AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 8:45 a.m., Wednesday, January 24, 2001
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Frederick W. Pierce, IV
Ali C. Razi

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of November 8, 2000

Discussion Items

1. Annual Report on Completed California State University Capital Outlay Projects, Action
2. Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor’s Budget, Information
3. Approval of Schematic Plans, Action
4. Certify a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Internet Switching Center Phase 1 at California State University, Hayward, 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

November 8, 2000

Members Present

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of Board, ex officio
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio

Members Absent

William D. Campbell
Murray L. Galinson

Other Trustees Present

Daniel N. Cartwright
Martha C. Fallgatter
Debra S. Farar
Robert G. Foster
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Neel I. Murarka

Chancellor’s Office Staff

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Wang greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.
Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 19, 2000, were approved as submitted.

Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2002/03 Through 2006/07

Mr. Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, stated that this item sought trustee approval of the categories and criteria for the 2002/2003 through the 2006/07 program. He noted that commencing in January 2002, the passage of AB 1473 requires the Governor and the Department of Finance (DOF) to submit to the state legislature a multi-year financial plan for handling the state’s infrastructure needs. This plan must identify the projects and a financing approach to funding those needs. As a result all agencies, including the California State University (CSU), are required to submit their capital outlay program to the DOF by February 2001. This requirement has caused the CSU to look at its current program scheduling process and make appropriate adjustments.

Mr. Drohan said that under the current process, a one-year approval request of the capital outlay program and a five-year capital outlay information item is submitted to the trustees each September. As an example, the trustees approved the final priority list for the 2001/02 program in September 2000. He explained that under the new process, the trustees are required to approve a five-year capital outlay program, along with a detailed priority list for the first year of the program. This list will be a statement of need for individual projects throughout the system for 2002/03 and staff will seek trustees’ preliminary approval of the priority list in March 2001. In the subsequent years of the five-year program, Mr. Drohan indicated that the trustees will be approving a funding program by category, not by specific projects, so as to advise the Governor and the Department of Finance of the CSU’s total needs over the next five years. Subsequent to the CSU’s submittal and trustees’ preliminary approval of the capital outlay program and during discussions and negotiations with the Department of Finance, it is expected that DOF will determine a level of funding for the 2002/03 year. Mr. Drohan’s departmental staff will then bring back to the trustees in September, or possibly as late as November 2001, a final priority list to be ratified for budget purposes.

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the current and new process. Currently, the trustees approve the categories and criteria in March, review the program in July and give final approval in September. Because of the earlier schedules for the new process for 2002/03, staff is seeking approval for the categories and criteria in November and final approval of the overall five-year program in March 2001, with the final priority list being determined at a later date. Referencing the 2003/04 column on the slide, Mr. Drohan pointed out how the process will change and will be normalized beginning July 1, 2001. Essentially, the review and preparation process for the capital outlay program has been expanded from an 18- to 24-month cycle.

Mr. Drohan turned to the subject of categories. Over the past several years, there have been three major categories—1) Funds for Projects of Systemwide Benefit which dealt with systemwide
needs for minor capital outlay and seismic studies; 2) Renovation which included infrastructure, modernization, and replacement projects; and 3) Growth which dealt with facility needs to accommodate enrollment growth and growth in academic support areas. The new proposed categories are collapsed into two—Existing Facility Infrastructure and New Facility Infrastructure. Mr. Drohan stated that in the past the campuses have been limited to one project in the first year, with the exceptions of telecommunication, seismic safety, and equipment projects. Under the new proposal, each campus will be allowed one project in each category as well as the previously stated exceptions. This will allow the CSU to be responsive to the process that the Department of Finance is undertaking in dealing with setting priorities for the governor’s consideration that is centered around state infrastructure needs.

Mr. Drohan told the trustees that we were seeking their continued support of past practice in the area of capital investment strategy. Over the past five years, the trustees have placed an emphasis on increased capital expenditure in order to preserve our existing infrastructure as a balance against enrollment growth projects at roughly a 60- to 40-percent split. If the next bond increases the annual capital outlay program budget to $250 million, the percentage allocation for renovation would be 60 percent or approximately $140 million to $150 million based on our current replacement value for existing state-funded facilities.

Viewing the pie chart slide that depicted the ages of the CSU’s state-maintained facilities, Mr. Drohan noted that 53 percent of our facilities are older than 30 years. This figure emphasizes the need for a concentrated effort in facility modernization to keep up with the new instructional delivery systems, as well as to sustain and renew the existing infrastructure of these facilities. Mr. Drohan said that the CSU has averaged over the past five years a percentage split in capital outlay dollars of 61 percent for renovation and 39 percent for growth. He said that there have been some deviations from year to year, but overall an emphasis on renovation over growth has been sustained.

The last slide depicted FTES capacity vs. enrollment. Mr. Drohan explained that the CSU has been experiencing a three percent enrollment growth; this is compared to the capacity figures shown on the slide that include projects that will be funded in the 2001/02 year. He noted that on the basis of current enrollment growth and the projects that have been or will be funded in 2001/02, there is sufficient capacity to meet those demands through 2006/07. The top line on the slide chart represented the 415,000 FTE systemwide master plan ceiling capacity. Although there are approximately four campuses that are nearing their master plan physical capacity ceiling, our existing systemwide capacity has significant room for growth.

Mr. Drohan closed by saying that the passage of this item’s resolution would represent the trustees’ concurrence with the CSU’s continued emphasis on renovation at a 60/40 percent split.

Trustee Hauck indicated that his employer sponsored this legislation and was aimed at those state agencies, not the CSU, that do not have five-year plans that are aimed at preserving their infrastructures. He complimented staff on their renovation approach and stated the cost of building new facilities vs. renovation of existing facilities is far greater.
Mr. Richard P. West, executive vice chancellor and chief financial officer, concurred with Trustee Hauck that the CSU’s challenge is to balance our renovation to keep our current facilities in good repair, with new state-of-the-art facilities for enrollment growth. Mr. West reminded the committee members that our definition of a renovation often includes a building that is demolished and replaced with a new facility that does not create any new capacity. State-funded general obligation bonds are being used for these capital improvements, although some growth projects are not included, e.g., Channel Islands, where new capacity is being created without state dollars, and Monterey Bay, where federal funds were used to a great extent.

Mr. West said that as Executive Director Warren Fox of the California Postsecondary Education Commission explained, the CSU’s challenge is to balance these demands and to find a new funding source if a general obligation bond is not used. He stated that part of the state’s analysis is to balance its debt capacity with its needs. The CSU and UC are the only state agencies that have done multi-year planning. Since the state does not have similar information for all state agencies, the state has a difficult time making priority capital budgeting decisions in the context of limited debt capacity. The CSU definitely is looking for additional revenue that it has had in the past to meet its capital needs.

Trustee Razi asked if we are currently looking at solutions for the four campuses that are reaching their master plan capacity limit.

Mr. Drohan responded that will be a decision for the campuses as to how they will meet their enrollment demands, e.g., whether it would be more practical to change their existing master plan ceiling or whether the continued strategies we are trying to implement around distance learning, branch campuses, and off-campus centers would be a more cost effective solution.

Trustee Razi stated that there is a possibility that every campus will at one point want to increase their capacity, and since it takes a long time to prepare and receive approval to increase a master plan capacity ceiling, why don’t we start now?

Mr. Drohan responded that two campuses are presently looking at changing their master plan ceilings—San Diego State University and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

Mr. West added that the bigger challenge for many campuses will be having the land base to expand, not the capital funding.

Trustee Pierce said that if we can accommodate the enrollment for the summer period for YRO, then we would not in many instances need to raise the master plan capacity, because that would accommodate a higher enrollment without affecting a given semester capacity ceiling like the fall semester.
Mr. West responded that among the Chancellor’s Office staff, the amount of new capacity generated through summer use is uncertain. However, summer sessions provide students with an opportunity to complete a degree program more quickly.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-20-00).

Approval of Schematic Plans

With the use of a computerized presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for two projects at California State University, Sacramento—Capital Public Radio Building and Parking Structure II.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-21-00).

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Annual Report on Completed California State University Capital Outlay Projects

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents a summary report of capital outlay projects.

Background

Board of Trustees’ policy requires an annual report on CSU capital outlay projects. Performance data will be presented on all projects completed between October 1, 1999 and September 30, 2000, regardless of fund source. The information will illustrate each project’s budgetary and schedule performance, as well as the performances of the project’s architect and contractor.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor’s Budget

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents a comparison between the CSU 2001/02 state funded capital outlay program request and the funding level included in the governor’s budget.

Background

The California State University’s proposed 2001/02 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2001/02 through 2005/06 were presented at the September 2000 Board of Trustees’ meeting. Although the 2001/02 state funded request identified campus needs totaling $555.8 million, the trustees approved a priority list totaling $207 million based on the anticipated funding level from Proposition 1A. This is the final year of funding to be provided by the November 1998 voter-approved four-year general obligation bond measure. The trustees also requested that the chancellor explore with the governor and legislature possibilities of funding the entire $555.8 million program. The Board of Trustees’ 2001/02 program priorities include the completion of previously funded projects, telecommunication infrastructure, renovation, and growth projects for campuses to meet enrollment demands.

The governor’s proposed budget will be published prior to the January board meeting. A handout will be presented comparing the trustees’ budget request with that of the governor’s budget.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

Schematic plans for two major capital outlay projects will be presented for approval.

1. California State University, Channel Islands
   East Campus Residential Development Phase I Faculty and Staff Housing

   Project Architects: Mclarand, Vasquez, Emsiek & Partners; Lim, Chang & Associates, Inc.; WFA Architecture & Planning

Background and Scope

In September 1998 the Board of Trustees, acting as Lead Agency for the CSU Channel Islands project, certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approved a concept Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the campus. At the same time, the Legislature authorized creation of the CSUCI Site Authority to act as the legislative authority to implement conversion of the former state hospital to a new state university.

In July 2000 the trustees, in their role of university oversight, approved an initial overall campus physical master plan for an enrollment ceiling of 15,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES). Under the approved master plan, CSU Channel Islands will open in Fall 2002 with a projected 2002/03 FTE enrollment of 1,320 (2,265 students) and approximately 155 full-time faculty and staff.

The proposed project is Phase I of the university’s Faculty and Staff Residential Development Plan and is based upon projected market demand and input from the CSU Channel Islands campus community. The overall program will provide a total of 900 residential units, in five phases, over a period of five to seven years. The goal is to provide affordable housing to incoming faculty and staff who are relocating, while providing the existing campus population
with convenient and affordable housing. The Ventura County region has maintained a very low vacancy rate and high cost of housing similar to many Southern California areas.

The Phase I project includes:

- 100 Rental Apartment Units
- 48 Attached Alley Loaded Cluster & Attached Courtyard Cluster Units for Rent
- 24 Attached Loaded Cluster and Attached Courtyard Cluster Units for Sale
- 36 Detached Alley Loaded Single Family Units for Sale

This totals approximately 208 residential units. The final number and distribution of type of units will be determined when precise site plans for each area are completed.

Phase I of the project includes essential “backbone” infrastructure for the entire 150-acre development site, including the major access roads, sewer, water, electrical, gas and storm drains. These backbone utilities are the base for later construction of “neighborhood” infrastructure (streets and utilities) as future phases of vertical construction (residential units) are completed. Public landscape areas, sidewalks, trails, street lighting, and improvement of streambeds and related open space are also included. Community recreation facilities and local parks will also be constructed. Existing drainage swales and riparian habitat will be improved by utilizing native vegetation and retention ponds, enhancing the biological and educational resources at the site.

Visuals of the following will be presented at the meeting: Overall site development plan for the east campus residential project; proposed site plan for Phase I; schematics of four basic residential unit products in Phase I; and a proposed plan of overall phasing, schedule, and distribution of product types for the build-out of the entire east campus project.

**Timing (Estimated) Backbone Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Drawings</td>
<td>September 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Construction Drawings</td>
<td>December 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>February 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion</td>
<td>February 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timing (Estimated) Vertical Construction (Phase I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Drawings</td>
<td>March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Construction Drawings</td>
<td>August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>October 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Completion | August 2002
Occupancy | August 2002

**Basic Statistics (Phase I)**

**Total Housing Units**
- Apartments | 840–1,260 square feet
- Attached Alley Loaded and Courtyard Clusters | 1,250–1,780 square feet
- Detached Alley Loaded Single Family | 1,730–2,225 square feet

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3909**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>($ per GSF)</th>
<th>(est. price)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$1.14–$1.22/SF/Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Alley Loaded Clusters for Rent</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$1.12–$1.31/SF/Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Alley Loaded Clusters for Sale</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$155,000–$221,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Alley Loaded for Sale</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>$225,000–$275,000 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Development and Infrastructure Construction Cost | $17,000,000 (3)
Infrastructure Fees Not Including Finance Costs | 3,500,000
Housing Construction Cost (Phase I) | 22,450,000
Fees and Contingency (Phase I) | $6,300,000

Total Phase I Estimated Project Cost | $49,250,000

(1) Value ratio attached single-family dwelling $123-125
(2) Value ratio detached single-family dwelling $123-127
(3) The cost component of $17,000,000 includes primary backbone infrastructure (roads, utilities, grading) for the overall site, and much of the local neighborhood infrastructure for all five phases of the total development. This provides independent and attractive access to the residential community area separate from the main academic campus, for marketing and sales; it allows for the issuance of one tax increment bond; provides necessary economies of scale; and also provides a required secondary access for fire and other emergencies.

**Funding Data**

Additional details on financing and funding will be provided at the board members at the meeting.
California Environmental Quality Act Action

Pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, a Program Environmental Impact Report was prepared in February 1998 and certified in September 1998. A Supplemental EIR (SEIR) was prepared in March 2000 to address the specific impacts of the East Campus Specific Reuse Plan. The SEIR was certified in June 2000. Comments were received and responded to in the FEIR and the SEIR. A copy of the previously approved FEIR and the SEIR, which include all written and oral comments received, will be available at the meeting.

The EIR and SEIR were each subject to a 45-day public review period. The SEIR addressed the master plan and construction level analysis of plans for the Phase I development as near-term implementation actions. Comments were received from public agencies and private individuals. The comments generally addressed the following primary issues:

- Traffic and Circulation
- Wastewater and Potable Water
- Flood and Hydrology
- Regulation of Development

With implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR and SEIR, the project will reduce most adverse environmental impacts to less than significant. Some remaining significant adverse impacts were identified and overriding considerations were adopted, which justify those remaining impacts, as required. The Site Authority certified the SEIR in June 2000. A copy of the certified FEIR and SEIR will be available at the meeting.

The Board of Trustees is a responsible agency for the project and is required to consider the FEIR/SEIR in the board’s planning process and review of the project.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The FEIR/SEIR was prepared to include the Specific Reuse Plan for the East Campus Residential Development (150 acres), and more specifically the Phase I Development, and this Board of Trustees concurs with the findings identified pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the subject FEIR/SEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein, the proposed project, Phase I East Campus Residential Development, will not have any additional or previously unknown significant adverse effects on the environment; and

3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are hereby adopted or required by the Board of Trustees as the Responsible Agency; and

4. The project will benefit the California State University; and

5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Channel Islands, East Campus Residential Development Phase I Faculty and Staff Housing are approved at an estimated project cost of $49,250,000 at CCCI 3909.

2. California State University, Northridge
Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics

Project Architect: J.C. Chang and Associates

Background and Scope

The CSU Northridge, Department of Kinesiology, Center for Achievement of the Physically Disabled is recognized worldwide for its innovative programs offering intensive adaptive exercise and training to maximize the physical capabilities and functional skills of people living with severe motor or neurological disabilities.

The center proposes to add an indoor adaptive aquatic facility that will create a model setting for people with physical disabilities as well as a site for highly specialized "hands-on" training for service providers. The addition will enable the center to provide enhanced exercise opportunities for adults and children with severely restricted movement capability, increase the number of disabled people served annually by 100 percent, and provide a wider range of educational opportunities for students pursuing professional training in such fields as adapted physical education, physical therapy, exercise science, recreation therapy, and special education.

The proposed project is an 18,400 gross square foot one-story facility that will feature four therapeutic pools, a warm-water pool, a spa, a cool-water pool, and a moveable-floor pool that can be adjusted to accommodate people requiring different water depths. The facility will also
include space for additional treadmill and weight-training equipment, plus support areas such as restrooms, changing rooms, reception area, offices, storage, and mechanical rooms.

**Timing (Estimated)**

- Completion of Preliminary Drawings: March 2001
- Completion of Working Drawings: May 2001
- Construction Start: July 2001
- Occupancy: August 2002

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 18,400 square feet
-Assignable Building Area: 13,058 square feet
- Efficiency: 71 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index CCCI 3909**

- Building Cost ($159 per gross square foot): $2,920,000

  **Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF)**

  a. Substructure (Foundation) $12.14
  b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure) $44.03
  c. Interiors (Partitions) $42.18
  d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Pro) $60.36

- Site Development (includes Landscaping): $297,000
- Group I Equipment: $432,000
- Construction Cost: $3,649,000
- Fees and Contingency: $756,000
- Total Project Cost ($239 per gross square foot): $4,405,000
- Group II Equipment: $165,000
- Grand Total: $4,570,000
Cost Comparison

There are no previously approved similar CSU projects to provide a building cost comparison.

Funding Data

The facility is funded through a $925,000 federal appropriation and private donations. Abbott and Linda Brown have donated $2.1 million. The university will obtain interim funding through the University Foundation until the remaining $1.55 million is raised. Operating funds will come from user fees.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the California State University, Northridge, Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on July 5, 2000.

Recommended Action

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Northridge, Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and the project will benefit The California State University; and

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Western Center for Adaptive Aquatics are approved at a project cost of $4,570,000 at CCCI 3909.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Internet Switching Center Phase 1 at California State University, Hayward

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for the California State University, Hayward:

• Certification of a Mitigated Negative Declaration
• Approval of a Campus Master Plan Revision
• Approval of an Amendment to the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Internet Switching Center, Phase 1

The master plan revision provides for the siting of the 380,000 gross square foot Internet Switching Center, Phase 1 and 2, and 230 parking spaces. This proposed project would be constructed on seven-acres of undeveloped land south-east of the existing central campus.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting. Any adverse public comments will be reported. The following attachments are included in this item:

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan dated January 2001.
Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated May 1993.
Attachment C is the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

Background

The proposed master plan revision for California State University, Hayward maintains a maximum student population of 18,000 full-time equivalent students. The revision proposes the development of a seven-acre site for a new facility with adjacent parking. The new facility is proposed to be the Internet Switching Center, Phase 1 and 2.
Over the past several years, California State University, Hayward has been searching for ways to take advantage of its location at the transportation hub of the East Bay as that location relates to technological opportunities. It has also been searching out methods of utilizing its almost one hundred and twenty (120) undeveloped acres in ways which will serve both the University and its surrounding community.

Within the telecommunications industry, an Internet Switching Center is often called a “carrier hotel” – a technology building designed to house network equipment and servers belonging to several different telecommunications carrier companies. Examples of telecommunications carrier companies are UUNet, Sprint, Cable and Wireless, PacBell, AT&T, and MCI. Multiple carrier companies lease space within the same carrier hotel so they can easily interconnect their respective networks, creating what is known as a network exchange point or a network peering point.

Campus Master Plan

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan; Attachment B is the previously approved plan dated May 1993. The proposed campus master plan revision changes the proposed use of a seven-acre site on the southeastern edge of campus. The site formerly proposed for student housing and commons areas is now proposed to locate the 380,000 gross square foot Internet Switching Center, (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and adjacent parking spaces. Phase 1 will consist of a 180,000 gross square foot facility and the second phase will include construction of an adjacent 200,000 gross square foot facility. Attachment A identifies the proposed revisions with a hexagon numbering system as indicated below:

Hexagon 1: Internet Switching Center, Phase 1
Hexagon 2 Internet Switching Center, Phase 2
Hexagon 3: Parking Lot (230 spaces)

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision adds nonstate funded projects at a total estimated cost of $71,000,000 in current dollars.

Amend the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program

The university wishes to amend the 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to include $32.2 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Hayward Internet Switching Center, Phase 1. This incorporates the internet center, site developments, landscaping and a 230 space parking lot. Funding will be provided by a private entity, GEOgraphic Network Affiliates International, Incorporated.

Approval of Schematic Plans
Internet Switching Center, Phase 1

Project Architects: Kaplan, McLaughlin, Diaz
Weber and Associates
GEOgraphic Network Affiliates International, Inc.

Scope

The proposed 180,000 GSF project includes a lobby/atrium and various spaces to lease out to users of the carrier hotel facility. The four-story facility will primarily be configured to facilitate the interconnection of lessee conduit, cable and network terminal resources in support of the existing Internet and future Internet2. Approximately 15,000 GSF of the data center will be dedicated to the California State University in support of the CalRen2, 4CNet, etc. The Phase 1 building will be a steel frame structure with a glass and lightweight material envelope. The site development/landscaping adjacent to the center includes and extension of the existing road to the new site, lighting, and parking areas for 230 vehicles.

Timing (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Drawings</td>
<td>January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>February 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td>March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>September 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Area</td>
<td>180,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignable Building Area</td>
<td>144,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>80 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 3909

Building Cost including Group I equipment ($128 per gross square foot) $ 23,027,000

System Breakdown ($ per GSF)

- Substructure (Foundation) $ 16.06
- Shell $ 55.76
- Interiors $ 10.00
- Services $ 40.92
e. Special Construction $ 5.19

Site Development (includes parking, road, landscaping) $ 3,973,000
Construction Cost $27,000,000
Fees and Contingency 5,167,000
Total Project Cost ($179 per gross square foot) $32,167,000
Group II Equipment 0
Grand Total $32,167,000

**Funding Data**

GEOgraphic Network Affiliates International, Inc. (GEO) will provide all the project funding, including the facility proper and all accompanying infrastructures (including parking). Funding details associated with this private sector development project are contained within the corresponding Committee on Finance agenda item also presented at this January 2001 meeting.

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

An initial study was completed and a Negative Declaration was prepared and filed with the State Clearinghouse on November 18, 2000. The initial study was revised to more fully define the project in response to comments received, and re-circulated as a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The thirty-day public review period for the revised initial study ended on January 16, 2001. Any adverse comments received will be reported at the meeting. The Mitigated Negative Declaration includes the five mitigation measures listed in Attachment C. (The final 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, that:

1. The board finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the California State University, Hayward, Internet Switching Center, project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

2. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which are hereby adopted and specifically identified in
Attachment C herein, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and will benefit The California State University; and

3. The mitigation measures identified shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan included as Attachment C herein which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and

4. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the project; and

5. The California State University, Hayward campus master plan revision dated January 2001 is hereby approved.

6. The 2000/01 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $32,167,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction, for the Internet Switching Center, Phase 1 and related site development/landscaping.

7. The schematic plans for the California State University, Hayward, Internet Switching Center, Phase 1 project are approved at a project cost of $32,167,000 at CCCI 3909
Map Legend

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
PROPOSED CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – JANUARY 2001

1. SCIENCE BUILDING
2. ART AND EDUCATION
3. MUSIC AND BUSINESS
4. FACILITIES MANAGEMENT
5. CORPORATION YARD
6. FIELD HOUSE
7. PHYSICAL EDUCATION
   FACILITY
8. UNIVERSITY UNION
9. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN
   HALL (CLASSROOM)
10. KARL F. ROBINSON HALL
    (SPEECH AND DRAMA)
11. UNIVERSITY THEATER
12. LIBRARY
13. E. GUY WARREN HALL
    (ADMINISTRATION)
14. OLD FOUNDATION
    BUILDING
15. Physical Education Addition
16. Student Health Center
17. Corporation Yard
18. Classroom
19. Science
20. Business Center
21. Classroom
22. Technology Resource Center
23. Classroom
24. Classroom
25. Science
26. Classroom
27. Classroom
28. Classroom
29. Classroom
30. Pioneer Heights
31. Library Addition
32. Student Residence
33. Switch Gear House
34. Internet Switching Center, Phase 1
35. Internet Switching Center, Phase 2
36. Pioneer Stadium
37. Baseball Stadium
38. Athletic Field
39. Tennis Courts
40. Amphitheater
41. Basketball Court
42. Child Center
43. University Club
44. Foundation/Bookstore
45. Early Childhood
   Education Center
46. American Language
   Program
47. Early Childhood Education
   Center Addition
48. Pioneer Heights
49. Student Apartments
50. Student Residence
51. Student Apartments
52. Student Apartments
53. Student Apartments
54. Student Apartments
55. Student Apartments
56. Student Apartments
57. Student Apartments
58. Student Apartments
59. Student Apartments
60. Student Apartments
61. Student Apartments
62. Student Apartments
63. Student Apartments
64. Student Apartments
65. Student Apartments
66. Student Apartments
67. Student Apartments
68. Student Apartments
69. Student Apartments
70. Student Apartments
71. Student Apartments
72. Student Apartments
73. Student Apartments
74. Student Apartments
75. Student Apartments
76. Student Apartments
77. Student Apartments
78. Student Apartments
79. Student Apartments
80. Student Apartments
81. Student Apartments
82. Student Apartments
83. Student Apartments
84. Student Apartments
85. Student Apartments
86. Student Apartments
87. Student Apartments
88. Student Apartments
89. Student Apartments
90. Student Apartments
91. Student Apartments
92. Student Apartments
93. Student Apartments
94. Student Apartments
95. Student Apartments
96. Student Apartments
97. Student Apartments
98. Student Apartments
99. Student Apartments
100. Student Apartments

LEGEND

EXISTING FACILITY/Proposed Facility

Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDB)
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CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
APPROVED CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – MAY 1993

1. SCIENCE BUILDING
2. ART AND EDUCATION
3. MUSIC AND BUSINESS
4. FACILITIES MANAGEMENT
5. CORPORATION YARD
6. FIELD HOUSE
7. PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACILITY
8. UNIVERSITY UNION
9. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN HALL (CLASSROOM)
10. KARL F. ROBINSON HALL (SPEECH AND DRAMA)
11. UNIVERSITY THEATER
12. LIBRARY
13. E. GUY WARREN HALL (ADMINISTRATION)
14. OLD FOUNDATION BUILDING
15. Physical Education Addition
16. STUDENT HEALTH CENTER
17. FIELD HOUSE
18. CLASSROOM
19. Technology Resource Center
20. Business Center
21. Classroom
22. Science
23. Library Addition
24. Science
25. Corporation Yard
26. Classroom
27. Classroom
28. Business Center
29. Classroom
30. Pioneer
31. Student Residence
32. Old Foundation Building
33. Student Health Center
34. Switch Gear House
35. Pioneer Stadium
36. Baseball Stadium
37. Athletic Field
38. Tennis Courts
39. Amphitheater
40. Basketball Court
41. Child Center
42. University Club
43. Foundation/Bookstore
44. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
45. Early Childhood Education Center
46. American Language Program
47. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
48. Early Childhood Education Center
49. American Language Program
50. Pioneer Stadium
51. Baseball Stadium
52. Athletic Field
53. Tennis Courts
54. Amphitheater
55. Basketball Court
56. Child Center
57. University Club
58. Foundation/Bookstore
59. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
60. Early Childhood Education Center
61. American Language Program
62. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
63. Early Childhood Education Center
64. American Language Program
65. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
66. Early Childhood Education Center
67. American Language Program
68. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
69. Early Childhood Education Center
70. American Language Program
71. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
72. Early Childhood Education Center
73. American Language Program
74. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
75. Early Childhood Education Center
76. American Language Program
77. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
78. Early Childhood Education Center
79. American Language Program
80. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
81. Early Childhood Education Center
82. American Language Program
83. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
84. Early Childhood Education Center
85. American Language Program
86. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
87. Early Childhood Education Center
88. American Language Program
89. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
90. Early Childhood Education Center
91. American Language Program
92. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
93. Early Childhood Education Center
94. American Language Program
95. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
96. Early Childhood Education Center
97. American Language Program
98. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
99. Early Childhood Education Center
100. American Language Program
101. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
102. Early Childhood Education Center
103. American Language Program
104. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
105. Early Childhood Education Center
106. American Language Program
107. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
108. Early Childhood Education Center
109. American Language Program
110. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
111. Early Childhood Education Center
112. American Language Program
113. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
114. Early Childhood Education Center
115. American Language Program
116. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
117. Early Childhood Education Center
118. American Language Program
119. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
120. Early Childhood Education Center
121. American Language Program
122. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
123. Early Childhood Education Center
124. American Language Program
125. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
126. Early Childhood Education Center
127. American Language Program
128. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
129. Early Childhood Education Center
130. American Language Program
131. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
132. Early Childhood Education Center
133. American Language Program
134. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
135. Early Childhood Education Center
136. American Language Program
137. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
138. Early Childhood Education Center
139. American Language Program
140. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
141. Early Childhood Education Center
142. American Language Program
143. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
144. Early Childhood Education Center
145. American Language Program
146. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
147. Early Childhood Education Center
148. American Language Program
149. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
150. Early Childhood Education Center
151. American Language Program
152. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
153. Early Childhood Education Center
154. American Language Program
155. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
156. Early Childhood Education Center
157. American Language Program
158. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
159. Early Childhood Education Center
160. American Language Program
161. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
162. Early Childhood Education Center
163. American Language Program
164. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
165. Early Childhood Education Center
166. American Language Program
167. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
168. Early Childhood Education Center
169. American Language Program
170. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
171. Early Childhood Education Center
172. American Language Program
173. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
174. Early Childhood Education Center
175. American Language Program
176. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
177. Early Childhood Education Center
178. American Language Program
179. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
180. Early Childhood Education Center
181. American Language Program
182. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
183. Early Childhood Education Center
184. American Language Program
185. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
186. Early Childhood Education Center
187. American Language Program
188. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
189. Early Childhood Education Center
190. American Language Program
191. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
192. Early Childhood Education Center
193. American Language Program
194. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
195. Early Childhood Education Center
196. American Language Program
197. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
198. Early Childhood Education Center
199. American Language Program
200. Early Childhood Education Center Addition
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Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDB)
Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for California State University, Hayward — Campus Master Plan Revision and Internet Switching Center

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.

2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report based on the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall be prepared for this project by campus staff until project completion or until compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file at the Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore Avenue, Long Beach, California 90802-4210 and at California State University Hayward, Office of Facilities Planning, 25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard, Hayward, California 94542.

3. 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.

4. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by the 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 Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

The Board of Trustees finds this plan adequate to meet the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure #</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility Person/Agency</th>
<th>Frequency of Monitoring</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
<th>Date Report Received</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>(1) Preparation of project specifications; (2) Project construction</td>
<td>(1) University; (2) Contractor</td>
<td>(1) Once, during preparation of specifications; (2) Weekly</td>
<td>(1) Following completion of specifications; (2) Once per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Project construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Once per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure #</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Mitigation Timing</td>
<td>Responsibility Person/Agency</td>
<td>Frequency of Monitoring</td>
<td>Report Due</td>
<td>Date Report Received</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Project construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Once per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction operations will be conducted in such a manner as to minimize waste generation, and to maximize recycling of construction waste. Operations will be conducted in a manner consistent with the erosion control plan (to be developed prior to construction by the contractor and to be approved by the University prior to the start of site development activities). Earth excavated during grading activities should be kept within the project site boundaries until transported off-site, particularly averting the southern project boundary as erosion impacts on the southern boundary may affect Zelie Creek. To prevent any erosion from earth moving activities affecting Zelie Creek, grading activities will be limited to the project site area. Potential source reduction measures could include temporary silt fences, temporary sedimentation basins, mulching, diversion ditches, and revegetation of areas disturbed during construction. The locations of pollutant-reduction measures will be determined during the final design process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure #</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility Person/Agency</th>
<th>Frequency of Monitoring</th>
<th>Report Due</th>
<th>Date Report Received</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Once, during preparation of specifications</td>
<td>(1) Following completion of specifications; (2) Following completion of as-builts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with the recommendations of a site specific geotechnical investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Once per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If archaeological resources are encountered in any portion of the project area during construction, ground-disturbing activities within the immediate vicinity of the find will be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find. The contractor will comply with the recommendations of the archaeologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>