

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting: 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 16, 2008**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

A. Robert Linscheid, Chair  
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair  
Herbert L. Carter  
George G. Gowgani  
Curtis Grima  
William Hauck  
Peter G. Mehas  
Lou Monville  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 15, 2008

#### **Consent Items**

1. Amend the 2008-2009 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded, *Action*

#### **Discussion Items**

2. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, *Information*
3. California State University Seismic Safety Program Annual Report, *Information*
4. Campus Land Acquisitions, *Information*
5. Acceptance of Interest in Real Property, *Information*
6. Sustainability Overview, *Information*
7. Report on 2008-2009 State Funded Program and State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2009-2010 through 2013-2014, *Action*
8. 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 15, 2008**

**Members Present**

A. Robert Linscheid, Chair  
Margaret G. Fortune, Vice Chair  
Jeffrey Bleich, Chair of the Board  
Herbert L. Carter  
George Gowgani  
Curtis Grima  
William Hauck  
Peter G. Mehas  
Lou Monville  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes for the May 2008 meeting were approved as submitted.

**Amend the 2008-2009 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded**

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Linscheid presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 7-08-09).

**Amend the 2008-2009 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Linscheid presented agenda item 2 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 7-08-10).

**Status Report on the 2008-2009 State Funded Capital Outlay Program**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra F. San Juan presented the status report on the state funded capital outlay budget for 2008-2009. The trustees' program request of \$420 million (using funds from existing bonds and assuming passage of a new bond) was reduced by the Department of Finance (DOF) in the governor's budget to \$358 million. The Legislative Analyst (LAO) took some exception to the program, largely to drive increased summer term enrollment at two campuses. The Senate and Assembly subcommittees took a different tact. Recognizing that there

would not be a general obligation bond on the November ballot, the subcommittees did not approve any projects reliant upon a 2008 bond and recommended a program funded from old bond money, being clear that it was not the merits of the projects they were taking issue with but rather the lack of a bond measure. In doing so, the subcommittees increased the capital renewal program but decreased funding for two priority trustee projects. The capital renewal program funds will be primarily used to match energy efficiency partnership grant funding for energy conservation projects. This will help the campuses manage their utility budgets and other increases in energy costs. The resulting program is \$72 million which reflects the use of reserves to fund equipment. As programs for 2009-2010 were due to DOF earlier this month, CPDC has begun to repackage those deleted project in anticipation of a request for lease revenue bonds.

Trustee Hauck asked if the Entrance Road project for CSU Channel Islands which is proposed to be funded from old bond money will proceed. Ms. San Juan stated that the Entrance Road would proceed as noted, as would the ADA project at CSU San Bernardino, both proposed by the trustees to use existing funds. The legislature proposed that the balance of old bond money be used for equipment to complete six capital projects. Both the Assembly and Senate subcommittees approved a total of \$72 million for 2008-2009.

Trustee Linscheid asked Ms. San Juan to clarify the difference between the governor's revised program and that recommended by the LAO. Ms. San Juan responded that the LAO primarily objected to two projects stating that there was inadequate summer term enrollment on the campuses to support the proposed programs (Chico, Taylor II Replacement and Sacramento, Science II, Phase 2).

Trustee Chandler inquired whether any seismic or renovations projects were eliminated by the legislature which would put the CSU at risk for health and safety compliance, and whether arguments could be put forth for their funding. Ms. San Juan stated that the CSU did argue for funding for East Bay Warren Hall, a very complicated project and currently the top seismic priority in the system. The legislature did not agree with the argument and held to its own recommendation of using old bond money for equipment.

Mr. West emphasized that health and safety is always the highest priority, and this ranking was articulated in the letter from the CSU/UC to the governor and legislature requesting \$1.2 billion in lease revenue bonds for a two-year capital program (letter provided to trustees as handout).

Lt. Governor John Garamendi asked what was the source of revenue for lease revenue bonds.

Mr. West responded that the debt service is paid from the general fund.

Superintendent Jack O'Connell expressed his disappointment that a statewide general obligation bond would not be on the November ballot to fund public works projects in education. Not only are the projects needed for the institutions, but the projects provide jobs statewide which will aid

the current unemployment numbers. He also remarked that he thought lease revenue bonds were expensive in that they put the institution in competition with its own operational demands on the general fund.

### **Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2010-2011 through 2014-2015**

Ms. San Juan presented the item. Approval of the Categories and Criteria begins the planning process for the 2010-2011 program, informing the campuses of the priorities so they can initiate feasibility studies for renovation and new construction. The proposed criteria are consistent with what was approved by the trustees last year, which follow closely the priorities set by both the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office.

The committee recommended approval by the board on the proposed resolution (RCPBG 7-08-11).

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

The proposed item on the agenda requests the approval of schematic plans for California State University, San Marcos—Parking Structure 1, Phase 2A. With an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item. All CEQA requirements on this project have been completed and staff recommends approval.

Trustee Linscheid spoke to the many challenges in funding facilities and pressure in land use as noted in earlier discussions during this meeting. Believing that CSU has many good examples of collaborative projects between universities and cities and unified school districts, he has asked Ms. San Juan to prepare a report of best practices that have been completed in the CSU to serve as models and lessons learned for future endeavors.

Trustee Gowgani expressed his concern that the CSU stands to lose matching private donor funds if the state bond funds do not come through.

Chair Jeffrey Bleich concurred stating that there are great needs on CSU campuses to build and complete projects. These projects also provide for increased employment in the state. Chair Bleich congratulated the chancellor on the excellent letter sent to the governor seeking support for lease revenue bonds for the capital program.

The committee recommended approval by the board on the proposed resolution (RCPBG 7-08-12).

Trustee Linscheid adjourned the meeting.

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

**Amend the 2008-2009 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded**

**Presentation by**

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

**Summary**

This item requests approval to amend the 2008-2009 non-state capital outlay program to include the following three projects:

**1. California State University, Fullerton  
Parking Structure 4, Phase 1**

**PWC            \$35,783,000**

California State University, Fullerton wishes to proceed with the design and construction of Phase 1 of a new six-level parking structure (#59) to accommodate approximately 1,500 vehicles on the east side of campus. This structure is identified on the approved campus master plan map as one structure; however, it was revised into two phases to meet immediate parking needs while keeping fee increases at a moderate level. The purpose of the Phase 1 project is to maintain existing campus parking capacity of approximately 10,600 spaces by balancing the loss of surface parking spaces as a result of future capital development. The project will displace approximately 500 surface lot spaces and will provide a net increase of 1,000 spaces. If enrollment growth continues at the current pace, Phase 2 is planned in 2011-12, providing an additional 1,500 parking spaces.

A stepped parking fee increase was approved in February 2008, with increases starting in spring 2009 through fall 2016. Funding for Phase 1 will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program. The bonds will be repaid from parking revenues.

**2. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Technology Park Pilot Building**

**PWC            \$6,300,000**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the design-build, Technology Park Pilot Project (#82D). The project will consist of a new 25,000 GSF pre-engineered metal building. The project will include over 20,000 square feet of leasable space in five separate labs and 5,300 square feet of common space that

will include the restroom and vertical circulation. This facility will provide a space for faculty and students to collaborate with outside firms on the development of new products and technologies.

This project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program, with additional funding coming from donor funds, and an Economic Development Administration grant.

**3. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo**  
**Simpson Strong-Tie Building** **PWC** **\$3,000,000**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Simpson Strong-Tie Building (#186D) located adjacent to the Construction Management building (#186) currently under construction. The project will consist of a new single-story 5,200 GSF heavy timber structure and will accommodate an additional 5,000 GSF outdoor “working courtyard.” The project will provide materials demonstration space for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design.

This project will be funded from donor gifts.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2008-2009 non-state funded capital outlay program is amended to include: 1) \$35,783,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Fullerton, Parking Structure 4, Phase 1 project; 2) \$6,300,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment, for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Technology Park Pilot Building project; and 3) \$3,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Simpson Strong-Tie Building project.

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

### **California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

Pursuant to the Board of Trustees' policy, this information item provides the annual report on the CSU's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) certification actions for Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) and related documentation. The report identifies the compliance actions and board certifications consistent with their responsibility. As the “Lead Agency” under CEQA, the board must certify all Final EIRs and other CEQA compliance documents for major master plan revisions before approving the implementation and construction of major capital projects that provide the necessary capacity on campus to accommodate growth. Certain minor projects are delegated for administrative approval to the assistant vice chancellor, capital planning design and construction. CEQA is implemented through State CEQA Guidelines, and university administrative procedures in the State University Administrative Manual.

With the California Supreme Court Decision in *City of Marina v. Trustees of CSU* (2006), the CSU has modified procedures consistent with the court ruling; however board certifications of EIRs prepared for campus enrollment ceiling increases, or for a specific project are still being challenged in court at the Fresno and San Diego campuses.

#### **Background**

As the Lead Agency, the board has a responsibility to ensure that each EIR that is circulated for public review sets forth all relevant information on potential environmental impacts of a project. They must also determine when the benefits to the educational mission of the CSU will outweigh any adverse impacts that may result from growth on the campus, or the construction of improvements. The chancellor is delegated responsibility for implementing actions to ensure compliance with approval conditions and mitigation requirements for campus capital projects. The assistant vice chancellor for capital planning, design and construction (CPDC) is delegated authority to approve certain capital projects (e.g., architecturally not significant or utility and infrastructure projects) and their related environmental compliance documents, primarily Negative Declarations. Both EIRs and Negative Declarations require public notice to provide opportunity for comments from agencies and the public regarding proposed project actions.

Minor changes and adjustments to facilities typically are exempt from CEQA analysis through defined Categorical Exemptions.

### **CSU Compliance Actions for Calendar Year 2007**

Attachment A lists activity during 2007. In summary:

- An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified for the master plan revisions for the Bakersfield, Fresno, San Diego and San Francisco campuses. Of the individual capital projects listed in Attachment A, two projects met CEQA compliance requirements through preparation of an Addendum to an existing approved EIR, thus reducing duplication of effort and time to meet requirements for trustee approval. For four other projects, a Finding of Consistency with a previously approved EIR was prepared to meet CEQA requirements, confirming previously reported conditions and thus streamlining CEQA compliance for approval of major capital projects.
- Negative Declarations were certified for capital projects at the Chico, Long Beach, Maritime, Pomona, and San Marcos campuses.
- Fifteen Categorical Exemptions were submitted for Major Capital Outlay projects included on Attachment A.
- Administratively approved minor capital outlay projects and minor master plan revisions for which a Notice of Exemption was submitted by the respective campus directly to the State Clearinghouse are not included in Attachment A.

### **CEQA Legislative and Judicial Action Updates**

Significant legislative and judicial actions have occurred in the past year that may have implications for the CSU capital improvement program and campus growth programs.

CPDC continues to monitor legislative bills that propose changes to CEQA compliance requirements that affect CSU policies and procedures. Of particular interest is The California Climate Solutions Act (CCSA), legislation approved in 2006 in California aimed at reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG), and its repercussions for CEQA EIR analyses. The specific short-term impact has not been determined, although with a companion bill, SB 97, thresholds for GHG emissions reduction are mandated to be established by 2010 that would then be the primary criteria for evaluation of this issue in an EIR. This issue has gained prominence in environmental analyses as the focus on global warming has taken prominence in the nation and, particularly, in California environmental debates. Serious controversy remains regarding what

constitutes significant GHG impacts, what thresholds are appropriate given the global nature of the issue, and what type of analysis is required to make the determination that an individual project may or may not contribute to the impact. There has been no court decision yet that defines the adequacy of an EIR that attempts to analyze GHG emissions.

Another important area of environmental legislation for California particularly, has been the continuing controversies over water supply. This issue inextricably interacts with the global warming controversy, and known stresses on availability of water through the State Water Project.

- SB 221 (Kuehl) requires large residential subdivisions and other major land developments to verify water availability for 20 years forward and identify water availability history over the past 20 years, and identify with certainty the legal and physical sources for how future water supplies will be made available.
- SB 610 (Costa) imposes additional requirements on large development projects subject to CEQA with regard to requiring that before a city or county can approve a proposed development project, a thorough water supply analysis must be completed to ensure water will be sufficient, or the supplier agency must show how additional water supplies will be acquired to meet the project needs.

The legislation is primarily aimed at large, new commercial and residential developments; it illustrates the emphasis on analysis of water supplies for the state's growth. Such legislation will directly impact the evaluation in each EIR reviewed by the trustees for growth of enrollment capacity at CSU campuses across the state.

In May 2007, the board certified the Final EIR and approved the Fresno Master Plan Revision for Campus Pointe. While a fair share agreement was reached with the city of Clovis and eventually with the city of Fresno, litigation was filed by LandValue 77 claiming in part that the EIR was deficient in analyzing the environmental impacts to air quality, traffic, and water supplies.

The CSU sought funds for off-site mitigation responsibility in the 2008/2009 state budget request, in anticipation of the board's approval of respective campus master plans and certification of the EIRs. However, the governor's administration did not include this CSU capital outlay budget item in the 2008 governor's budget proposal that went forward to the legislature. CSU will continue its efforts to seek funding for mitigation in the capital outlay program, pending a policy level resolution by the governor and/or legislature.

### **Master Plans with Enrollment Growth Ceilings Approved by Trustees in 2007**

In 2007, the Board of Trustees approved three major master plan revisions for campuses with enrollment ceiling increases ranging from twenty to fifty percent. These are noted below along with the May 2008 board action on Long Beach:

Bakersfield: 12,000 FTE to 18,000 FTE—No fair share mitigation specific agreement; future mitigation tied primarily to implementation of public/private partnership projects and reassessments of traffic impacts once campus grows.

San Diego: 25,000 FTE to 35,000 FTE—Litigation filed by City and other San Diego agencies, challenging the CSU-determined fair share based on EIR analysis.

San Francisco: 20,000 FTE to 25,000 FTE—Agreement executed with City/County of San Francisco for fair share mitigation related to transit improvements, based on future campus trip generation and transit ridership analysis.

Long Beach: 25,000 to 31,000 FTE—Agreement developed between the City and the university regarding off-site mitigation responsibility and a schedule for implementation of local street improvements.

With these four master plan approvals by the trustees since the *Marina* decision, CSU has implemented mitigation determinations consistent with that decision. The approvals and corresponding resolutions acknowledge essential principles of the decision, including:

1. CSU, through the EIR analysis, determines the university's fair share responsibility.
2. This determination and the EIR technical methodology behind it are the basis for negotiation with local agencies should they question the mitigation responsibility as determined by CSU.
3. CSU must request funding from the governor and legislature through the annual budget process as the source for mitigation payments.
4. CSU does not pay a fair share of state highway mitigation improvement to Caltrans, but would support Caltrans' request for funding. The concept of mitigation of off-campus impacts— to provide for local community infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate university growth impacts— should not extend to state highway improvements for which the Legislature and the Governor are the authority for appropriations and program approval.
5. CSU's mitigation contribution for project implementation is to be provided to the local agency when all funding and necessary approvals are in place at the local agency. CSU's pro rata contribution is payable based on the completion of design and construction milestones.

6. CSU may assess a proportionate share of on-campus mitigation improvement costs that benefit off-campus agencies, such as contribution of CSU property for right of way or similar, against the campus's fair share responsibility for off-campus mitigation to local agencies.
7. Public/private partnership projects will pay full fair share mitigation costs for both on-campus and off-campus required mitigation improvement costs as their project responsibility.

CPDC is including the above as part of revised CEQA procedures to provide guidance to campus staff and executives in fair share mitigation negotiations with local agencies. CPDC continues to host CEQA working groups with campus administrators, and conduct training seminars for campus facilities planning staff to develop CSU policies and provide updated CEQA procedures on the technical and practical aspects of CEQA compliance. As new legislation is enacted, and court decisions may interpret those provisions, CSU strives to meet the changing environmental review requirements.

CSU procedures aim to ensure that the obligations for public review and input are met for major new projects and master plan revisions. In each major master plan revision brought before the trustees, the procedures encourage campuses to not only meet the legal obligations for public review, but exceed those requirements with extensive public information efforts that ensure all interested community segments are brought into the process and fully informed of the university's growth proposals as part of the EIR process.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ANNUAL REPORT  
 January 2007 through December 2007

CAMPUS/Project	CEQA Action Prepared					
	Exempt	MIT. N.D.	N.D.	E I R	BOT Action	NOD Filed
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD</b> Certify Final EIR and Approve Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Increase				√	9/19/2007	9/20/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHANNEL ISLANDS</b> Student Union Schematic Plan Approval	√				9/19/2007	
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO</b> Housing and Food Service Phase I Schematic Plan Approval Northern California Natural History Museum Phase I Schematic Plan Approval		√ √			9/19/2007 11/14/2007	9/20/2007 11/15/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY</b> Pioneer Heights Student Housing Phase III Schematic Plan Approval	√				5/16/2007	
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO</b> Certify the Final EIR and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for Campus Pointe Hotel and Retail Components of Campus Pointe Schematic Plan Approval Multi-Family and Senior Housing Components of Campus Pointe Schematic Plan Approval				√ √ √	5/16/2007 5/16/2007 7/11/2007	* 5/17/2007 7/12/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON</b> University Police Building Schematic Plan Approval Children's Center Schematic Plan Approval	√ √				5/16/2007 11/14/2007	
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH</b> Outpost Food Service Replacement Building Schematic Plan Approval		√			3/14/2007	3/28/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES</b> Science Replacement Building Wing B Schematic Plan Approval Corporation Yard and Public Safety Schematic Plan Approval Math and Science Charter High School Schematic Plan Approval Los Angeles County High School for the Arts Schematic Plan Approval	√ √ √ √				1/24/2007 5/16/2007 5/16/2007 5/16/2007	
<b>CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY</b> Student Housing Phase I Schematic Plan Approval			√		9/19/2007	9/20/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE</b> Student Housing, Phase I Schematic Plan Approval				√	1/24/2007	**
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA</b> Student Housing Phase II Schematic Plan Approval International Polytechnic High School Schematic Plan Approval College of Business Administration Schematic Plan Approval Innovation Village Phase IV Schematic Plan Approval	√ √			√	1/24/2007 3/14/2007 5/16/2007 5/16/2007	** 5/17/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO</b> Recreation Wellness Center Schematic Plan Approval Student Housing Phase I Schematic Plan Approval	√ √				5/16/2007 5/16/2007	
<b>SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY</b> Alumni Center Schematic Plan Approval Certify Final EIR and Approve Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Increase	√			√	11/14/2007 11/14/2007	11/15/2007
<b>SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY</b> Approve Campus Master Plan Rev. for Property Acq. of Lots 1, 2, 5 and 6 of Park Merced Certify Final EIR and Approve Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Increase	√			√	3/14/2007 11/14/2007	11/15/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO</b> Center for Science Schematic Plan Approval				√	9/19/2007	9/20/2007
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS</b> Social and Behavioral Sciences Building Schematic Plan Approval Public Safety Building Schematic Plan Approval	√	√			5/16/2007 11/14/2007	4/3/2007
<b>SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY</b> Tuscany Village Student Housing Schematic Plan Approval				√	5/16/2007	5/17/2007

EXEMPT           Categorical Exemption  
 MIT. N.D.       Mitigated Negative Declaration  
 N.D.             Negative Declaration  
 EIR              Environmental Impact Report  
 BOT Action     Meeting Date Action Taken (or Delegated Approval)  
 NOD Filed     Date Notice of Determination Filed with State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research or Date of Notice of Exemption  
 \*NOD recalled and not re-filed due to litigation.  
 \*\*NOD not required based on Addendum and Finding of Consistency with EIR.

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

### **California State University Seismic Safety Program Annual Report**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

This information item presents the CSU Seismic Safety Program Annual Report. This reporting period spans July 2007 to June 2008.

#### **Seismic Policy and History**

The CSU initiated the assessment of the seismic hazards posed by CSU buildings as directed by former Governor Deukmejian's executive order and legislative provisions. 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)]*

Out of this policy the CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) was established to advise and assist in determining the condition of CSU buildings, and to technically oversee the trustees' seismic

policy. The CSU has identified the seismic hazard within its existing building stock and is in the process of completing their mitigation.

### **The CSU Seismic Review Board**

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, G.E., Principle Engineer, Geomatrix Consultants
- John A. Martin, Jr., S.E., President, John A. Martin and Associates, Inc.
- Richard Niewiarowski, S.E., Principle, Rutherford and Chekene
- Thomas Sabol, Ph.D., S.E., Principle, Englekirk and Sabol
- Theodore C. Zsutty, Ph.D., S.E., Consulting Structural Engineer, Professor, San Jose State University, Retired (co-chair)

### **CSU Seismic Mitigation and Oversight**

The California State University seismic mitigation and oversight planning effort has six elements:

1. **Mitigate urgent falling hazard concerns.** Mitigate significant life-safety threats posed by falling hazards as a priority. Identified falling hazard concerns at the 23 campuses and off-campus centers have been mitigated.
2. **Identify and broadly prioritize existing seismic deficiencies.** Identify existing buildings that pose a significant life-safety threat and mitigate these hazards as soon as practical. Prioritize these buildings into two listings; urgent and less urgent. Of the more than 200 buildings identified as potentially highly hazardous since inception, most have been retrofitted. The currently published priority listing identifies 33 buildings as a first priority for seismic retrofit and 30 buildings as a second priority. As an update to previous reporting, the following merits special note:

*At CSU East Bay, the Student Services Administrative Replacement Building is under construction. Completion of this building will permit occupants of Warren Hall to vacate the building during the seismic strengthening and renovation project. The design funding for Warren Hall was included in the 2008/09 Governor's Budget, but not supported by legislative subcommittees due to lack of support for a 2008 General Obligation bond. As a seismic repair, Warren Hall remains an urgent seismic retrofit priority and the CSU continues to seek funding for the project.*

3. **Perform periodic re-evaluation of existing facilities.** A second comprehensive systemwide seismic assessment has now been completed. The results of these evaluations are reflected in the updated CSU Seismic Retrofit Priority Lists.

4. **Provide peer review for all major construction.** Assure that all CSU new construction and modification of existing structures have independent, technical peer review of the seismic performance aspects of the proposed design. The California Building Code includes provisions applicable to renovation work for state projects. Specifically, CBC Chapter 34 contains criteria and triggers that work to systematically raise the level of seismic safety for existing building stock over time whenever any structural modification, alteration or addition to the structure is undertaken. The SRB closely monitors this compliance as a part of its peer reviews.
5. **Have in place a Seismic Event Response Plan.** The CSU Seismic Policy has a proven methodology in place to respond in the case of a significant seismic event. This includes:
  - Based on reporting of a significant seismic event SRB chair or co-chair contacts potentially affected campus(es) to assess situation.
  - Determination made by SRB chair if on-site campus visit by SRB chair is required.
  - As warranted, SRB chair (and/or CSU Building Official/Chief of Architecture & Engineering) travels to affected campus(es).
  - Immediate post-quake seismic safety assessments begin. Buildings are reviewed and posted as 'Occupancy Permitted', 'Restricted Use', or 'Unsafe'. Above parties validate any initial campus first-responder postings that were made. Per CSU Seismic Policy and confirming systemwide memo on this topic, seismic postings are enforced by campus police.
  - Follow-up inspections and repair strategies begin after initial assessments made.

*Page 5 discusses the application of this policy in the July 29, 2008 Chino Hills quake.*

6. **Conduct seismic related staff training.** CSU facilities planning and construction staff are afforded systemwide training on project management, building code, building official responsibilities and seismic emergency response and assessment procedures.

#### **2007/2008 Seismic Review Board Activities**

The Seismic Review Board (SRB) met five times during the reporting time period (FY 2007/08), two meetings at the Chancellor's Office and three meetings at campuses (Bakersfield, Sonoma, San Diego). The SRB members provide peer review of design and construction activities at all of the campuses and provide technical support to the CSU Building Official and the Deputy Building Official at each campus.

Notable activities of the SRB since the last report to the trustees include the following:

1. Provided seismic and structural engineering technical support to the Chancellor's Office and to the campuses.
2. Peer reviews are underway or were completed for construction projects in accordance with the trustee's policy. This includes all new construction and all construction projects that modify the structural characteristics of existing structures, regardless of their extent.
3. Administrative sections of the trustees' CSU Seismic Requirements were revised to reflect the modifications of the State Building Code contained in the 2007 Edition. This changed the basis of the California Building Code seismic requirements from the Uniform Building Code, to the American Society of Civil Engineers ASCE 7-05 standard. The Seismic Policy and its tables were updated to reflect these new standards.
4. A lease/purchase standard for CSU was incorporated into the CSU Seismic Requirements. The standard for the seismic evaluation of acquired facilities, developed principally by CSU, is now actively used by the University of California (UC) and is *de facto* used by the Department of General Services (DGS). Effectively CSU, UC and DGS are using the same seismic evaluation as part of the real property acquisition due diligence report.
5. Reviewed the fault investigation for the Student Housing project at Humboldt. The soils engineer had identified a fault that passed through the site. Under the direction of the SRB assigned peer reviewer, a fault investigation was conducted that demonstrated that there are no active fault traces within the planned development. This is the second project for which such an investigation has been conducted at Humboldt.
6. At the request of the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the chairman of the SRB and CSU staff have provided advice on how to implement a code enforcement and seismic review process for the Community Colleges Districts. CCC is adapting the CSU's model to its institutional setting and system needs. Legislation currently under consideration cites CSU practices as the referenced standard for CCC actions.
7. The CSU Seismic Retrofit Priority List has been updated. There are two parts: Priority List 1, those projects that are recommended as priority actions to be undertaken solely because of the seismic hazard posed by the building; and second, Priority List 2 identifies 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. The CSU Seismic Retrofit Priority Lists are regularly reviewed and periodically updated to reflect changes due to construction activity, physical building reviews, and code changes as may occur.
8. There were no earthquakes within the time period that required safety assessments of a campus. While outside the reporting period, a few comments on the July 29, 2008 Chino Hills seismic event are warranted. A magnitude 5.4 earthquake occurred at 11:42 AM in Chino Hills, about 25 miles southeast of Los Angeles. Peak ground motions of 0.185g were recorded at the Fullerton campus and of the order of 0.16g at Pomona.

As noted earlier, when a significant seismic event occurs, predefined CSU and SRB actions are triggered. Initial damage assessments by campus first responders are relayed within an hour to Chancellor's Office senior management and the CSU Building Official/Chief of Architecture & Engineering. The SRB Chairman confers with potentially affected campuses to determine if an on-site presence by the SRB is warranted. If so, the Chair of the SRB is pre-designated and empowered to act as a Special Deputy Building Official to make Campus Police-enforceable building occupancy posting assessments in an immediate post earthquake period regarding the safety of buildings where structural damage has occurred. Once initial life-safety assessments are made follow-up structural repair strategies can be developed.

Within one hour of the Chino Hills event both the Fullerton and Pomona campuses had been contacted to determine whether SRB mobilization was required. The initial reports were that damage had not occurred, but that shaking was intense. The decision was made early the afternoon of the earthquake that mobilization was not required. This determination was re-validated by various field observations the following morning. By 9 AM the following day both campuses reported that their consulting structural engineers and campus staff inspections were indicating no significant structural damage to any building. Some non-structural damage was reported (cracks in gypsum board walls, light fixtures, etc.) and few cracks were noted in some concrete structures, but they were evaluated as not significant.

The trustees' *CSU Seismic Requirements* and updated Seismic Retrofit Priority Lists are available online at [http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/ae/seismic\\_contracts.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/ae/seismic_contracts.shtml).

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

### **Campus Land Acquisitions**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

The trustees' standing orders delegate the acceptance and disposition of real property to the chancellor or his designee. This item informs the board of significant real property acquisitions realized through this delegated authority. Fee title for three sites will be vested in the State of California on behalf of CSU. The acquisitions include:

- Channel Islands – 369 acres of open space and recreational use property that is on the Northeast boundary of the campus, adjacent to the University Glen residential community development project, acquired from the County of Ventura.
- San Diego – 4.46 acres, also known as the Clegg property, and the last keyhole parcel within the Santa Margarita Ecological Reserve, purchased from a private party.
- San Diego – 11 parcels totaling 2.46 acres adjacent to the south boundary of the campus, purchased from the San Diego State University Research Foundation.

Extensive due diligence was conducted on the properties, including geotechnical and biological studies. Results of the due diligence process revealed no basis that would cause CSU not to accept the properties.

#### **Discussion**

The trustees on behalf of California State University, Channel Islands will be acquiring approximately 369 acres of land from the County of Ventura adjoining the university's northeasterly boundary. The property consists of three parcels of land, the majority of which was obtained in prior years by Ventura County through Federal and State grant resources. The land is restricted to recreational parkland and open space type uses. The county currently uses the land for public park and recreation purposes. Similarly, CSU Channel Islands proposes to preserve portions of the site as open space and wildlife habitat, while providing community access and education programs, as such adding value to the university's academic, research, and cultural

CPB&G

Agenda Item 4

September 16-17, 2008

Page 2 of 2

programs. The property is adjacent and southerly of Calleguas Creek, which is an important regional drainage course for the area around the campus. The creek is maintained by the Ventura County Flood Control District. The land is separated from the University Glen residential community development by a moderate ridge that serves as both a buffer and access from the campus through existing trails. The land, a habitat for many animal and plant species, will provide valuable local resources for educational and research programs in biology, geography, and environmental studies.

The trustees also acquired on behalf of San Diego State University the last in-holding within the Santa Margarita Ecological Reserve, which is operated by the campus. It is the culmination of several years of negotiation and efforts on the part of SDSU staff and faculty to consolidate university holdings within the 4,344-acre reserve. The acquisition consists of 4.46 acres and provides new facilities for field station operations and maintenance. Under the authority of Education Code Section 89724(b), the land was purchased for \$680,100 with proceeds from the sale of a portion of the Mt. Fortuna property, which was gifted to the university. The Santa Margarita Ecological Reserve lies on the Riverside/San Diego county line between Temecula and Fallbrook. Established in 1962, it provides protected sites for research and acts as a living laboratory and outdoor classroom for San Diego State University. This addition completes the ownership of this magnificent natural reserve property that will continue to serve the academic mission of the university and the CSU system.

The last acquisition by the trustees included 11 parcels totaling 2.46 acres adjacent to the south of the existing San Diego State main campus. Parcels were purchased from the San Diego State University Research Foundation (Foundation). Of the 11 parcels, four parcels currently contain occupied structures and the remaining parcels are unoccupied and provide temporary parking. This existing use will continue into the near future until comprehensive environmental documentation is conducted to establish future use. Under the authority of Education Code Section 89048(g), the land was purchased for \$14,800,000 with parking and housing cash reserves.

## **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

Albert Karnig  
President  
CSU San Bernardino

#### **Summary**

The trustees' standing orders delegate the acceptance and disposition of real property to the chancellor or his designee. This item informs the board of significant real property interest to be acquired through this delegated authority. The property of interest is proposed to be donated to CSU San Bernardino by Inland Communities Corporation (ICC).

The donated property includes two significant parcels of land. The first parcel is an approximate four-acre site, which is currently in the process of being re-zoned for at least 60 faculty/staff units as part of the larger ICC 404-acre site development plan. The four-acre site will be accepted by the CSU San Bernardino Foundation with fee title vested in the name of the foundation. The second parcel consists of approximately 235 acres and is proposed to be a natural preserve. The preserve site will be accepted by the trustees on behalf of CSU San Bernardino, and fee title will be vested in the State of California on behalf of the CSU.

#### **Discussion**

Inland Communities Corporation plans to develop residential neighborhoods on 169.5 acres of the 404-acre site located north of and adjacent to the university. This acreage includes the approximately four acres of land that will accommodate 60 faculty/staff residential units. The four-acre parcel will be re-zoned and graded, and will include the completion of streets and utilities to the site. The site will be prepared and transferred to the foundation ready for vertical construction of homes.

CPB&G

Agenda Item 5

September 16-17, 2008

Page 2 of 2

The ICC development will include 980 residential units arranged in sixteen neighborhoods, ranging from medium to high density single-family homes. There will be a variety of unit types, including estate, single-family detached, small lot detached, cluster court homes, and townhomes.

The 235-acre natural preserve, to be acquired by the trustees, is located on the northern section of the property and is north of the San Andreas Fault. The land is relatively steep and contains several fault lines. The preserve is important for its geological qualities and its habitat for many animal and plant species. The property will provide valuable local resources for educational and research programs in geology, biology, geography, and environmental studies, and may assist the university in meeting future environmental impact mitigation requirements.

The preserve will be named the Akkad Natural Preserve in honor of world-renowned filmmaker, the late Moustapha Akkad, who as an immigrant to this country exemplified the American success story. Mr. Akkad was a long-time close friend and business associate of ICC president Jim Ahmad.

Extensive due diligence was conducted on the property, including geotechnical and biological studies. Results of the due diligence process revealed no basis that would cause the CSU or the foundation not to accept the properties.

CSU San Bernardino will also benefit in this transaction by the construction of an extension of Campus Parkway, which will be completed by ICC on land directly adjacent to the university. The four-lane roadway will provide major vehicular access to the western and northern portions of the campus, which will greatly improve traffic flow. As part of the negotiated agreement, the campus will grant the City of San Bernardino an access easement on East Campus Drive to provide ICC access to their project site on the eastern boundary. The City of San Bernardino will install two traffic signals, one at the corner of Campus Drive and Northpark Boulevard, and the other at the intersection of East Campus Drive and North Campus Drive. A signal has already been installed at East Campus Drive and Northpark Boulevard by the city.

The land transfers and related improvements described above will be documented by an agreement between CSU San Bernardino, ICC, and the city. The covenants will also be included in the land deeds to ensure the agreements are permanent and all improvements benefiting the university will be completed as proposed by both the city and ICC.

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

**Sustainability Overview**

**Presentation By**

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

**Summary**

This item will present background on the institutionalization of sustainability in the California State University, recognize the multifaceted efforts throughout the system, and identify the areas of effort in the near and long term.

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

**Report on 2008-2009 State Funded Program and State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2009-2010 through 2013-2014**

**Presentation By**

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

**Summary**

This item presents an update of the 2008-09 Capital Outlay Program, and seeks board approval of the 2009-10 State and Non-State Funded Capital Outlay Program and the 2009-10 through 2013-14 State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (including the 2009-10 priority list) are included in the agenda mailing material. Due to the uncertainty of the final 2008-09 program, the accompanying board resolutions direct staff to negotiate with the governor's office and the legislature during the budget process to maximize funding opportunities for the campuses.

**2008-09 Capital Outlay Program Status Report**

During the spring 2008 capital budget hearings, legislative budget subcommittees deleted projects included in the 2008-09 Governor's Budget absent a November 2008 ballot measure for education. Out of the \$357.9 million in CSU capital projects included in the 2008 Governor's Budget, legislative subcommittees have approved a program totaling \$72.1 million using previously approved general obligation (GO) bond funds (Attachment A).

Consistent with the board's authorization to the chancellor, recent efforts have been made to explore funding options and adjust projects as necessary to seek additional funding. To secure lease revenue bond funding for the 2008-09 projects which had been deleted from the Governor's Budget, and in order to comply with Department of Finance (DOF) deadlines for capital program submittals for the 2009-10 program, staff submitted capital outlay budget change proposals to DOF totaling \$833.3 million needed to fund 27 capital projects. CSU also requested DOF to include a re-appropriation of \$30.6 million of previously appropriated GO bond funds for the construction of the Cal Poly Pomona College of Business Administration. Of the \$833.3 million, there were twelve projects prioritized for 2008-09 funding totaling \$532.1 million.

As of the date this agenda item was prepared, the administration selected five of the projects for the legislature to consider for inclusion in an Economic Stimulus Package with the 2008-09 capital budget. These five projects total \$223.7 million and include:

Channel Islands	Classroom and Faculty Office Renovation/Addition	\$ 29,686,000
Bakersfield	Art Center and Satellite Plant	\$ 17,681,000
San Luis Obispo	Center for Science	\$101,071,000
Monterey Bay	Academic Building II	\$ 40,599,000
Maritime Academy	Physical Education Building Replacement	\$ 34,751,000

2008-09 Lease Revenue Bond Subtotal	<u>\$223,788,000</u>
-------------------------------------	----------------------

If the legislature approves an Economic Stimulus package proposed by the governor that includes the noted projects, the 2008-09 capital program will increase to \$295.9 million, comprised of \$72.1 million for nine GO bond funded projects plus \$223.7 million for the five lease revenue bond funded projects. While the potential \$295.9 million program is less than the Compact amount, it would enable the CSU to address significant classroom, laboratory, and instructional support deficiencies. The CSU could serve more students, address workforce demand, and help regional economic activity from the design and construction of these facilities.

### **2009-10 Capital Outlay Program**

Due to the uncertainty of the final 2008-09 program, the trustees are requested to approve the entire Priority List (37 projects) of \$850.5 million for the 2009-10 capital outlay program. This is requested should the legislature not support the use of lease revenue bond to fund the 2008-09 Economic Stimulus projects. Funding for these projects would rely on the governor's and legislature's support to use lease revenue bond financing.

Of the \$850.6 million amount, program documentation for 27 projects, including the systemwide Minor Capital Outlay, Capital Renewal, and Off-Site Mitigation programs have been submitted to DOF. Of the 27 projects, the six equipment projects totaling \$16.1 million are proposed to be funded from existing GO bond reserves. The proposed property acquisition for San Francisco State was approved by the board and legislature in 2007-2008, and is included to allow greater flexibility in the use of the appropriated funds to support a more complex acquisition transaction.

The 2009-10 Non-State Capital Program totals \$80.4 million. The projects will be funded through campus auxiliary organizations, donations, grants, and parking programs. The parking programs rely on user fees to repay systemwide revenue bonds issued by the board.

### **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

The 2009-10 through 2013-14 Capital Improvement Program document is included with the agenda mailing. The report identifies the campuses capital project priorities to address facility deficiencies and accommodate student growth. The plan includes the physical master plan of each campus along with recently funded projects. The 2009-10 through 2013-14 State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program totals \$6.2 billion and \$4.6 billion respectively.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The final State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2009-10 through 2013-14 totaling \$6,177,401,000 and \$4,632,395,000 respectively are approved.
2. The 2009-10 State Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at \$850,592,000.
3. The 2009-10 Non-State Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program is approved at \$80,476,000. The chancellor is authorized to proceed in 2008-09 with design documents for fast-track projects in the 2009-10 Non-State 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 2009-10 State Funded Capital Outlay Program.

**State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2008-09 Priority List**

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index 5179 and Equipment Price Index 2799

Rank Order	Category	Campus	Project Title	Trustees' Request		Governor's Budget		Legislative Analyst's Office		Senate/Assembly Subcommittees		
				FTE	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IA	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay		PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	0 (l)
2	IA	Statewide	Capital Renewal		PWC	50,000,000 (a)	PWC	50,000,000 (c)	PWC	50,000,000	PWC	18,671,000 (m)
3	IA	Statewide	Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts		PWC	15,000,000		0 (d)		0		0
4	II	Los Angeles	Forensic Science Building	N/A	E	575,000	E	575,000	E	575,000 (b)	E	575,000
5	IB	Chico	Student Services Center	N/A	E	2,432,000	E	2,432,000	E	2,432,000 (b)	E	2,432,000
6	II	Northridge	Science I Replacement	N/A	E	4,499,000	E	4,499,000	E	4,499,000 (b)	E	4,499,000
7	IA	East Bay	Student Services Replacement Building	N/A	E	1,963,000	E	1,963,000	E	1,963,000 (b)	E	1,963,000
8	II	Dominguez Hills	Educational Resource Center Addition	N/A	E	3,664,000	E	3,664,000	E	3,664,000 (b)	E	3,664,000
9	II	Northridge	Performing Arts Center ◊	N/A	E	6,032,000	E	6,032,000	E	6,032,000 (b)	E	6,032,000
10	IA	Channel Islands	Entrance Road	N/A	C	23,822,000 (b)	C	23,822,000 (b)	C	23,822,000	C	23,822,000
11	IA	San Bernardino	Access Compliance Barrier Removal	N/A	PWC	10,510,000 (b)	PWC	10,510,000 (b)	PWC	10,510,000 (b)	PWC	10,510,000
12	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall (Seismic) ◊	-526	PW	3,468,000 (b)	PW	3,468,000 (b)	PW	3,468,000	PW	0 (l)
13	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall Telecommunications Relocation	N/A	PWC	2,003,000 (b)	PWC	2,003,000 (e)	PWC	2,003,000	PWC	0 (l)
14	IA	Humboldt	Library Seismic Safety Upgrade	N/A	PW	454,000	PW	454,000	PW	454,000	PW	0 (l)
15	II	Channel Islands	Classroom/Faculty Office Reno./Add.	1,050	C	30,128,000	C	30,128,000	C	30,128,000	C	0 (l)
16	IB	San Diego	Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation ◊	-2,196	C	47,169,000	C	47,169,000	C	47,169,000	C	0 (l)
17	IB	Bakersfield	Art Center and Satellite Plant	177	WC	17,292,000	WC	17,292,000	WC	17,292,000	WC	0 (l)
18	IB	Stanislaus	Science I Renovation (Seismic)	422	C	16,731,000	C	16,731,000	C	16,731,000	C	0 (l)
19	IB	San Luis Obispo	Center for Science ◊	66	C	99,620,000	C	99,620,000	C	99,620,000	C	0 (l)
20	II	Monterey Bay	Academic Building II	1,243	PWC	38,092,000	PW	2,145,000 (f)	PW	2,145,000	PW	0 (l)
21	IB	San Jose	Spartan Complex Renovation (Seismic)	62	PW	2,769,000	P	1,162,000 (g)	P	1,162,000	P	0 (l)
22	IB	Maritime	Physical Education Replacement	0	PW	1,928,000	P	917,000 (g)	P	917,000	P	0 (l)
23	II	Channel Islands	West Hall	438	P	868,000	P	868,000	P	868,000	P	0 (l)
24	II	Chico	Taylor II Replacement Building	751	PWc	4,982,000	PW	2,637,000 (h)	PW	0 (j)	PW	0 (l)
25	IB	Sacramento	Science II, Phase 2	924	PWc	10,965,000 (b)	PW	4,826,000 (i)	PW	4,336,000 (k)	PW	0 (l)
<b>Totals</b>				<b>2,411</b>		<b>\$419,966,000</b>		<b>\$357,917,000</b>		<b>\$354,790,000</b>		<b>\$72,168,000</b>

**Notes:**

**Trustees' Request**

- (a) \$2,000,000 funded by old bond funds.
- (b) Proposed from old bond funds.

**Governor's Budget**

- (c) Funded by University Capital Outlay Bond Fund (UCOBF) of 2008.
- (d) Not included in Governor's Budget.
- (e) \$241,000 (PW) funded by HECOB of 2004, the remainder funded from UCOBF of 2008.
- (f) Funded as a non-streamlined project; C phase deferred (\$35,947,000).
- (g) W phase deferred (San Jose: \$1,607,000; Maritime: \$1,011,000).
- (h) c phase deferred (\$2,345,000).
- (i) Funded by HECOB of 1988; c phase deferred (\$6,139,000).

**LAO Recommendation**

- (j) Recommend deletion (\$2,637,000).
- (k) Recommend partial program reduction (\$490,000).

**Senate/Assembly Sub-Committee Approvals**

- (l) Delete projects funded by UCOBF of 2008.
- (m) Restrict to available funds from HECOB of 1988 and HECOB of 2004.
- (n) Lease Revenue Bond funded (\$223,788,000) at CCCI 5320.

**Categories:** I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure

- A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies
- B. Modernization/Renovation

II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

◊ This project is dependent upon state and non-state 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**

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

#### **Summary**

Schematic plans for the following five projects will be presented for approval:

**1. California State University, Fullerton—Student Housing, Phase 3 and 4, Meeting and Dining Facility**

*Design/Build Contractor: PCL Construction Services*

*Project Architect: Steinberg Architects*

#### **Background and Scope**

California State University, Fullerton proposes to construct Student Housing, Phase 3 (#53) and 4 (#55) at the east side of the campus on a ten-acre site just south of the existing student housing complex (#24 and 25). The new 1,064-bed student housing will include a Meeting and Dining Facility (#57) with a seating capacity of approximately 600.

The project will permanently displace approximately 600 existing surface parking spaces. About 300 existing parking spaces will be temporarily displaced for construction staging, but will be rebuilt and returned to use at the conclusion of the project. Mitigation of the permanent loss of parking capacity due to this project will be through the construction of Parking Structure 4, Phase 1 (#59), scheduled for occupancy in 2010 (see Agenda Item 1 from this meeting).

The project will consist of five new student housing buildings of five stories each and a Meeting and Dining Facility for a total of 339,000 GSF. A typical floor in the student housing buildings will have approximately 24 double occupancy rooms, three ADA accessible restrooms, and two lounges. Two of the five structures will include a total of two faculty-in-residence apartments, two Residential Community Coordinator (RCC) units, three smart classrooms, public restrooms, a lounge/library, administrative offices, a laundry facility and a small convenience store located at the ground level for ease of student and staff access. The Meeting and Dining building (34,000 GSF) will include a dining area, kitchen, support spaces, loading dock and maintenance areas.

This project will site the buildings to provide a pedestrian concourse connected to the existing student housing to the north and create a new 50,000 GSF outdoor gathering place (piazza). The piazza will mark the entrance to the new student housing complex and will provide an attractive outdoor venue for dining, study, and recreation.

The five residential buildings will be constructed of durable concrete masonry unit (CMU) walls and concrete decks. The interior walls will be CMU with steel stud construction, and the windows will have low emission glazing and strategic sun screening on the south and west building facades. The ground floors of the buildings around the piazza will feature a covered arcade to form sheltered walkways. The meeting and dining facility will be constructed as a steel brace frame structure, and will be designed to complement the adjacent student housing buildings.

This project will be designed and constructed to meet LEED Gold certification. Circulation space is focused on the east side of the structures, allowing for natural light without excessive heat gain. Sustainable design features incorporated into the project include energy and water use reduction via low-flow water fixtures and irrigation. New “bio swales” will be constructed to naturally percolate storm water and irrigate the landscape on the site. Computer-based HVAC monitoring and controls, low emission glazing, and optimized thermal insulation will provide energy savings in daily operations. The design accommodates the installation of a separate photovoltaic project in the future on the roofs of the complex to provide renewable energy.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Preliminary Drawings Completed	December 2008
Working Drawings Completed	July 2009
Construction Start	September 2009
Occupancy	August 2011

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	339,490 square feet
Assignable Building Area	228,227 square feet
Efficiency	67 percent

**Cost Estimate - California Construction Cost Index 4890**

Building Cost (\$298 per GSF)	\$101,286,000
-------------------------------	---------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	(\$ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 9.54
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$ 111.01
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 60.62
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 103.58
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 10.34
f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 3.24
 Site Development (includes landscaping and parking)	 <u>12,430,000</u>
 Construction Costs	 \$113,716,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>22,842,000</u>
 Total Project Costs (\$402 per GSF)	 \$136,558,000
Group II Equipment	<u>6,221,000</u>
 Grand Total	 <u>\$142,779,000</u>

**Cost Comparison**

The project's building cost of \$298 per GSF is less than the \$338 per GSF for the Chico University Housing and Food Service, Phase I project, approved in September 2007, adjusted to CCCI 4890. The lower cost for this project can be attributed to the economy of scale afforded by its size, three times the square footage of the Chico facility, as well as the economy of building the housing and dining area as stand alone structures on a large site versus combining building types in a small footprint.

The project cost is substantially higher, however, than the \$240 per GSF for the Northridge Student Housing, Phase I project, approved in January 2007, adjusted to CCCI 4890. The higher cost of this project is due in part to the more durable steel frame structure and concrete masonry unit walls (versus wood frame and cement board), mini central plant, and the full food service dining facility.

**Funding Data**

The proposed project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program. The bonds will be repaid from student housing revenue.

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

This project is consistent with the program-level Environmental Impact Report defining future campus development, approved by the trustees in November 2003. A Notice of Exemption has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and will be filed with the State Clearinghouse as required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Fullerton, Student Housing, Phase 3 and 4, Meeting and Dining Facility project has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fullerton, Student Housing, Phase 3 and 4, Meeting and Dining Facility are approved at the project cost of \$142,779,000 at CCCI 4890.

## **2. California State University, Long Beach—Nursing Building Addition** *Project Architect: HMC Architects*

### **Background and Scope**

California State University, Long Beach proposes to construct an addition to the east side of the existing Nursing Building (#3). The new 10,800 GSF facility will house teaching labs, computer labs, administrative and department offices, and support space.

The single story addition will be constructed on Parking Lot #2, displacing forty-five spaces. The project scope includes the addition of three accessible parking spaces to Parking Lot #1, which is immediately west of the existing Nursing Building. The loss of the 45 spaces will be absorbed by Parking Structure No. 3 (#92) currently under construction.

The building's structure is proposed to be a steel brace frame, with steel decking and metal studs. The building exterior will be a combination of thin brick, aluminum storefront and glass windows, and stucco plaster. The facility will be designed to be LEED Silver equivalent.

Sustainable features will include natural daylighting, materials with high recycled content and no or low VOC emissions, waterless urinals, low flow plumbing fixtures, higher rated insulation, low emission dual glazed windows, and recycling of construction waste.

**Timing (estimated)**

Preliminary Plans Completed	November 2008
Working Drawings Completed	May 2009
Construction Start	August 2009
Occupancy	June 2010

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	10,809 square feet
Assignable Building Area	6,792 square feet
Efficiency	63 percent

**Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890**

Building Cost (\$307 per GSF)	\$3,315,000
-------------------------------	-------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure	\$ 21.19
b. Shell Structure and Enclosure	\$111.94
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 47.00
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 98.44
e. Equipment	\$ 5.09
f. General Conditions	\$ 23.01

Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>602,000</u>
---	----------------

Construction Cost	\$3,917,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>1,275,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$480 per GSF)	\$5,192,000
Group II Equipment	<u>306,000</u>

Grand Total	<u><u>\$5,498,000</u></u>
-------------	---------------------------

### **Cost Comparison**

The project's building cost of \$303 per GSF is higher than the CSU construction cost guidelines of \$273 per GSF for classroom buildings and \$274 per GSF for Administrative Offices at CCCI 4890. The higher cost for this project can be attributed to increased costs for the foundation to address poor soils condition and for the brick-cladding on the exterior required to match the existing nursing building and campus architectural vocabulary.

### **Funding Data**

The project will be funded in part from a 2007 state appropriation in the amount of \$2,312,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment. The balance of the project (\$3,186,000) will be funded from the CSU Long Beach Foundation.

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

A Notice of Exemption has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Notice of Exemption will be filed with the State Clearinghouse as required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Long Beach, Nursing Building Addition project, has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
  2. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
  3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Long Beach, Nursing Building Addition are approved at the project cost of \$5,498,000 at CCCI 4890.
- 3. California State University, Northridge—Student Recreation Center**  
*CM at Risk Contractor: CW Driver*  
*Project Architect: LPA Architects*

## **Background and Scope**

California State University, Northridge proposes to construct a 119,000 GSF Student Recreation Center (#129) in the southeast area of the campus immediately adjacent to the University Student Union (#24). The building has been sited to meet the master plan goals for student life, pedestrian and vehicle circulation in the eastern quadrant of the campus. The new facility includes administrative offices, cardio fitness and weight training rooms, three basketball courts, workout studios, racquetball court, an indoor running track, and locker rooms. The project includes a 5,000 square foot outdoor recreational pool with two lap lanes and an artificial turf field for intramural sports.

The building will be constructed over 350 existing surface parking spaces that will be replaced by the adjacent G3 parking structure (#155) currently under construction. The building orientation provides second floor views to the local mountains and ground level visual connections to the lobby and recreation spaces. The full height entry lobby is accented by a rock climbing wall.

The project incorporates an integrated design approach that utilizes Building Information Modeling (BIM) to integrate architectural, structural, and HVAC systems. The innovative structural design uses angled columns for gravity and lateral loads to reduce the distances spanned. The exterior skin contains a significant amount of glass curtain wall, metal panel, and window shading. The gymnasium areas at the second floor and mezzanine use a displacement ventilation design that supplies cool air at the floor level, allowing hot air to collect in the trusses well above the occupied level prior to exhausting to the exterior. The orientation of the building provides maximum shading of glass surfaces so that daylighting can be achieved while maintaining desired thermal performance.

A “cool roof” design minimizes the local heat island effect, while high efficiency elevators and low-flow plumbing fixtures with automatic shut-offs are utilized to minimize building utility costs. Drought-tolerant landscaping and natural filtration of storm water run-off will help to reduce water use. This project is participating in the pilot program for Program for Environmental Responsibility (PER), the CSU’s sustainability rating system.

### **Timing (estimated)**

Preliminary Plans Completed	January 2009
Working Drawings Completed	April 2009
Construction Started	September 2009
Occupancy	September 2011

### Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	118,952 square feet
Assignable Building Area	88,216 square feet
Efficiency	74 percent

### Cost Estimate - California Construction Cost Index 4890

Building Cost (\$325 per GSF) \$38,694,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 14.87
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$153.00
c. Interior (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 60.01
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 91.56
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 3.98
f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 1.87

Site Development (includes landscaping, pool and sports field) 9,152,000

Construction Costs \$47,846,000

Fees, Contingency, Services 19,520,000

Total Project Cost (\$566 per GSF) \$67,366,000

Group II Equipment 2,500,000

Grand Total \$69,866,000

### Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$325 per GSF is comparable to other recreation center facility types including the Sacramento Recreation Wellness Center at a project cost of \$307 per GSF approved in May 2007 and the Chico Wildcat Activity Center at a project cost of \$303 per GSF approved in July 2006, both adjusted to CCCI 4890. The increased cost for this project is due to the high cost for the exterior curtain wall.

### Funding Data

A student referendum was passed in spring 2007 approving increases to the University Student Union fees to fund the Student Recreation Center project. The project will be funded from a combination of reserves and cash on hand from University Student Union fees (\$20,624,000),

with the balance (\$49,242,000) financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program. The bonds will be repaid from future University Student Union fees.

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

A Finding of Consistency has determined that the project is consistent with the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared in conjunction with the campus master plan revision approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2006 and no new environmental analysis is required because the effects of the project were fully analyzed in the 2006 FEIR. A copy of the FEIR and the Findings of Consistency will be available at the meeting.

The following is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the California State University, Northridge, Student Recreation Center project is consistent with the campus master plan revision approved in March 2006 and a Finding of Consistency has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The Finding of Consistency analysis has determined that no new, previously undisclosed, potential significant impacts have been found, and therefore no additional mitigation measures are required to mitigate impacts disclosed in the previously certified Master Plan FEIR.
3. 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.
4. 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).
5. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file a Notice of Determination for the project.
6. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Student Recreation Center are approved at the project cost of \$69,866,000 at CCCI 4890.

**4. San Francisco State University—Children’s Center**  
*Project Architect: Asian Neighborhood Design*

**Background and Scope**

San Francisco State University proposes to construct a new Children’s Center building (#8) for the child care and child development academic program, located to the west of the Corporation Yard (#25). The Children’s Center will serve the children of San Francisco State University’s faculty and staff and will provide “hands-on” learning opportunities for university students studying to become early childhood educators.

This project will be located on an approximately 33,000 GSF site in what was the west half of the now demolished Lakeview Center Building property bounded by Lake Merced Boulevard on the west, Winston Avenue on the north and the university’s North State Drive on the south. The site includes 12 existing, mature bay laurel trees on the south and a large cypress on the north that will provide shade to the new buildings and play areas.

The program will be housed in a “pre-engineered” modular facility until the permanent on-campus structure (#94) is designed and built. The one-story building will be approximately 8,000 GSF and will house administration offices and six classrooms serving infant, toddlers and pre-school level children with supporting nap and observation rooms. The administration spaces include a multi-purpose room, teacher preparation room, offices and support spaces. The new Children’s Center will be licensed for 72 children. The site will include four outdoor play yards and a dedicated lane for child drop off and pick up off of North State Drive adjacent to the building entrance walkway.

The building is designed to be energy efficient, exceeding California Title 24 requirements by 15 percent and will include double-glazed operable windows with low emission coatings. The mechanical systems are designed for an energy efficient thermal building envelope. High efficiency interior and exterior lighting will be installed with occupancy sensors, as well as photo cells for exterior fixtures. The landscape planting design will be low water use with drip irrigation supporting drought tolerant plants.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Preliminary Plans Completed	December 2008
Working Drawings Completed	March 2009
Construction Start	June 2009
Occupancy	November 2009

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	8,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	6,500 square feet
Efficiency	81 percent

**Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890**

Building Cost (\$289 per GSF)	\$2,310,000
-------------------------------	-------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 33.38
b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure)	\$ 59.75
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 54.88
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 63.00
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 19.75
f. Special Construction (Demolition, Haz Mat)	\$ 58.00

Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>633,000</u>
---	----------------

Construction Cost	\$2,943,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>1,237,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$523 per GSF)	<u>\$4,180,000</u>
------------------------------------	--------------------

**Cost Comparison**

The project's building cost of \$289 per GSF is lower than the Fullerton Children's Center approved in November 2007 at \$317 per GSF, adjusted to CCCI 4890. The lower building cost is largely due to a cheaper shell/exterior skin cost.

**Funding Data**

The project will be fully funded through the University Corporation, San Francisco State, Inc., and campus reserves. The campus will operate the facility and provide funding for the facility's maintenance and custodial cost.

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

A Notice of Exemption has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Notice of Exemption will be filed with the State Clearinghouse as required.

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 Categorical Exemption for the San Francisco State University, Children's Center project has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
  2. The proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
  3. The schematic plans for the San Francisco State University, Children's Center are approved at a project cost of \$4,180,000 at CCCI 4890.
- 5. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo—Technology Park Pilot Building**  
*Design/Build Contractor: Rarig Construction, Inc.*  
*Project Architect: Omni Design Group*

### **Background and Scope**

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo proposes to construct the Technology Park Pilot Building (#82D), a 25,000 GSF two-story facility designed for research and development that will foster the existing, strong academic program and provide additional "real-world" experience for faculty and students. This project will construct the building shell with tenant improvements to be constructed once tenants are secured.

The project will be a pre-engineered building with a design reminiscent of agricultural buildings adjacent to the site. The project will be built on approximately three acres of land located west of the campus core and will include associated utilities, access upgrades, and an 84-car parking lot. The site has been used for a softball field in the past and is currently being used for a construction lay down yard.

Sustainable features include the use of high fly ash concrete, water saving fixtures, large overhangs along the south and west elevations and a pre-engineered metal building made of largely recycled steel.

**Timing (estimated)**

Preliminary Plans Completed	December 2008
Working Drawings Completed	March 2009
Construction Started	May 2009
Occupancy	October 2010

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	25,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	20,000 square feet
Efficiency	80 percent

**Cost Estimate - California Construction Cost Index 5179**

Building Cost (\$153 per GSF)	\$3,828,000
-------------------------------	-------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (Includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 24.72
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$ 54.12
c. Interior (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 25.36
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 36.72
e. General Conditions	\$ 12.20

Site Demolition and Development (includes landscaping)	<u>853,000</u>
--	----------------

Construction Costs	\$4,681,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>1,619,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$252 per GSF)	<u>\$6,300,000</u>
------------------------------------	--------------------

Grand Total	<u>\$6,300,000</u>
-------------	--------------------

**Cost Comparison**

The cost of \$153 per GSF is less than the CSU Construction Cost Guide for an engineering building of \$372 per GSF. The reduced cost reflects the unfinished nature of the interiors/partitions and building services (mechanical, electrical, etc.).

### **Funding Data**

A grant from the Economic Development Agency is providing \$1,800,000; donor funds are providing \$2,000,000; and the balance (\$2,500,000) is being financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program. The bonds will be repaid from lease revenue. Cal Poly San Luis Obispo has received a responsive design/build proposal within budget.

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

The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed master plan revisions in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. The Public Review Period was from June 11, 2008 and closed July 10, 2008 and only one written comment letter was received at the close of the public review period. Public comments received specific to the project focused on air quality. The content of the comment was included in the mitigation program and has been deemed to be less than significant

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared to address the potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the Technology Park Pilot Building project, and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified in the Final Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. The MND (State Clearinghouse No. 2008061076) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines.
3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which requires that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project and as such the mitigated project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment and that the project be constructed with the mitigation measures.

4. The schematic plans for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Technology Park Pilot Building are approved at a project cost of \$6,300,000 at CCCI 5179.