

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 3:15 p.m. Tuesday, September 14, 2004
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Anthony M. Vitti, Vice Chair
Jeffrey L. Bleich
Moctesuma Esparza
George G. Gowgani
Raymond W. Holdsworth
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Shailesh J. Mehta

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 13, 2004

1. Acceptance of Interest in Real Property, *Action*
2. Amend the 2004/2005 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*
3. Final Report on the 2004/2005 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*

Discussion Items

4. California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report, *Information*
5. State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program
2005/2006 through 2009/2010, *Action*
6. 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**

July 13, 2004

Members Present

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Murray Galinson, Chair of the Board
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Shailesh J. Mehta
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Members Absent

Anthony M. Vitti, Vice Chair

Other Trustees Present

Roberta Achtenberg
Jeffrey Bleich
Herbert Carter
Carol Chandler
Debra Farar
Robert Foster
George Gowgani
Eric Guerra
Corey Jackson
Melinda Guzman Moore
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
Larry Mandel, University Audit
Elvyra F. San Juan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Tsakopoulos greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 18, 2004, were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2004/2005 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-04-13).

Prior to the presentation of the next agenda item, Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West introduced Assistant Vice Chancellor San Juan to the new trustees. Mr. West spoke briefly about Ms. San Juan's new role as assistant vice chancellor of capital planning, design, and construction and how much of an asset she has been in the organization. She is highly experienced in capital planning, and has done a superb job in defending the capital budget in Sacramento.

Final Report on the 2004/2005 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Elvyra San Juan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, presented a summary of the actions that have occurred to date on the 2004/05 capital program. The 2004/05 capital program, totalling \$312 million, has been approved by both the senate and assembly fiscal subcommittees, and is awaiting the approval of the state's final budget. The program is funded from Proposition 55, passed by the voters in March, which provides \$690 million to the CSU to fund both the 2004/05 and 2005/06 programs.

To provide additional background to the capital program, Ms. San Juan reported that the trustees approved the draft program for 2005/06 in March, and this allowed for the submission of programs to the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst's Office for consideration. If the Department of Finance accepts the proposals, the projects will appear in the governor's budget in January 2005. To date, the Department of Finance has not issued a new construction cost index representative of recent price escalation, therefore we are not yet final on the costs of the projects that have been submitted. Site visits with the Department of Finance are being planned for this fall. The Department of Finance will visit 3 to 5 campuses. Site visits help explain the need for a project, versus reviewing strictly the written proposal. With regards to the 2006/07 program, agenda item 5 is related to the priority setting of state funded projects.

Trustee Kaiser asked Ms. San Juan which 3 to 5 campuses have been selected for site visits with the Department of Finance.

Ms. San Juan stated that, in order to comply with the Department of Finance's travel restrictions, Sacramento, San Jose, Maritime Academy, and potentially Hayward have been proposed. Humboldt was proposed because of a possible acquisition project, but their travel restrictions may prohibit the trip. We like to focus on projects that we think will make the final cut in 2005. If not, we will look at projects deferred to 2006.

Regarding the footnotes on Attachment A, Trustee Pierce asked Ms. San Juan if we are supporting the reductions for the capital projects, and he also asked about the \$10 million minor capital outlay reduction.

Ms. San Juan stated that the reductions were supported by the campuses. The projects at Humboldt, Long Beach, and Dominguez Hills had significant cost changes or schedule concerns. With regards to the minor capital outlay issue, the systemwide program is typically used as a balancing point to accommodate a change in the inflation index or the amount the Department of Finance wants to hold in reserve.

Trustee Pierce asked Ms. San Juan about the \$690 million funding from Proposition 55. If only \$313 million is being used this year, will we have \$377 million next year.

Ms. San Juan responded that the total program of approved projects will never equal \$690 million. We are targeting about \$675 million, but that is assuming that a certain amount is held for the cost of issuance and for reserves should one of the projects need an augmentation for a contractor claim or for unforeseen conditions. We expect to have approximately \$355 million to \$360 million, but the reserve issue could require more funds to be held.

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Tsakopoulos presented Agenda Item 2 as an information item.

Annual Report on Completed Capital Projects

With the use of a handout and slide presentation, Ms. San Juan presented Agenda Item 3, the fourth Annual Report on Completed Projects. The CSU has roughly \$2 billion in design and construction with the state and nonstate components at about \$1 billion each. The report includes completed projects from October 2002 through June 2003, as we transition to report by fiscal year. We are currently processing data for projects completed from July 2003 to June 2004, and plan to report on these projects in January 2005.

Ms. San Juan summarized the handout, which contains a high-level three-part summary: the Summary Report, Comparison by Project Delivery Type (design-bid-award, design-build), and Individual Project Reports. Overall, the campuses performed fairly well in managing the 23 projects. The performance statistics are consistent from previous reports. The campuses have more flexibility with nonstate funded projects, and these projects do tend to show greater increases in budget and schedule versus planned. State projects have less flexibility, but campuses are able to add nonstate funds to enhance them. There are essentially an equal number

of state and nonstate projects, as well as the number of new construction versus remodel projects. With growth slowing down to a compact rate of 2.5%, we are likely to see more remodels in the future on the state side.

In the Comparison by Project Delivery Type, the budget performance numbers indicate that on average the projects' final budgets were 102% and 107% of planned, dependent upon delivery method. The average performance of the last three years ranged from 106% to 111% of planned. Three projects significantly exceeded the planned budget: CSU Los Angeles – Child Care; CSU Chico – Infrastructure; and CSU Fullerton – Student Housing. Two of these were positive changes as the campus was able to secure additional funds and change order scope or quality into the project.

The change order performance, at 6% and 13% (higher than usual), was largely driven by two projects, which had a high percent of unforeseen conditions and university requested change orders. The change orders related to architects' errors and omissions were below 3% and within historical and industry norms, a positive sign.

Schedule performance (comparing actual durations versus planned) showed an average of 137% for design-bid-award and 170% for design-build. This is higher than what it has been in the last three years, the average being 140%. The campuses have been encountering problems in meeting the schedule; half of the projects had problems during design, and the other half had problems during construction.

The Individual Project Report tracks comparative data on the budget, schedule, and evaluations of contractor and service providers. We are now able to track the change orders by project delivery type better. We have a number of design-bid projects and we expect that to continue versus the normal design-bid-award delivery. We ask the campuses to rate both the architect/engineer team and the contractor. We also have statistics on whether there are any claims and if the campus would recommend that these service providers be used again. This information is maintained in a database, which is made available to campuses when selecting architects and engineers.

Ms. San Juan gave some visual examples of some of the completed projects. Of the 23 projects, there are a number of support facilities. The campuses have to plan not only to meet the access issues for enrollment, but to meet other student service needs as well. The projects shown were: the Education/Classroom/Faculty Office building at CSU Chico, the Technology Center at CSU Dominguez Hills, the Child Care Center at CSU Los Angeles; and the Telecommunications Infrastructure project at the California Maritime Academy. The CSU has embarked over the last several years to spend about \$300 million in capital funds on telecommunications infrastructure. This investment will improve the voice, video, and data service to academic and administrative functions. The other projects include the CSU Sacramento, Parking Structure II; CSU San Bernardino, Student Housing Phase II project; and at CSU Stanislaus, the Faculty Development Center. There is no litigation on any of these projects, and the amounts of the settlements to contractors for claims during construction were nominal.

Trustee Galinson asked Ms. San Juan whether the funds for the Child Care Center at CSU Los Angeles, which ran over budget, were raised privately or if the project had been changed.

Ms. San Juan responded that the campus was able to secure grant funding, therefore the funds were raised through nonstate sources, and not through fees.

Mr. West commented that a project being over budget is not necessarily bad nor indicative of poor management. If there are additional funds secured during the project, the scope can be expanded. The fact that, out of \$223 million worth of projects, there are only \$100,000 of contractor claims indicates how well these projects are managed.

Trustee Pierce commended Ms. San Juan on the accountability and the good work on managing the projects, adding that this information is really good. He commented that a blended schedule as a measurement of performance on a project, does not distinguish between design versus construction phase issues. He recommended adding the detail of schedule by phase to the summary sheet may help to better reflect where our success lay.

Trustee Kaiser also commended Ms. San Juan for implementing a tracking system where contractors are evaluated and the information is shared with other campuses.

Trustee Chandler stated that she appreciated Ms. San Juan's overview of the completed projects. She asked Ms. San Juan if we are mandated to take the lowest bid, and if there is a list of contractors who should be avoided.

Ms. San Juan responded that we are mandated to take the lowest responsive bid. However, in the design-build delivery process, we are able to build in a quality factor as well. We also have a different delivery method, Construction Management at Risk, which is just starting. There are a couple of nonstate and four state funded projects using this new delivery method.

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Tsakopoulos presented Agenda Item 3 as an information item.

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

With the use of a slide presentation, Ms. San Juan presented an overview of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the roles of the trustees, and our existing guidelines as a complement to the annual report included in the agenda. The purpose of CEQA is to inform the decision-makers and the public about potential significant environmental impacts. It identifies ways to avoid or reduce environmental impacts and ways to prevent other impacts by use of alternatives and mitigation measures. Sometimes the purpose is to disclose to the public the reasons why the decision-makers approve projects, which have significant effects that cannot be avoided. The role of a trustee is to act on behalf of the CSU as the lead agency to certify the adequacy of environmental impact reports (EIR), review and consider the report prior to action, and ensure the report reflects independent judgement. Other decision-making requirements are to

adopt the “Findings of Fact” for each significant impact, noting which alternatives and mitigation measures are being adopted by the trustees. Additionally, the measures that are in the jurisdiction of another public agency, and environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated, must be identified. The trustees can also approve a “Statement of Overriding Consideration” if they deem appropriate, identifying the economic, educational, social, or other factual considerations that compel the project’s approval despite remaining adverse environmental impacts. The trustees’ guidelines and procedures have been in place since 1985 and have been updated to respond to legislative changes, State CEQA guidelines, and judicial decisions. The guidelines are to ensure that environmental concerns are considered early, and are in full compliance with CEQA requirements. Another objective is to ensure that the EIR is comprehensive and provides all of the information on potential environmental, social, and economic consequences. It should examine feasible and practical mitigation, whereby the trustees consider project objectives, consequences, and alternatives in order to make an informed decision on whether to proceed with the project, revise the project, or discontinue the project.

Ms. San Juan used a slide shown in the presentation called the “CEQA Decision Tree” to describe and determine the appropriate CEQA document to be used for a particular project. Renovation projects, seismic retrofits, and utility infrastructures would be exempt from the CEQA process. If the project is not exempt, an initial study is performed to assess the impact to identify potential significant concerns. A negative declaration can be filed if it is found that there are no significant impacts or issues being mitigated to a less than significant level. An EIR is prepared if significant impacts are anticipated or if the campus expects negative comments from the local community. A notice of preparation is distributed to the public and government agencies to inform them of the project, and a second notice is sent out after the completion of the draft EIR. This second notice begins the 45-day public review period. Written comments received during this period are responded to and incorporated into the final EIR. The trustees approved eleven EIR’s related to physical master plan revisions and schematic plan approvals last year. While the “Decision Tree” simplifies the CEQA process, significant time and consideration is necessary in order to move forward with a project or make significant changes to the campus physical master plan.

Trustee Kaiser asked Ms. San Juan and Karen Zamarripa, assistant vice chancellor of advocacy and institutional relations, about the case at CSU Monterey Bay that is going before the California Supreme Court. She also stated that there was proposed legislation, which would compel us to pay for shared funding for infrastructure improvements that we had identified as not our responsibility. She asked how we are fairing in the case with the potential legislation.

Ms. San Juan responded that General Counsel could comment on the supreme court issue, and that there has been a number of legislative proposals which would require us to pay for off-site mitigation. For example, it would require us to pay for public transit and housing, if there’s a shortage of housing. Our argument has been that it is not within our legislative mandate, and other agencies and cities receive tax revenues to pay for such items. We work closely with Karen’s staff to fight these proposals, specifically AB 2902 (Hancock).

Ms. Karen Zamarripa commented on the bill. She stated that at this point we have been successful with the help of the Chair of the Environmental Quality Committee, Mr. Byron Sher, who has refused to hear the bill, because it is changing and taking CEQA in a different direction. He also thinks it's inappropriate for the legislature to take action on a bill which has a related case in litigation. Representative Lonnie Hancock has added an urgency clause to the bill, which gives her flexibility to move the bill from the committee without having to meet legislative deadlines. At this point, we have seen no movement from Chair Byron Sher or his committee staff.

Chancellor Reed asked Christine Helwick, General Counsel, to comment on the issue.

Ms. Christine Helwick stated that the case at Monterey Bay raises the fundamental issue of whether or not environmental mitigation can be used as means to overcome the CSU's traditional constitutional immunity towards contributing to local infrastructure costs. It is difficult to predict what the outcome will be when going before the California Supreme Court, but we are hopeful and optimistic. We had a sophisticated and thoughtful opinion at the California Appellate Court level in which we prevailed. It was a split decision. The case has been briefed and we will go to oral argument later this year.

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Tsakopoulos presented Agenda Item 4 as an information item.

Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2006/2007 - 2010/2011

This item proposes the annual Categories and Criteria for priority setting for the state funded capital program for 2006/07. The criteria in previous years limits campuses to submit one project for 2006/07 and 2007/08, and three projects per year for the remaining three years of the five-year plan. The trustees have approved this limitation in the past, and have allowed exceptions of projects to fund equipment for constructed or renovated buildings and seismic retrofit projects, which invoke a life-safety issue. We are anticipating that a new general obligation bond will be approved to fund the 2006/07 and 2007/08 programs. We use campus enrollment projections to compare against physical capacity as criteria to prioritize projects. In addition, use of this criteria encourages campuses to increase a building's capacity when a total renovation of the building is being performed.

This year the criteria for prioritizing auditoriums have been included. The language proposed was excerpted from the trustees' 1988 policy due to the number of proposed auditoriums and performing arts projects in the current five-year plan.

Trustee Galinson asked Ms. San Juan when was the one project per year policy adopted, and was there any consideration made regarding the size of the projects.

Ms. San Juan responded that initially the limitation on the number of projects was in the first year only and that it went back at least five years. She stated no considerations have been made regarding the size of the projects, although the costs are growing.

Trustee Galinson continued his line of questioning by asking Ms. San Juan if a campus wants to construct two projects at \$5 million each in one year, that would be denied, but another campus requesting a project that is \$150 million would be all right.

Ms. San Juan responded in the affirmative. We discourage campuses from requesting a \$150 million project, encouraging them to look at how it could be phased differently. It makes more sense to break it up into manageable parts, due to budget and schedule limitations on the state side. We prefer projects to come in closer to \$30 million. The \$5 million project can fall under the language that allows exceptions. If a campus were to make a request stating that they would like two projects, there is flexibility in the criteria.

Trustee Galinson commented that the policy seems arbitrary and does not make fiscal sense.

Mr. West responded to Trustee Galinson. The five-year plan gives a perspective overview of the period, when the campuses get a project and the various factors that contribute to that decision. As Ms. San Juan stated, there is a self-limiting dollar amount based on state funding, and a time elapse for completion of the project, which is considered over the 5-year period. It's a highly negotiated process with the campuses, and we have more need than we have funds. The campuses know what kind of projects they need and their average size. As we look at the capital program over time, we can show that there is good equity related to campus size for the project awarded.

Trustee Pierce commented about the enrollment pressure that varies from campus to campus, and specifically the growth occurring at the newest campuses, Channel Islands and San Marcos. He asked how the process works for campuses where more rapid growth may be necessary.

Ms. San Juan responded that when we rank the campuses, we look at where they are in the current year on capacity versus enrollment. We also look at where they are projected to be based on the multi-year enrollment projections, which go out to 2010/11. We can see which campuses have a greater rate of growth and we take into account the projects that are funded. Therefore, even though the 2004 funded projects are not operational, their future impact on capacity is taken into consideration in this ranking scenario.

Trustee Chandler asked Ms. San Juan whether seismic strengthening is prioritized over new projects, expressing her concern for the infrastructure that's already in place.

Ms. San Juan responded that we do prioritize them over both new buildings and renovations. We have a Seismic Review Board (SRB), a team of seven structural engineers, and we prioritize the buildings requested for seismic strengthening based on the SRB rating.

Chair Galinson made a temporary appointment of two trustees to serve on the committee, Debra Farar and Bob Foster.

Chair Tsakopoulos called for a motion and the trustees approved the motion for the temporary appointment of the members to serve on the committee.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-04-14).

Certify a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Campus Master Plan Revision, and Approve the Proposed Campus Master Plan Revision for California State University, San Bernardino

With the use of a slide presentation, Ms. San Juan presented Agenda Item 6. The campus master plan is designed to serve 20,000 FTES. The proposed changes are designed to improve land use and strategically site proposed parking structures in place of surface parking lots. Another key change is the identification of a future land acquisition immediately adjacent to the campus. This master plan revision will help address some safety issues and assess where parking will be needed in the future on the campus. A Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum have been prepared in accordance with CEQA and no adverse comments have been received.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-04-15).

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of a schematic plan for the CSU Sacramento—Foundation/Bookstore. With the use of an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. A Negative Declaration was prepared in accordance with CEQA, which indicated that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and staff recommends approval.

Trustee Mehta asked Ms. San Juan if this project would be consistent with our sustainability standards.

Ms. San Juan stated that the campus is proposing to use low volatile organic compounds in materials that would be used in the building. The project is planned to be connected to the central plant, but there is some debate on whether that will occur, which would be a sustainability measure. The campuswide energy management system is also proposed to be integrated into the project.

Trustee Kaiser asked President Gonzalez if this project was part of the master plan presentation seen in a previous board meeting.

President Gonzalez responded that this project is part of the master plan that was brought to the board in January, and that this is one of the first buildings in line to complete that master plan.

10
CPB&G

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-04-16).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Acceptance of Interest in Real Property

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

William and Joan Roth propose to gift to Sonoma State University 190 acres of property on Sonoma Mountain next to the university's Fairfield Osborn Preserve for expansion of the preserve. The property is within five miles due east of the main campus. The so-called Wilroth property carries a "forever wild" conservation easement that safeguards the open meadows and the oak woodlands that provide a habitat for numerous plant and animal species. The conservation easement allows educational and research use of the property and is consonant with the purposes of the Fairfield Osborn Preserve. Acquisition of the property would enhance educational and research programs in anthropology, biology, environmental studies, and geography and result in a total of 393 acres in the Fairfield Osborn Preserve.

The gift proposal contains two contingencies: (a) the university acknowledges an eventual house site selection on one of two designated locations (each 40 acres) on property retained by the Roth family and approved by the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, and (b) the university accepts the property in the calendar year 2004. In order to address these contingencies, the university will accept 150 acres of property unaffected by the home site selection this calendar year, and will accept the remaining 40 acres of the gift at such time that the Roth family determines its home site selection.

The results of the due diligence process revealed no basis that would cause the university to reject the property. Chapter III, Section 7-b of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees requires adoption of a "specific resolution" authorizing the campus president to accept this gift on behalf of the board.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the campus president or designee is authorized to accept on behalf of the Board of Trustees the interest in 190 acres of real property given to the California State University by William and Joan Roth to be included in the Fairfield Osborn Preserve.

San Diego State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Swimming Pool Complex. This program will construct a new swimming pool complex to replace the Terry Pool, which was taken out of service in June 2000 to allow for the construction of the Aztec Athletic Center. The campus has been without a pool complex since that time. The proposed pool complex will provide high quality pool facilities for educational and recreational use by students, faculty, and staff, as well as the university's intercollegiate swimming team. The Swimming Pool Complex is consistent with the revised campus master plan approved by the Board of Trustees in May 1999.

The proposed facility will include three pools: a 50-meter by 25-yard Olympic-style pool; a 7,000-square foot irregularly shaped pool for recreation; and a hydrotherapy spa. The complex will include an 11,000 square foot building to accommodate showers and locker rooms, restrooms, administrative offices, member services, storage and support facilities. In addition, permanent bleacher seating for approximately 500 spectators will be provided. The new complex will complement the nearby sports facilities and reflect their established character and appearance, including the Tennis and Softball Complex, the Tony Gwynn Baseball Stadium, the Aztec Athletic Center, the Aztec Recreation Center, and the Cox Arena.

In April 2004, the San Diego State University students voted to support the increase of student fees to build the Swimming Pool Complex. At a future meeting the Board of Trustees will be requested to approve the issuance of systemwide revenue bonds to finance this project.

**3. California State University, San Marcos
Transit Station**

PWC \$1,341,000

CSU San Marcos wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a North County Transit District (NCTD) Transit Station on the northeast edge of the campus. Shortly after the university's founding in 1989, NCTD proposed to the university that a light rail line and station be placed on the campus. This station would be one stop along a light rail line serving the northern San Diego County cities of Escondido, San Marcos, Vista, and Oceanside.

A rail station and approximately 350 lineal feet of rail line will be constructed on the campus. Amenities at the station will include canopies, guard railings, handicap ramps, signage, and an elevator. Currently, a vanpool and shared ridership program, as well as bike lanes and parking for bicycles exist at the campus to facilitate the use of alternative transportation. The purpose of these programs is to reduce the number of vehicles on campus, thus diminishing the demand for new parking lots or structures and avoiding added air pollution in the region. The North County Transit District will provide funding for and management of the project.

4. California State University, San Marcos

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Final Report on the 2004/2005 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Attachment A provides the final report on the trustees' 2004/05 capital outlay budget request. The legislature has approved all 22 projects requested by the trustees and included in the governor's budget proposal and May Revision. The final budget remains unchanged from the May Revision.

2004/05 State Funded Capital Outlay Program Budget Summary

<i>Trustees' Request</i>	<i>Governor's Budget with May Revision</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst</i>	<i>Senate</i>	<i>Assembly</i>	<i>Final Budget</i>
<i>\$394.2 M</i>	<i>\$312.7 M</i>	<i>\$333.1 M</i>	<i>\$312.7 M</i>	<i>\$312.7 M</i>	<i>\$312.7 M</i>

Final State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2004/05 Priority List

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index **4100** and Equipment Price Index **2627**

Rank Order	Cat.	Campus	Project Title	FTE	Trustees' Request		Governor's May Revise Budget		Final Budget	
					Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IB	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay	N/A	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	15,225,000 (a)	PWC	15,225,000
2	II	Fullerton	Aud./Fine Arts Instructional Facility	N/A	E	3,625,000	E	3,625,000	E	3,625,000
3	IB	Northridge	Engineering Renovation Phase II	N/A	E	3,429,000	E	3,429,000	E	3,429,000
4	II	San Bernardino	Sci. Bldg. Reno./Add., Phase I Annex	N/A	E	2,556,000	E	2,556,000	E	2,556,000
5	II	San Bernardino	Palm Desert Campus, Phase II	N/A	E	1,382,000	E	1,382,000	E	1,382,000
6	II	San Marcos	Academic Hall II, Building 13	N/A	E	3,425,000	E	3,425,000	E	3,425,000
7	IA	Hayward	Seismic Upgrade, Warren Hall	N/A	P	675,000	P	675,000	P	675,000
8	IB	Monterey Bay	Infrastructure Improvements	N/A	PWC	18,515,000	PWC	18,515,000	PWC	18,515,000
9	IB	Los Angeles	Science Replacement Bldg. - Wing B	849	PWC	31,082,000	PWC	31,082,000	PWC	31,082,000
10	II	Dominguez Hills	Educational Resource Ctr. Addition	N/A	PWC	34,057,000	PW	1,725,000 (c)	PW	1,725,000
11	II	Fresno	Library Addition and Renovation	0	P	1,677,000	P	1,677,000	P	1,677,000
12	II	San Bernardino	College of Education	1,531	PWC	48,697,000	PWC	48,697,000	PWC	48,697,000
13	II	Fullerton	College of Business & Economics	3,346	PWC	47,417,000	PWC	47,417,000	PWC	47,417,000
14	II	Bakersfield	Math & Computer Science Building	877	PWC	18,975,000	PWC	18,975,000	PWC	18,975,000
15	IB	Pomona	Science Renovation (Seismic)	107	PWC	20,298,000	PWC	20,298,000	PWC	20,298,000
16	IB	Humboldt	Forbes PE Complex Renovation	40	PWC	42,678,000	P	1,313,000 (b)	P	1,313,000
17	II	San Luis Obispo	Engineering/Architecture R&R, Ph. IIB	517	WC	28,589,000	WC	28,589,000	WC	28,589,000
18	II	Northridge	Science I Replacement	1,863	PWC	46,193,000	PWC	46,193,000	PWC	46,193,000
19	II	Long Beach	Peterson Hall 3 Replacement	1,177	P	1,284,000	P	1,361,000 (d)	P	1,361,000
20	II	Maritime Academy	Simulation Center	119	PWC	8,306,000	PWC	8,306,000	PWC	8,306,000
21	IB	San Marcos	Craven Hall Renovation	0	PWC	6,366,000	PWC	6,366,000	PWC	6,366,000
22	II	Maritime Academy	Land Acquisition	N/A			A	1,914,000 (e)	A	1,914,000
Totals				10,426		\$394,226,000		\$312,745,000		\$312,745,000

Notes: Governor's May Revise Budget

- (a) Amount reduced by the Department of Finance.
- (b) Reflects campus request to proceed with P phase only.
- (c) Amount reduced due to changing from a (PWC) streamlined to a (PW) nonstreamlined project.
- (d) Amount increased due to changing from a (P) streamlined to a (P) nonstreamlined project.
- (e) New appropriation to cover increased costs.

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

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

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This information item presents the CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report.

Seismic Policy and Review Board

The California State University has addressed the seismic hazard posed by its buildings and is in the process of completing their mitigation. In 1993, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted the following policy:

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that to the maximum extent feasible by present earthquake engineering practice, to acquire, build, maintain, and rehabilitate buildings and other facilities that provide an acceptable level of earthquake safety for students, employees, and the public who occupy these buildings and other facilities at all locations where CSU operations and activities occur. The standard for new construction is that it meets the life-safety and seismic hazard objectives of the pertinent provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations; the standard for existing construction is that it provides reasonable life-safety protection, consistent with that for typical new buildings. The California State University shall cause to be performed independent technical peer reviews of the seismic aspects of all construction projects from their design initiation, including both new construction and remodeling, for conformance to good seismic resistant practices consistent with this policy. The feasibility of all construction projects shall include seismic safety implications and shall be determined by weighing the practicality and cost of protective measures against the severity and probability of injury resulting from seismic occurrences. [Approved by the Board of Trustees of the California State University at its May 19, 1993 meeting (RCPBG 05-93-13).]

CSU initiated the assessment of the seismic hazards posed by CSU buildings as directed by former Governor Deukmejian's executive order and legislative provisions. The CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) was established to advise and assist in determining the condition of CSU buildings, and to technically oversee the program.

The SRB is comprised of:

- Charles Thiel Jr., Ph.D., President, Telesis Engineers (Chairman)
- Gregg Brandow, Ph.D., S.E., President, Brandow and Johnston, Adjunct Professor, University of Southern California
- John Egan, Principle Engineer, Geomatrix Consultants
- James A. Hill, S.E., President, James A. Hill and Associates, Inc.
- John A. Martin, Jr., S.E., President, John A. Martin and Associates, Inc.
- Svend Nielsen, S.E., Principle, Johnson and Nielsen
- Theodore C. Zsutty, Ph.D., S.E., Professor, San Jose State University, Retired

Seismic Mitigation and Plan

The CSU plan has four elements:

1. Mitigate significant life-safety threats posed by falling hazards as a priority. All such hazards at all 23 campuses and off-campus centers have been mitigated.
2. Identify those buildings that pose a significant life-safety threat and mitigate these hazards as soon as practical. As of September 2004, the majority of CSU buildings identified as posing a life-safety hazard to the students, staff, and faculty have been mitigated. Of the more than 200 buildings identified as potentially highly hazardous since inception, most have been retrofitted, and only eight priority buildings remain to have retrofit design initiated. One of the eight, Warren Hall at CSU Hayward, was recently approved for funding in the 2004/05 capital program.
3. Systematically raise the level of seismic safety for deficient buildings whenever any structural modification, alteration or addition to the structure is undertaken. This is through the application of Division VI-R requirements for all construction; particularly those circumstances identified as warranting action. The SRB is planning to revisit and evaluate the existing structure of campus buildings during 2004/05. The purpose is to confirm the building's structural life-safety hazards in light of code changes and lessons learned since 1992.
4. Assure that all CSU new construction and modification of existing structures have independent, technical peer review of the earthquake performance aspects of the plans. Review continues through construction.

2003-2004 Seismic Review Board Activities

The SRB met six times during the reporting time period, four meetings at the Chancellor's Office and two meetings at campuses. The SRB members continue to provide peer review of construction activities at all of the campuses and technical support to the CSU Building Official and the Deputy Building Officials at each campus.

Among the notable activities of the SRB in the year since the last report to the trustees were:

1. Revised and distributed the *CSU Seismic Requirements*, adopted December 8, 2000, revised April 2003. This includes the specific seismic requirements for all construction work in the CSU and establishes the minimum seismic coefficients to be used with the California Building Code (CBC) provisions.
2. Maintained the CSU priority list for seismic retrofit list, which was revised to contain two parts: first, those projects that are priority actions that should be undertaken solely because of the seismic hazard posed by the building; and second, those buildings that have significant seismic issues that need to be recognized when the campus is contemplating alterations or modifications of the building. The latter is to recognize the seismic issues of the building during the planning stage for such modifications or alterations. These problems are to be resolved notwithstanding the possibility that the CBC, Division VI-R may administratively not so require.
3. Continued working with the Pomona campus to implement actions to accommodate the San Jose fault that passes through the campus and has an identified trace. Of the 22 Pomona buildings within the fault trace, only a limited number pose a significant life-safety hazard during fault rupture. These buildings were added to the seismic retrofit priority list as appropriate. Development of seismic retrofit plans for these specific buildings is under the review of the SRB.
4. Continued preparing additions to the *CSU Seismic Requirements* to address temporary structures (e.g., trailers), light metal frame construction, pre-engineered structures, and selected issues in wood construction, all of which are not treated adequately in the CBC.
5. Worked with the Division of the State Architect and the Building Standards Commission on how Division VI-R (CBC) will be revised to reflect the recently adopted National Fire Prevention Association building code as the basis for the CBC.
6. Continued to develop a common lease/purchase policy to be used by state agencies (Department of General Services) and the University of California. The objective is to establish a common set of seismic requirements to be used by all, which would provide a basis for decision-making and could be customized to meet individual circumstances.
7. Made an initial inspection of the damage to the San Luis Obispo campus following the San Simeon earthquake and determined that there was no need for special actions to identify dangerous conditions or oversee repair and reconstruction. The earthquake caused almost no structural damage to the CSU campus, and no further SRB action was required. The SRB earthquake emergency response plan was not activated.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2005/2006 through 2009/2010

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests approval of the final 2005/06 through 2009/10 state and nonstate funded five-year capital improvement program totaling \$4.3 billion and \$2.0 billion respectively. The 2005/06 action-year requests totals \$602.7 million for state projects and \$101.4 million for nonstate projects. The 2005/06 through 2009/10 capital program document is included with the agenda mailing.

Background

The Board of Trustees approved the Draft State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2005/06 through 2009/10 at the March 2004 meeting. Funding for the 2005/06 state funded program was included in the Proposition 55 general obligation bond measure approved by the California voters in March 2004. It is anticipated that approximately \$289 million will be available for the 2005/06 program after covering the cost of issuance and reserves.

Funding sources for the nonstate five-year program include campus auxiliary organizations; donations; grants; and the student union, housing, and parking programs.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2005/06 through 2009/10 totaling \$4,319,084,000 and \$2,002,620,000 respectively are approved.
2. The 2005/06 State Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at \$602,785,000.

3. The 2005/06 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at \$101,428,000 and the chancellor is authorized to proceed in 2004/05 with design documents for fast-track projects in the 2005/06 nonstate program.
4. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.
5. The chancellor is authorized to make adjustments, as necessary, including priority sequence, scope, phase, project cost and total budget request for the 2005/06 State Funded Capital Outlay Program within the \$602,785,000.

REVISED

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS, AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design, and Construction

Summary

Schematic plans for the following project will be presented for approval:

CPSU San Luis Obispo — Engineering/Architecture Renovation and Replacement, Phase IIB Addition

Project Architect: ~~Dominy Associates~~ Austin Veum Robbins Partners

Background and Scope

This project is the final phase of collaboration between the College of Engineering and the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. This phase of the project will construct new laboratory space and faculty office space for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, and space for interdisciplinary lecture. Along with the renovation portion, this project will allow the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and the College of Engineering to accommodate the projected growth as outlined in the master plan approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2001.

The project, now referred to by the campus as EDES (Environmental Design) South, consists of four structures, one one-story building and three three-story buildings, connected by exterior walkways. The buildings will have a drilled pier slab on grade foundations, with a steel brace frame structure. The exterior of the buildings will include glass curtain walls, ribbed metal and pre-cast panels. This project contains many sustainable features including operable windows and single loaded corridors that will allow for cross ventilation of the laboratory and lecture spaces. The building also includes appropriate shading devices on the south side to reduce solar heat gain. The landscaping includes the use of drought tolerant plantings, and will provide additional shading in the summer months with the use of deciduous trees along the southern exposure. Nonstate funds will provide for three demonstration labs, a conference room, and support space.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	November 2004
Completion of Working Drawings	April 2005
Construction Start	June 2005
Occupancy	July 2008

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	59,443 square feet
State Funded Assignable Building Area	36,306 square feet
Nonstate Funded Assignable Building Area	5,814 square feet
Total Assignable Building Area	42,120 square feet
Efficiency	71 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4100

Building Cost (\$209 per gross square foot) \$12,402,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure	\$ 10.66
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$ 92.06
c. Interior (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 24.72
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 63.49
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 5.07
f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 12.64

Site Development \$ 1,600,000

Construction Cost \$14,002,000

Fees, Contingency and Services \$ 3,700,000

Total Project Cost (\$298 per gross square foot) \$17,702,000

Group II Equipment \$ 2,200,000

Grand Total \$19,902,000

Cost Comparison

This project's building cost of \$209 per GSF is below the CSU construction cost guidelines of \$229 per GSF at CCCI 4100 for engineering buildings. The main factor driving the lower cost is the mix of space in the building. Over fifty percent of the building is comprised of classrooms and faculty offices, and an amount of the laboratories are design studios, not requiring fume hoods, compressed air, or natural gas.

Funding Data

Proposition 55, approved by the voters in March 2004, and the previous bond measure of 2002 provide general obligation bonds to fund the state portion (\$17,036,000) of this project. The nonstate portion of \$2,866,000 will be funded through donations. Funding for the state Group II equipment (\$1,677,000) is proposed to come from a future bond measure.

California Environmental Quality Act

A Finding of Consistency has determined that the project is consistent with the FEIR prepared in conjunction with the campus master plan revision and approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2001. A new environmental analysis is not required because the effects of the project were fully analyzed in the 2001 FEIR. A copy of the FEIR and the Findings of Consistency will be available at the meeting and can also be viewed at the campus web site: <http://www.facilities.calpoly.edu>.

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 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Engineering/Architecture Renovation and Replacement, Phase IIB Addition project is consistent with the campus master plan revision approved in March 2001 and a Letter of Compliance documenting the Finding of Consistency was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the master plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.

3. The mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
4. The Chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file a Notice of Determination for the project.
5. The schematic plans for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Engineering/Architecture Renovation and Replacement, Phase IIB Addition project are approved at a project cost of \$19,902,000 at CCCI 4100.