

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, July 7, 1999
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 11, 1999

1. Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*
2. Professional Appointments, *Information*
3. CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report, *Information*

Discussion Items

4. Policy on the Roles in the Physical Development of CSU Campuses, *Action*
5. Streamlining Policies on Professional Appointments and Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*
6. Status Report on the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
7. Draft of the Capital Outlay Program 2000/01 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 Through 2004/05, State and Nonstate Funded, *Information*
8. Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex, *Action*

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

**Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

May 11, 1999

Members Present

Ali C. Razi, Chair
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Eric C. Mitchell
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Michael D. Stennis

Members Absent

William D. Campbell

Other Trustees Present

Martha C. Fallgatter
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources
J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Presidential Liaisons

Warren J. Baker, President, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, present
Alistair W. McCrone, President, Humboldt State University, present
Peter P. Smith, President, California State University, Monterey Bay, present

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:23 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the March 16, 1999, meeting were approved as submitted.

Amend the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-99-07).

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University

Chair Razi introduced Patrick Drohan, senior director, capital planning, design and construction, to present the item.

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. He stated that the appropriate CEQA documents had been prepared that included the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C of the printed agenda item). A handout was introduced to the committee members as a clarifying statement to be added to the end of the first paragraph of Page 18, Attachment C, of this agenda item.

President Weber said that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity for San Diego State University because of the confluence of three separate projects. The Aztec Walk component is a major east-west pedestrian corridor through the campus. San Diego State University does have a north-south corridor. The coming of the San Diego Trolley to the campus in approximately the year 2004 will be the second project. This will be an underground transit system that will have two entrances on our campus. The San Diego State University Foundation Community Redevelopment project has started and is located south of the Aztec Walk. This is the third project and will include residential and mixed-use commercial facilities. Over the next five to ten years, approximately 1.1 billion dollars in nonstate dollars will be spent to improve San Diego State University and its neighbors.

Trustee Pesqueira inquired as to where on the campus the trolley would surface.

President Weber responded that the trolley would travel under the Aztec Walk with one entrance at the intersection of Campanile and Aztec Walk and one entrance over the Student Center.

Trustee Pierce congratulated the president and the campus's architect in putting together this master plan that includes the private contributions, making several projects a reality.

Chair Razi asked that with the advent of the trolley bringing a lot of people to the campus, had the issue of reducing the number of parking spaces been addressed.

President Weber stated that his immediate concern is the need for extra parking spaces during construction of the trolley since the lay down and staging facilities will require the use of existing parking spaces. With the completion of the project, it is the president's hope that a shifting to the use of the trolley for access to the campus will result in not needing another parking structure at San

Diego State University.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-99-08).

Status Report on the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Referring to the status report handout, Mr. Drohan reviewed the information as shown. He indicated that the last two columns on pages three and four reflect the actions of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Subcommittee No. 1 on Education and the Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2 on Education Finance. Staff has been successful in getting our budget through these two committees. In addition, the Department of Finance submitted a revised technical letter to the legislature reinstating two projects that had been previously deferred as a result of the funding requirements for the San Jose State University Library. Mr. Drohan opined that it is a good budget that will fund a number of needed projects and other critical elements of our 1999/2000 capital program.

Approval of Schematic Plans

Using a short visual presentation, Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. He stated that the appropriate CEQA documentation had been completed on both projects and staff recommended approval of the schematics.

At Chair Razi's invitation for comments, President Wilson stated that the University Club is historically significant for two reasons. The original building was built by the faculty and is located in one of the two remaining San Fernando Valley orange groves. The Associated Students Children's Center project, when completed, will complement the renovation of Monterey Hall, and will provide a transition to adjacent residential buildings.

President Wilson continued by saying that the University Club has begun to serve as a very popular meeting and banquet facility for the university and surrounding communities. A weekly Sunday Brunch is being served. The historic deficit that the University Club had experienced, when it was a university membership club only, has now disappeared and the university would not like those deficits to return. The remodeled University Club, in its design, is a very unusual building, serves multiple purposes, will be showcased within the orange grove and complement the Monterey Hall for public use of the academic programs.

Chair Razi noted that this is a two-project action item. He called for the vote on the first project, California State University, Northridge—Associated Students Children's Center.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution for the CSUN Associated Students Children's Center project (RCPBG 05-99-09).

In reference to the second project, the University Club, Trustee Pierce asked if an appropriate campus staff person would elaborate on the aggregate construction cost of \$382 per square foot.

Mr. Drohan asked to respond, stating that while the unit cost is correct, as shown, it is a project level cost. The building construction cost, the site development of over 50,000 square feet that includes a large area beyond the building lines to enhance the entrance to the facility, and the patio improvements for outside dining are all part of the project cost. There is almost two hundred thousand dollars worth of utilities within the site development cost with an approximate breakdown of \$13

per gsf for the general site development and another \$4 per gsf for the utilities. The \$756,000 for fees and contingency applied to the \$3.8 million construction cost equates to a little over 19 percent. Our standard fee structure for architecture/management fees and project contingencies runs between 18 and 20 percent. Mr. Drohan noted that when he reviewed the schematics, he was advised by the architects and campus staff that part of the appeal to the community would be the setting and ambience established by the architectural solutions. This provides some of the reasons for the cost.

Trustee Pierce stated that if he understood the agenda item correctly, the construction cost for this project would be financed through the auxiliary probably with tax-exempt bonds. Using today's prevailing rates at a 6 percent assumed rate that would include interest and amortization, the debt service alone would be \$275,000. This means that the monthly rent would be approximately \$3.25 per square foot triple net. He questioned how a faculty restaurant with community support could afford to pay that kind of rent from the revenue generated by this facility.

Mr. Phil Loughman, real estate manager, University Corporation, responded that a pro forma had been developed for this facility. Two revenue sources are anticipated: one from the surrounding community using the banquet and meeting facilities, and the other from the continued Faculty Club membership fee. He said that staff expects it will take two years before the facility will start to make a profit.

Trustee Pierce indicated that he was not comfortable with the total aggregate budget. He suggested that the item be continued until the next board meeting to give the campus staff an opportunity to take a second look at the development cost budget versus occupancy cost and what other options there might be for a more reasonable cost.

Chair Razi asked President Wilson if the campus staff would have a problem in delaying the item until the July 1999 Board of Trustees' meeting.

President Wilson responded that it is always the intent of the campus to fully satisfy the board. Since the board does not meet monthly, a delay in approval means delaying the project.

At Trustee Stennis' suggestion and concurrence of the committee members, it was agreed that discussion between committee members, campus and Chancellor's Office staffs would take place sometime before 8 a.m. on Wednesday, May 12.

Trustee Wang noted that there are a lot of factors involved in the site development cost. He pointed out that the facility was designed so that the patio area totals approximately 3,500 to 4,000 square feet and provides seating for banquets and other types of activities. Therefore, the patio furniture is a large portion of the patio cost. Additional parking spaces to accommodate 125 cars will supplement existing parking. Improved access to the site is needed to make the facility a little less remote to the academic core. An extensive landscape budget is anticipated to tie the indoor and outdoor space together. In summary, Trustee Wang stated that in essence we are buying a lot of outside seating space at less cost than it would be if included inside the structure itself.

The committee recommended tabling the item until the reconvening of the Committee on Campus

Planning, Buildings and Grounds on Wednesday, May 12, 1999, at 8:00 a.m.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 4:00 p.m.

Reconvened

Chair Razi greeted the audience and reconvened the meeting at 8:07 a.m., May 12, 1999. All members of the committee were present except William D. Campbell and Bob Foster. Ralph R. Pesqueira and Anthony M. Vitti were the other trustees in attendance.

Approval of Schematic Plans

Chair Razi stated that the committee was reconvened because the cost of the CSU Northridge University Club was in question. He informed the committee that a new resolution had been developed and asked Mr. Drohan to elaborate.

Mr. Drohan stated that the new resolution modifies the approval of the schematic plans at the cost published with the condition and understanding that the university will engage a contractor to assist in value engineering the schematic plans and adjusting costs, as appropriate, prior to the university requesting approval of the financing from the trustees.

Trustee Pierce emphasized that it is essential that a contractor be consulted at this time with the hope that the cost will be reduced. It was his opinion that this step needs to be completed before the campus proceeds with working drawings.

Chair Razi suggested that in the future when staff reviews capital costs that are over the norm, a detailed breakdown of the cost would be helpful for the trustees to review.

Trustee Wang said that even if the design on this project is different in several ways, what if the University Club has a constant deficit?

Mr. Drohan said that this point was discussed in an earlier meeting that day. He said that it is hoped that the compromise that was reached will have a favorable influence on the financial package for CSU Northridge.

Mr. Drohan noted that on page six of Agenda Item 4 under Funding Data, the word "foundation" should be University Corporation, the sponsor of this project.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution for the CSUN University Club project (RCPBG 05-99-10).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 a.m.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1999/2000 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- | | | |
|--|------|--------------|
| 1. California State University, Bakersfield
Classroom/Office Building III Complex | PWCE | \$3,614,000 |
| 2. California State University, Los Angeles
Bookstore/Cafeteria | PWCE | \$20,000,000 |
| 3. San Diego State University
Residential Housing and Dining Complex | PWCE | \$37,884,000 |

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

This is a request to amend the 1999/2000 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. California State University, Bakersfield PWCE \$3,614,000
Classroom/Office Building III Complex

This project will provide the nonstate component of the CSU Bakersfield classroom/office building complex. It includes 17,105 gross square feet for the Extended University Center and Leadership Development Center. Permanent classroom and office space will be provided for extended education operations plus administrative offices, seminar and study rooms for the development center. Nonstate components will be integrated with the state funded classroom/office complex to serve academic programs enhanced by partnerships with local businesses and the community. Funding is from the Extended Education Fund and community donations. Adjacent parking will be funded from parking reserves. The schematic plans for the project are also being presented at this meeting.

2. California State University, Los Angeles PWCE \$20,000,000
Bookstore/Cafeteria

CSU Los Angeles wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new 108,000 gross square foot bookstore/cafeteria. The proposed project will serve various university functions, including continuing education, food services, bookstore, credit union and administrative and support space. The existing cafeteria will be demolished and the new structure will be built on the same site with a slightly larger footprint. University Auxiliary Services, Inc., a CSU recognized auxiliary organization, will fund the project through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. The Board of Trustees will be requested to approve bond financing at a future board meeting.

3. San Diego State University PWCE \$37,884,000
Residential Housing and Dining Complex

San Diego State University wishes to proceed with a design/build project to construct a residential housing and dining complex adjacent to the existing east residence hall complex. The project will be located on three acres and consists of two, six-story residential buildings. Each building contains approximately 100,000 gross square feet with 347 beds in eight-person suites. Also included is a 48,000 gross square foot two-story commons building for residential dining, housing administration, laundry, living/learning classrooms, and a coffee shop. Outdoor amenities include a swimming pool, barbecue area, volleyball court and green space. The proposal supports the university's educational mission and demand for residential suite style living. It furthers the sense of community in the east residential complex by centralizing a dining area for over 2,500 students and creates a pedestrian street leading toward the university core. The project will be funded from the issuance of Dormitory Revenue Fund-Housing revenue bonds. The Board of Trustees will be requested to approve bond financing at a future board meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: (1) \$3,614,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Bakersfield, Classroom/Office Building III Complex; (2) \$20,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Los Angeles, Bookstore/Cafeteria and (3) \$37,884,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the San Diego State University, Residential Housing and Dining Complex.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Professional Appointments

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This information item reports the campus appointments for Fiscal Year 1999/2000 consulting master plan architects and three major capital outlay projects.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2

July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Professional Appointments

In accordance with trustee policy, the following campuses wish to report on professional appointments made since the last board meeting:

I . Fiscal Year	1999/2000	Consulting	Master Plan	Architects	First Appointed
	CSU Bakersfield	BFGC Architects Planners, Inc.			1975
	CSU Chico	Vacant			NA
	CSU Dominguez Hills	Louis Liets Architects, Inc.			1961
	CSU Fresno	Allen Y. Lew & William E. Patnaude, Inc.			1967
	CSU Fullerton	Vacant			NA
	CSU Hayward	Allen M. Walter & Associates, Inc.			1999
	Humboldt State University	Freeman Architects			1989
	CSU Long Beach	Killingsworth, Stricker, Lindgren, Wilson & Assocs.			1961
	CSU Los Angeles	Coleman/Caskey Architects			1999
	California Maritime Academy	NBBJ Architecture			1995
	CSU Monterey Bay	Sasaki Associates, Inc.			1994
	CSU Northridge	R. L. Binder Architecture & Planning			1999
	CSPU Pomona	Robbins Jorgensen Christopher			1996
	CSU Sacramento	E.M. Kado Associates, Inc.			1991
	CSU San Bernardino	Rossetti Associates Architects			1990
	San Diego State University	Delawie Wilkes Rodrigues Barker & Bretton Assoc.			1989
	San Francisco State University	ELS/Elbasant & Logan Architects			1990
	San Jose State University	Allen M. Walter & Associates, Inc.			1986
	CPSU San Luis Obispo	RRM Design Group			1992
	CSU San Marcos	Robbins Jorgensen Christopher			1993
	Sonoma State University	TLCD Architecture			1998
	CSU Stanislaus	John R. Rollings + Associates			1996

II . Major Capital Outlay Projects

- 1. CSU Monterey Bay
Renovate Building 206—Residence Hall
Project Architect: The Paul Davis Partnership

After assessing the qualifications of architectural firms with whom CSU Monterey Bay has had prior experience and who would have the capacity for a very condensed design and construction time frame for this project, CSUMB selected The Paul Davis Partnership to design the Residence Hall 206. This approximately 32,000 gross square foot structure is estimated to cost \$4.9 million.

2. CSU Monterey Bay
Renovate Building 45a—Classrooms/Faculty Offices
Project Architect: Fisher Friedman Associates

After reviewing the qualifications of architectural firms in Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, Santa Clara, and San Francisco Counties with substantial university renovation experience, CSU Monterey Bay selected the firm of Fisher Friedman Associates to design the adaptive reuse of the first floor of Building 45a. This approximately 10,000 gross square foot renovation is estimated to cost \$928,000.

3. CSU San Marcos
Fieldhouse and Student Union Offices
Project Architect: Robbins Jorgensen Christopher

After reviewing the qualifications of architectural firms in San Diego and Orange Counties with substantial athletic facilities experience, CSU San Marcos selected the firm of Robbins Jorgensen Christopher to design the Fieldhouse and Student Union Offices. The firm is also the campus consulting master plan architect. This 33,000 gross square foot structure is estimated to cost \$7.1 million.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

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

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3

July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report

The CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB), established in 1992, advises the Chancellor's Office on seismic safety matters. Its members are: Charles C. Thiel Jr., Chairman; Gregg E. Brandow; Neville C. Donovan; James A. Hill; John A. Martin, Jr.; Svend H. Nielsen; and Theodore C. Zsutty. The SRB met six times during the past year to consider seismic construction issues, monitor CSU seismic retrofit program progress, develop technical provisions for retrofit design, and advise the Chancellor's Office on technical issues. For each CSU campus, SRB members advised on seismic construction issues and managed construction project peer reviews. Additional activities of the SRB during this period include:

1. Implemented Division III-R regulations for all CSU construction projects consistent with Board of Trustees' seismic policy. The SRB also incorporated Division III-R into the Building Standards Commission's Title 24. Division III-R regulates seismic modifications, alterations, or additions to existing state buildings. Division III-R originally responded, in part, to AB 3313, which required the CSU and the University of California to develop and use specific seismic design approaches. Its adoption into Title 24 caused no significant technical changes in the CSU's program.
2. Assisted the Division of the State Architect with committee work and with building code issue presentations to the Building Standards Commission on Division III-R. This work included initiating a revision to conform to the new state Building Code edition.
3. Reviewed new and existing construction projects for all CSU campuses.
4. Reviewed seismic safety of several new CSU buildings where recent research findings and performance reviews brought into question their seismic safety. Removed some buildings from the priority list when study indicated that the buildings did not pose a significant life-safety risk.
5. Revised the 1998 seismic evaluation of all CSU buildings and developed a new seismic retrofit projects priority list. The priority list includes all of the CSU's major life-safety retrofit projects. The list only includes projects with major life-safety implications. The list does not include damage limitation or operations maintenance projects. Each year, new seismic retrofit projects are selected for implementation based on the ranking and available resources.
6. Provided assistance to Capital Planning, Design and Construction in responding to information requests from the Office of the Legislative Analyst.
7. Assessed CSU's buildings use of welded steel moment frame (WSMF) structural systems. Before the 1994 Northridge earthquake, WSMF was thought to be among the best performing structural systems. The quake proved it to be very damageable. New standards for the evaluation of WSMF structures are expected in late 1999. This assessment prepares CSU to respond to the new standards and to identify any buildings needing structural modification.

8. Assisted San Bernardino with a federal research grant studying novel approaches to WSMF building improvements.
9. Initiated a study of Pomona's San Jose fault to determine whether it is active or not. California Division of Mines and Geology rates the fault as not potentially active. However, the campus needed to assess the fault's potential for activity and determine what steps would protect its buildings from the damaging effects of the fault. The study will be completed by the end of summer 1999.
10. Initiated a CSU Building Database that systematically records the CSU buildings' seismic condition.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Policy on the Roles in the Physical Development of CSU Campuses

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item presents the Board of Trustees' policy on the various roles in the physical development of CSU campuses (Attachment A). It has been updated to include the Board of Trustees' action to delegate authority to the campuses to appoint design professionals for approved capital outlay projects and to reflect current business practice related to the management of the capital outlay process. The related changes to the Standing Orders are contained in Attachment B and will be presented to the Committee on Organization and Rules for action at this board meeting.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Policy on the Roles in the Physical Development of CSU Campuses

Background

In 1961 and 1966, the Board of Trustees approved policy defining roles in the physical development of CSU campuses. Though modified slightly over the years, the policy remains in effect today. In 1997, the Board of Trustees delegated design professional appointment authority to the campuses for approved capital outlay projects. This action was taken in conjunction with an executive order shifting capital outlay process management to the campuses. Attachment A updates the policy to include these changes. It also reaffirms the importance of fulfilling the board's direction in developing CSU campuses. Attachment B shows changes in the Standing Orders that will be presented to the Committee on Organization and Rules for action at this board meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the updated "Policy on the Roles in the Physical Development of CSU Campuses" contained in Attachment A of Agenda Item 4 of the July 7-8, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds be approved.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

POLICY ON THE ROLES IN THE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CSU CAMPUSES

The Board of Trustees approved the original policy on administering CSU's capital outlay program in December 1961 and modified it on September 8, 1966. The policy defined the roles, procedures and relationships in physically developing CSU campuses. In 1997, the Board of Trustees delegated design professional appointment authority to the campuses for approved capital outlay projects. This was done in conjunction with an executive order shifting capital outlay management to the campuses. This new policy updates role definitions for campus physical development; namely, Consulting Master Plan Architect, Consulting Landscape Architect, Project Architect, Project Landscape Architect, Project Engineer, Campus, Chancellor's Office, and the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees

Although the primary contractual relationships for architects, landscape architects, project engineers, and other consultants serving the CSU campuses are with the trustees, the board has delegated the negotiation, execution, administration, and supervision of these contracts and the services involved to the chancellor who has further delegated the authority to campus presidents or designees. The board has retained authority to review and approve the following:

1. Capital outlay budgets.
2. Site selections.
3. Campus master plans in complete detail.
4. Schematic designs for major capital outlay projects.

The Chancellor's Office

The Board of Trustees has delegated authority to the chancellor to perform the following actions while reporting to the Board of Trustees:

1. Prepare one-year and five-year capital outlay programs for review and approval by the board.
2. Review and approve scope of projects.
3. Review campus master plans and schedule for review and approval by the board when satisfactory.
4. Approve minor campus master plan revisions designated by the Board of Trustees.
5. Review schematic plans for buildings and schedule for review and approval by the board when satisfactory.
6. Approve schematic plans for certain projects designated by the Board of Trustees.

7. Validate conformance of preliminary plans to scope, schedule and budget for all projects within limits designated by the Board of Trustees.
8. Validate conformance of working drawings to scope, schedule and budget for all projects within limits designated by the Board of Trustees.

The Campus

The campus president—acting with the advice and assistance of an administrative officer that he or she appoints—and a Campus Planning Committee that the president also appoints, initiates all planning, services, and projects. The president or designee directly manages all approved capital outlay projects. Membership of the Campus Planning Committee includes educational policy, finance, and master planning representation. The Consulting Master Plan Architect serves as an ex officio member of the committee. The committee recommends actions to the president on the campus's long-range physical development plan, all capital outlay related matters, and other areas of study delegated by the president.

The Consulting Master Plan Architect

The Consulting Master Plan Architect (MP Architect) advises the campus on developing its physical master plan. The MP Architect serves as an ex officio member of the Campus Planning Committee and advises the president on developing, coordinating, and controlling the long-range, physical development plan. The MP Architect supplies continuity in planning for the growth of the campus, and in maintaining and updating the campus physical master plan.

The MP Architect's responsibility is for the total building program. Working with the president and Campus Planning Committee, the MP Architect develops a general architectural vocabulary or character for the campus, which lends efficiency, distinction, and unity to campus buildings. This role also includes guiding Project Architects in complying with Board of Trustees' procedures and standards. The MP Architect also recommends approval of schematic designs including architectural vocabulary, building color and material palettes. Finally, the MP Architect also advises the president on other long-range development matters.

The Consulting Landscape Architect

The Consulting Landscape Architect plays a similar role to the Consulting Master Plan Architect except that the Consulting Landscape Architect's role applies to landscaping and developing campus grounds. The Consulting Landscape Architect works with the Consulting Master Plan Architect to align landscape design with building design. The Consulting Landscape Architect prepares and maintains a long-range landscape master plan and advises the Consulting Master Plan Architect and the campus on all landscaping and campus grounds development issues. In addition, the Consulting Landscape Architect serves as a Project Landscape Architect when designated.

The Project Architect, Project Landscape Architect or Project Engineer

The Project Architect, Landscape Architect or Engineer looks to the university for direction, guidance, and approvals regarding their project-related work. This includes interpretation of CSU standards, policies, and procedures. The person in this role should seek guidance from the Consulting Master Plan Architect, and the Consulting Landscape Architect when appropriate, to prepare a project design that satisfies both the approved campus master plan and the campus design vocabulary.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS OF THE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

CHAPTER III—DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO THE CHANCELLOR

§ 7. Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds

a. ~~Approval~~ Validation of Plans; ~~and~~ Construction Contracts

1. ~~Following completion of preliminary plans pursuant to approval of schematic plans and an estimated cost by the Board of Trustees, the campus president or designee may proceed with preliminary plans. The Chancellor may approve such preliminary plans and authorize the preparation of working drawings where the estimated project cost, based on such preliminary plans, is within ten percent (10%) of the estimated cost as defined in the approved schematic plans, plus any cost rise subsequent to approval of such schematic plans as shown by the Engineering News Record cost index. will validate conformance of preliminary plans to scope, schedule and budget within any limits designated by the Board of Trustees.~~

2. ~~In the event the estimated project cost, based on such preliminary plans, exceeds the amount specified in subdivision a-1 of this Section or the design is materially different from that contained in the schematic plans previously approved by the Board of Trustees, preliminary plans shall not be approved until such additional cost or materially different plans have been approved by the Board of Trustees.~~

3. ~~Following completion of working drawings preliminary plans pursuant to this Section, the campus president or designee may proceed with working drawings. The Chancellor may approve such working drawings where the estimated project cost, based on such working drawings, is within ten percent (10%) of the estimated cost as defined in the approved schematic plans, plus any cost rise subsequent to approval of such schematic plans as shown by the Engineering News Record cost index. will validate conformance of working drawings to scope, schedule and budget within any limits designated by the Board of Trustees.~~

4. ~~In the event the estimated project cost, based on such working drawings, exceeds the amount specified in subdivision a-3 of this Section, unless a different estimated cost was approved pursuant to subdivision a-2 of this Section, in which case such different amount shall govern, or the design is materially different from that contained in the schematic plans previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the working drawings shall not be approved until such additional cost or materially different plans have been approved by the Board of Trustees.~~

5. ~~Upon approval completion of working drawings, the Chancellor campus president or designee is authorized to solicit bids and to award and administer the construction contract, all pursuant to the California State University Contract Law.~~

6. ~~The Chancellor shall annually report to the Board approvals of preliminary plans and working drawings pursuant to this subdivision.~~

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 5
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Streamlining Policies on Professional Appointments and Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Over the years, the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds and the Board of Trustees have streamlined various processes by delegating certain actions to the chancellor. This item proposes streamlining the professional appointment process and schematic plan reviews.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 5

July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Streamlining Policies on Professional Appointments and Approval of Schematic Plans

Over the years, the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds and the Board of Trustees have streamlined various processes by delegating certain actions to the chancellor. These delegations have addressed master plan revisions, professional appointments, approval of schematic plans, and the handling of temporary facilities. By making these delegations the committee has been able to focus its attention on larger, non-operation issues like the annual capital outlay budget. This item proposes streamlining the professional appointment process and schematic plan approvals.

I. Recommended Changes to the Policy on Professional Appointments

Attachment A contains the proposed revisions to the Board of Trustees' policy on professional appointments. Currently, the campuses send their professional appointment selections to Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC). CPDC then prepares an information item reporting these selections to the Board of Trustees. The item appears on the committee's consent calendar for approval. This process has not generated trustee questions or comments since enacted. The proposed policy revision, created in response to a trustee request, no longer requires presenting these selections to the trustees. In keeping with decentralized capital outlay management, this proposal also contains a housekeeping measure that allows campuses to select architects from CPDC's prequalified list using appropriate project-specific criteria. Finally, some minor edits are included to reflect changing the office name from Physical Planning and Development to Capital Planning, Design and Construction.

II. Recommended Change to the Policy on Approval of Schematic Plans and Amendment to the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees

The committee and then the full Board of Trustees currently approve schematic plans for major capital outlay projects—those exceeding \$1 million. The chancellor, or designee, is delegated authority to approve schematic plans for projects under \$1 million. The chancellor also has delegated authority over all remodel and utilitarian projects regardless of cost unless they are architecturally significant. CPDC presents architecturally significant major capital outlay projects to the Board of Trustees for approval. In keeping with past trustee streamlining proposals, it is recommended that the chancellor or designee be delegated authority to approve major capital outlay project schematic plans for projects costing up to \$5 million. This change requires amending the Board of Trustees' Standing Orders §7.d. *Approval of Schematic Plans*, which the Committee on Organization and Rules is being asked to do in a companion agenda item.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the revised "Policy on the Appointment of Architectural Firms for State and Nonstate Funded Major Capital Outlay Projects" contained in Attachment A of Agenda Item 5 of the July 7-8, 1999, meeting of Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, be approved; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees delegates authority to the chancellor or designee to approve schematic plans for major capital outlay projects with a project cost of up to \$5 million.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

**POLICY ON THE APPOINTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS FOR STATE AND
NONSTATE FUNDED MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS**

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish a well-defined and fair procedure to be used by the Chancellor's Office and the campuses in the selection of architectural firms to design major capital outlay projects.

II. POLICY

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) to identify and effectively utilize the professional skills of the architectural firms most highly qualified for a CSU project, and to base the CSU architect selection process on the professional qualifications and past performance of the applicant firms. It is further the policy of the trustees to endeavor to hire architects who can create efficient, functional and aesthetically pleasing buildings and facilities which further the educational mission of the CSU.

III. PROCEDURE

A. Notice/Announcement

Once each year, the Chancellor's Office shall announce and publish a notice that the CSU desires submittals of a questionnaire and brochure from all architectural firms interested in performing architectural services for the CSU during the following fiscal year.

B. Submittals and Staff Review

Once each year interested architectural firms shall submit the completed questionnaire and brochure by an announced date to the Chancellor's Office, Attention: Office of ~~Physical Planning and Development (PPD)~~ Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC). The Chancellor's Office will evaluate the eligibility of each firm by reviewing the questionnaires and brochures of each firm. They will then place the firms in appropriate categories based on project types and construction value.

~~PPD~~ CPDC shall prepare a list of prequalified architects upon completion of the evaluation. The approved firms will immediately be notified of their approval for consideration during the following fiscal year.

C. Short List/Interviews/Appointments of Architectural Firms

Once a capital outlay project has been ~~funded~~ approved, the ~~PPD staff architect will prepare a written criteria, relevant to the project to be designed;~~ campus will use appropriate project specific criteria to select from CPDC's list of prequalified architects, a group of architectural firms. The campus will develop a short list of not less than three firms and prepare invitations to the short listed firms to be interviewed. The campus will form a panel for the purpose of interviewing the short list of architects. The panel may contact previous clients and users of projects designed by the short listed firms and, upon completion of the interviews, prioritize the list of firms and establish a first, second, and third order of preference. Upon completion of the interview process, the campus may select the firm rated first and notify the architect of the intended appointment.

In the event that it is not possible to conclude an agreement for architectural services for any reason with the first choice appointed architect, the campus shall terminate negotiations with the architect and enter into a contract with the architect rated next in preference. In the event that an architect is unable to complete architectural services once under agreement, the campus shall terminate the agreement and enter into an agreement with a firm approved by the panel that is qualified to complete the project.

Each campus shall advise ~~PPD~~ CPDC of its selections as soon as they are made: and the information will be reviewed for compliance with the Board of Trustees' policy and added to the campus file maintained in the system office. ~~PPD will then provide the Board of Trustees with an information item regarding the selection at the next board meeting.~~

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 6
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

A handout covering the Board of Trustees' 1999/2000 state funded capital outlay program will be provided. A final report will be presented if the 1999/2000 Budget Act has been enacted.

A brief summary of actions to date follows:

Status of the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program (June 1999)

Trustees' Request	Governor's Budget	Legislative Analyst	Senate Approved	Assembly Approved
\$214.9 million	\$209.5 million	\$124.1 million	\$260.0 million	\$260.0 million

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 7
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Draft of the Capital Outlay Program 2000/01 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 Through 2004/05, State and Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

The draft 2000/01 state and nonstate funded capital outlay program and the 2000/01 through 2004/05 five-year capital improvement program will be presented to the committee.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 7

July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Draft of the Capital Outlay Program 2000/01 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 Through 2004/05, State and Nonstate Funded

Each year, the California State University develops a five-year capital improvement program that identifies and prioritizes capital requirements at each of the CSU campuses. State capital program funding is proposed from Proposition 1A approved by the voters in November 1998. The 2000/01 program will be the third year funded from this four-year general obligation bond measure.

Additionally, Proposition 1A (Senate Bill 50) includes language that provides \$165 million for allocation during 2000/01 to be used by the three segments of higher education for:

1. The development of new campuses for the University of California.
2. The development of new campuses, small campuses with enrollments of less than 5,000 full-time equivalent students and off-campus centers at the California State University and the California Community Colleges.

During the summer, staff will continue to work with the campuses to refine the scope and budget for each project in the 2000/01 program. In consultation with the Executive Council, the 2000/01 requests will be prioritized and presented to the Board of Trustees for action at the September 1999 meeting as part of the presentation of the CSU five-year capital improvement program.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 8
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematics Plans—California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Senior Director
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Schematic plans for the California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex will be presented for approval.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2
Agenda Item 8
July 7-8, 1999

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematics Plans—California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex

Project Architect: BFGC Architects Planners, Inc.

Background

To address the needs of a growing region, CSU Bakersfield has envisioned a project that will enhance its business and public administration degree programs, further the delivery of extended education, and provide a Leadership Development Center. The Classroom/Office Building III Complex brings these three related needs together into a well-integrated and functional design. To help meet recent enrollment increases, the state-funded classroom and office component will increase campus capacity to 5,519 full time equivalent students (FTES), add faculty offices and provide space for specific programs currently constrained by a lack of instructional space. The Extended University Center will add space to replace existing undersized temporary facilities. The third feature, the community funded Leadership Development Center, will house programs promoting leadership training, and foster greater interaction between students, faculty, local businesses and the community.

Scope

This project will build a 36,629 assignable square foot/ASF (57,735 gross square foot/GSF) building complex consisting of three components in four buildings. All four buildings are connected by covered porches and are grouped around a central court. High canopies accentuate the main entrances into the court and into the individual buildings. Parking lots will be adjacent to both major court entrances. The state funded Classroom/Office Building III is a two-story “L” shaped facility (24,421 ASF/40,630 GSF) for business and public administration to house 943 FTES in lecture classrooms, 24 FTES upper division teaching laboratories, academic administrative space, graduate research laboratories, and 70 faculty offices. The second component is the two-building Extended University Center and Administrative Office Building (7,012 ASF/9,220 GSF) which will provide permanent space for extended education operations and additional administrative office space. The third element is the Leadership Development Center (5,192 ASF/7,885 GSF) which will house two 40-station executive seminar rooms, one 80-station room, one 30-station seminar room, four small study rooms and a lounge.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	October 1999
Completion of Working Drawings	July 2000
Construction Start	September 2000
Occupancy	March 2002

Basic Statistics	State	Nonstate	Total
Gross Building Area (square feet)	40,630	17,105	57,735
Assignable Area (square feet)	24,421	12,208	36,629
Efficiency	60.0%	71.4%	63.4%

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847

Building Costs (\$140 per gross square foot)	\$ 8,068,000																		
<i>Systems Detail:</i>																			
	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">State</th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Nonstate</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>(\$ per gsf)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>(\$ per gsf)</i></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. Substructure (Foundation)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$4.92</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$5.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$49.99</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$41.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishers)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$19.81</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$32.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$49.62</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$56.18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		State	Nonstate		<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$4.92	\$5.67	b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$49.99	\$41.86	c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishers)	\$19.81	\$32.45	d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$49.62	\$56.18
	State	Nonstate																	
	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>	<i>(\$ per gsf)</i>																	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$4.92	\$5.67																	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$49.99	\$41.86																	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishers)	\$19.81	\$32.45																	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protection)	\$49.62	\$56.18																	
Site Development (includes landscaping)	\$1,639,000																		
Group I Equipment	<u>369,000</u>																		
Construction Cost	\$10,076,600																		
Fees and Contingency	<u>2,091,000</u>																		
Total Project Costs (\$210 per gross square foot)	\$12,167,000																		
Group II Equipment	<u>411,000</u>																		
Grand Total	<u>\$12,578,000</u>																		

Funding Data

Funding for the state supported Classroom/Office Building III is from the Budget Act of 1999. The Extended University Center component will be funded from campus reserves in the Extended Education Fund. The Leadership Development Center will be funded from donations provided by the community. The adjacent parking will be funded from parking reserves. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study has been completed and a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared and filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 11, 1999. Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, the 30-day public review period ended on March 12, 1999, and no adverse public comments were received. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, upon consideration of the information provided in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the California State University, Bakersfield, Classroom/Office Building III Complex, the board finds that:

1. The Mitigated Negative Declaration, with reference and consideration to the Final Master Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR) prepared and approved by the Board of Trustees in January 1995, for the California State University, Bakersfield, Campus Master Plan, was prepared for this subsequent project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the previously certified Master EIR and Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project and identified specifically in Attachment A herein, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. The project will benefit The California State University; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the additional mitigation measures and implementation of the recommended improvements specified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are hereby adopted, in addition to those mitigation measures adopted in the previously certified Master EIR as part of this approval of the California State University, Bakersfield, Classroom/Office Building III Complex; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan included as Attachment A herein which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor or his designee is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Bakersfield, Classroom/Office Building III Complex; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the schematic plans for the California State University, Bakersfield, Classroom/Office Building III Complex are approved at a project cost of \$12,578,000 at CCCI 3847.

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for
California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex**

The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation of any revisions to the plan.

An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report based on the Environmental Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Summary herein shall be prepared for this project by the campus staff until project completion or until compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file in Capital Planning, Design and Construction, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 401 Golden Shore Drive, Long Beach, California, 90802, and the Office of the Business and Administrative Services, California State University, Bakersfield, 9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, California 93311.

Once significant construction is begun and under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the designated university construction supervision staff who shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is complete and occupied.

Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the executive vice chancellor and chief financial officer. Reference to such changes shall be made in the annual Environmental Mitigated Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

The board finds this plan adequate to meet the requirements of the Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

**California State University, Bakersfield—Classroom/Office Building III Complex
Environmental Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Summary**

Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Phase	Responsibility	Frequency of Monitoring
Biological Resources			
1. One-time mitigation fees paid for the Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan for all new construction.	Construction	CSU Bakersfield	Prior to construction completion
Cultural Resources			
2. A qualified professional paleontologist will monitor excavation as appropriate.	During design review Construction	CSU Bakersfield	During excavation
Recreation			
3. The existing hammer throw ring adjacent to the bike path shall be equipped with a metal cage.	Construction	CSU Bakersfield	Prior to opening of pedestrian/ bike path