rate of approximately 400 FTES per year. This added enrollment creates a demand for student gathering and activity spaces. The campus does not have a formal student union facility and has limited space for student group and club meetings. The student union portion of the proposed project includes a large conference room capable of seating 130 people for dining, three smaller conference rooms, student government offices, support areas, a catering kitchen and convenience store. The project will also provide space to meet the campus's current athletic and recreational needs by providing a multi-purpose gymnasium, weight lifting room, locker rooms, sports medicine facility, equipment storage and offices.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	March 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	September 2000
Construction Start	January 2001
Occupancy	February 2002

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	32,262 square feet
Assignable Building Area	24,800 square feet
Efficiency	77 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847

Building Cost (\$140 per gross square foot) \$4,512,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 7.71
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$45.36
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$28.54
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$58.25

Site Development (includes landscaping) 678,000

Group I Equipment 150,000

Construction Cost \$5,340,000

Fees & Contingency 1,294,000

Total Project Cost (\$206 per gross square foot) \$6,634,000

Group II Equipment 490,000

Grand Total \$7,124,000

Funding Data

Donations, recreation and student union fees will fund the project. A donor has provided funds for the design of the building. Project construction is contingent upon demonstration of a viable financial plan and construction will not proceed until funds are secured. The Board of Trustees will be requested to approve student union bond financing at a future meeting.

California Environmental Quality Act Action (CEQA)

The Board of Trustees certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) on March 9, 1988. The Draft EIR was distributed for a 45-day public review period. 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 Physical Education Facility. The Field House/Student Union Offices project is the first phase of that facility. No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the proposed Physical Education Facility. 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.

8

CPB&G

Agenda Item 4

March 14-15, 2000

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Final EIR for the California State University, San Marcos master plan, certified on March 9, 1988, was prepared to specifically include the Field House/Student Union Offices pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
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; and
3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and the project will benefit the California State University; and
4. The schematic plans for the California State University, San Marcos Field House/ Student Union Offices are approved at a project cost of \$7,124,000 at CCCI 3847.