AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 15, 2003
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair
Anthony M. Vitti, Vice Chair
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
M. Alexander Lopez

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 13, 2003

1. Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, Action
2. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, Information
3. Annual Report on Active Capital Projects, Information
5. Certify Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University, Long Beach, Action

Discussion Item

6. Approval of Schematic Plans, Action
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

May 13, 2003

Members Present
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos
Debra S. Farar, Chair of the Board
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Erene S. Thomas

Members Absent
Roberta Achtenberg

Other Trustees Present
Robert G. Foster
William Hauck
M. Alex Lopez
Frederick W. Pierce IV

Chancellor's Office Staff
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Pesqueira greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 11, 2003, were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2002/2003 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-03-06).

Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 2 as a consent information item. He reminded the committee that funding for the project, totalling approximately $200 million was approved by the voters in Proposition 47, which will enable critical CSU projects to proceed.

**Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University, Sacramento**

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 3 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-03-07).

**Approval of Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Faculty and Staff Housing H-8 at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo**

Chair Pesqueira announced that item 4 has been deferred at the campus’ request.

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

This item proposed the approval of the schematic plans for CSU Hayward—Business and Technology Building, CSU Los Angeles—Parking Structure III, CSU Northridge—Parking Structure, Phase II, CSU Northridge—Parking and Public Safety Building, Cal Poly, Pomona—American Red Cross Regional Headquarters, CSU San Bernardino—Student Recreation Center, CSU, Stanislaus—Science II Seismic Replacement Building.

With the use of a slide presentation, Mr. J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design, and Construction presented the items as printed in the agenda. Mr. Drohan also mentioned that CEQA action on all projects has been completed.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolutions (RCPBG 05-03-08)

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.
Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2003/04 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. **California State University, Dominguez Hills**
   **Child Development Center and Infant Toddler Center**
   PWC $1,218,000

   CSU Dominguez Hills wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a child development center and infant toddler center on a single site at the northeast corner of the campus. The project will provide permanent facilities for the two programs that are now housed in temporary buildings due to the construction of the Home Depot Center. The child development center will provide services to primarily university students while attending classes. The infant toddler center is for children with developmental disabilities, and serves as a practicum site for the School of Education. The proposed project consists of two one-story facilities totaling approximately 7,344 gross square feet (GSF). This project is consistent with the campus master plan. The university is scheduled to begin construction in December 2003 and complete construction in March 2004. The proposed project will be funded from three sources: $550,000 from the Home Depot Center; $150,000 from Associated Students, Inc.; and $518,000 from Infant/Toddler Center reserve funds.

2. **California State University, Fullerton**
   **Parking Structure B**
   PWC $17,100,000

   CSU Fullerton wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a four-level parking structure with 1,400 parking spaces resulting in a net increase of 600 parking spaces. The proposed project and the adjacent future student recreation center will replace the existing surface parking lot B on the west edge of the campus, and will provide convenient commuter and visitor access to the academic core of the university. This project is consistent with the campus master plan. The university is scheduled to begin construction in June 2004 and complete
construction in August 2005. As construction bids are received, the campus will request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program. The financial plan also includes a $3 million contribution from parking reserves.

As part of the new CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program, the system is phasing in new campus debt management benchmarks. The Fullerton campus meets all of these new benchmarks except that with this project the campus will be at or slightly below the campus coverage minimum benchmark for net revenue of at least 1.35 times debt service. However, because adequate parking is an important use of debt capacity and the campus has shown an exceptional need, the project is being presented for approval. The campus has also demonstrated a potential to improve this ratio.

3. California State University, Hayward  
   Pioneer Heights Phase II Student Housing  
   PWCE  
   $28,581,000

CSU Hayward wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a student housing expansion project that has been on hold since 1991. The project design is being revised to meet regulatory requirements, the current market conditions, and in consideration of the Campus Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. The proposed design locates the new housing between the main campus and the existing Pioneer Heights student housing and is organized around a new landscaped outdoor space. A new administration and commons building will support both the existing and proposed housing and is designed to serve as the new front door to the housing community. The proposed project will add 76 housing units for a total of 416 new beds (118,660 GSF) to serve upper division students. The project includes the interior redesign and reconfiguration of the existing 6,338 GSF El Dorado Hall. The buildings will incorporate energy-efficient, sustainable design elements. This project is consistent with the campus master plan. The university is scheduled to begin construction in February 2004 and complete construction in August 2005. As construction bids are received, the campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program to finance the construction.

The Hayward campus meets all of the new debt management benchmark tests except for the campus net revenue coverage for its combined pledged revenue programs. It is marginally below the benchmark of 1.35 times debt service. A review of the components of its pledged revenue programs shows that their ratios are affected by some short term issues that the campus feels can be improved. Coupled with the facts that 1) this project has been in initial planning for some time, 2) housing-type projects are a fundamental use of capacity, 3) the campus currently has only 404 bed spaces, and 4) the campus has demonstrated strong demand, the project is being presented for approval.
4. California State University, Long Beach
   Parking Office Building    PWCE    $4,954,000

CSU Long Beach wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new two-story, 16,000 GSF parking office building. The proposed project will replace offices in temporary trailers located west of parking lot 11. It will provide much needed offices and support space for the Parking, Transportation and Events program and the Sports, Athletic and Recreation program. The trustees are also being requested to revise the campus master plan to site the proposed project at this meeting. The campus is scheduled to begin construction in April 2004 and complete construction in February 2005. The parking program reserves will fund the project.

5. California State University, Long Beach
   Parking Structures 2 and 3    PWC    $38,193,000

CSU Long Beach wishes to proceed with the design and construction of two, four-level parking structures (835,000 GSF) near the intersection of Palo Verde Avenue and Atherton Street. The new structures will be built on an existing surface parking lot. Construction will occur in two consecutive phases and when completed will provide 2,584 spaces plus 671 on-grade spaces resulting in a net increase of approximately 1,000 spaces. Additional improvements include the development of several new pedestrian and fire access routes. The trustees are also being requested to revise the campus master plan to site the proposed structures at this meeting. The university is scheduled to begin construction in April 2005 and complete construction in August 2006. As construction bids are received, the campus will request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program. The financial plan also includes a $7.5 million contribution from parking reserves. The campus meets all of the new debt management program benchmarks.

6. California State University, Northridge
   Academic Support Facility    PWC    $1,250,000

CSU Northridge wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new academic support facility to meet short-term space needs associated with major and minor capital facility renewal/renovation projects. The 9,100 GSF building will be constructed near the northeast corner of the campus loop road, adjacent to parking lot E6. The pre-engineered metal building will have a conventional plaster skin and will be designed to incorporate day lighting and complement adjacent campus architecture. The university is scheduled to begin construction in September 2003 and complete construction in January 2004. The proposed project has been approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as an eligible alternate project and will be constructed using FEMA grant funding (1994 Northridge earthquake recovery).
7. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Parking Lot M Expansion PWC $669,000

Cal Poly Pomona wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the parking lot M expansion. The proposed project will expand the existing parking lot M by adding 272 new surface parking spaces, and develop a walkway from lot M to University Drive. The project also includes fencing, lighting and emergency telephone. This project is consistent with the campus master plan. The university is scheduled to begin construction in July 2003 and complete construction in September 2003. The parking program reserves will fund the project.

8. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Parking Structure 1 PWCE $27,924,000

Cal Poly Pomona wishes to proceed with the design and construction of parking structure 1. The proposed project will be located on parking lots F-6 and F-7 and will provide 2,650 parking spaces resulting in a net increase of 1,900 spaces (791,000 GSF). This project will also include permanent offices and related facilities (8,000 GSF) for the parking services personnel and university police staff that are currently housed in a temporary building. The project also includes walkways, fencing, lighting, emergency telephones and adjacent roadway improvements to Red Gum Lane, Oak Lane, Magnolia Lane, Kellogg and University Drives. This project is consistent with the campus master plan. The university is scheduled to begin construction in April 2004 and complete construction in September 2005. As construction bids are received, the campus plans to request that the Board of Trustees approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program to finance the construction. The financial plan also includes a $5 million contribution from parking reserves.

The Pomona campus meets all of the new debt management benchmark tests except that with this project its annual debt payments will slightly exceed the debt capacity benchmark of 4% of unrestricted expenditures. However, the campus has shown critical need for additional parking, and the project has been in conceptual planning for some time before our benchmark standards were applied. Because of these circumstances, the project is being presented for approval.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: 1) $1,218,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, Child Development Center and Infant Toddler Center; 2) $17,100,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Fullerton, Parking Structure
B project; 3) $28,581,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Hayward, Pioneer Heights Phase II Student Housing project; 4) $4,954,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Long Beach, Parking Office Building; 5) $38,193,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State University, Long Beach, Parking Structures 2 and 3; 6) $1,250,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State University, Northridge, Academic Support Facility; 7) $669,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Parking Lot M Expansion project; and 8) $27,924,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Parking Structure 1 project.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

Presentation By

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

Summary

Pursuant to Board of Trustees' policy, this information item provides the annual report on CSU's compliance actions required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Background

The Board of Trustees must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in assessing the potential environmental impacts of CSU development projects. The board is the “Lead Agency” for all CEQA approval actions involving projects sited on trustee property. The chancellor is delegated responsibility for implementing actions to ensure compliance for campus development projects. The assistant vice chancellor of Capital Planning, Design and Construction has delegated authority to approve certain capital projects and their related environmental compliance documents (primarily Negative Declarations).

Attachment A lists CSU compliance actions during 2002. In summary:

- Six Mitigated Negative Declarations and one Negative Declaration were certified.

- An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified for the Board of Trustees’ initial California Maritime Academy physical master plan. An EIR was also certified for a major master plan revision and housing project at San Jose. A previously certified EIR covered a major capital outlay project at Channel Islands. Environmental Impact Reports were also certified for projects at Fresno, San Bernardino, San Diego and San Luis Obispo. An EIR was approved by the board in its role as a responsible agency for a property exchange with the Los Angeles Unified School District at the Northridge campus.

- Fifteen Categorical Exemptions were submitted by Channel Islands, Fresno, Fullerton, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco,
San Jose, San Luis Obispo and Stanislaus for major capital outlay projects and minor master plan revisions that are included on Attachment A.

- Attachment A does not include twenty minor capital outlay projects for which Notice of Exemptions were submitted.

No substantial amendments to the basic statutes were enacted during 2002. CSU has been able to use a prior court decision to allow a number of major capital construction projects to proceed on the basis of previously certified CEQA documents, reducing time to start of construction.

Several campuses are pursuing development of faculty/staff and student housing projects as the need for campus housing grows. CEQA compliance for these projects continues to be subject to legal challenges from local community interests, delaying the construction of needed campus support housing.

The updated CSU Environmental Impact Review Procedures Handbook serves as an instructional and procedural tool for the campuses. Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC) staff continues to provide training in CEQA compliance procedures as part of the ongoing CSU Systemwide Capital Facilities Training Program. The seminar programs provide familiarization with the technical and practical aspects of CEQA compliance that can reduce the time and costs to meet environmental review requirements.

CPDC continues to monitor legislative bills that propose changes to CEQA compliance requirements that impact CSU policies and procedures. Of particular interest have been a number of initiatives dealing with Native American cultural resources issues. Our existing CSU policies and procedures in this regard have served to ensure appropriate consideration of these resource issues in all CSU construction projects on the campuses.
### CEQA Action Prepared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N.D.</th>
<th>E.I.R</th>
<th>BOT Action</th>
<th>NOD Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus Town Center Schematic Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHANNEL ISLANDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Master Plan Revision, Athletics Renovation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1/11/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science II Replacement Building Schematic Plans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Master Plan Revision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Master Plan Revision, Athletics Renovation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1/11/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/15/2002</td>
<td>5/16/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Master Plan Revision, Athletics Renovation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1/11/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HUMBOLDT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, ILLUSTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, MONTEREY BAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, POMONA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Physical Master Plan and Program EIR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Master Plan Revision, Gateway Building</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Children's Center Schematic Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Portable Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Apartment Building and Guest Center Repair Project</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>9/19/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIR Master Plan Revision and Village Housing Schematic Plans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Landing Pier Replacement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Infrastructure Upgrade</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, STANFORD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certify FEIR and Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8 Schematic Plans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Union Renovation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, STANFORD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Space Addition to the existing Campus Parking Lot No. 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village III Student Housing Schematic Plans &amp; Minor Master Plan Revision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5/2/2002</td>
<td>1/31/2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXEMPT** Categorical Exemption

**N.D.** Mitigated Negative Declaration

**E.I.R.** Negative Declaration

**BOT Action** Mitigated Negative Declaration

**NOD Filed** Date Notice of Determination Filed with State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research

**or Date of Notice of Exemption**
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COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Annual Report on Active Capital Projects

Presentation By

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

Summary

This report provides a summary of all currently active CSU major capital projects. The report includes performance data for these projects regardless of fund source (state and nonstate). This report also includes several projects that are currently ‘On Hold’, but expected to eventually continue on to completion.

As noted to the Trustees in last year’s presentation, this report has been recast to present project information on both design performance and construction performance. Information is now indicated in months, rather than percentages. We feel the current reporting provides a more thorough representation of the current performance of the Capital Outlay Program.

The active project reporting is a snapshot showing activity at the time of the final report query (June 19, 2003). Two reports are provided.

The Active Project Summary provides a summary of the following indicators:

1. Project Budget
2. Project Status (Design/Construction)
3. Project Design Phase Performance
4. Project Construction Phase Performance

The Individual Project Report provides a line item report on each individual active project, sorted by campus.

Number of Projects:

For this reporting period 95 projects are considered ‘active’. Of this, 52 are state funded and 43 nonstate funded.

There were 28 new additions to the active projects list for this year; 15 state funded and 13 nonstate funded.
Variations in number of active projects in any one reporting period should be considered only a general gauge of activity. This report does not weigh relative complexity of individual projects. For example, a small, relatively simple, 6-month project will indicate as active in the same manner as a large, complex, multi-year project.

**Definition of Active and Completed:**
Projects are considered active and appear in this report at the earlier of two conditions: project funding or start of schematic design work. The purpose is to evaluate the actual period under which the project is under management by the campus.

Projects are usually considered completed upon filing of a Notice of Completion. In some cases, a project may be partially complete with some portions occupied, but if final work is still remaining to close out the project, the project will still be considered ‘active’. Such instances are noted in the comments in the Individual Project Report (Example: CSULA Bookstore Dining Services).

### 1. Project Budget Performance

The total value for active projects in 2003 is approximately two billion dollars.

The total project construction budget column indicates current project funding. This value includes all hard and soft construction costs. On state projects, if Group II Equipment (i.e. furnishings and movable equipment) is included it will be noted in the individual project comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Value of Active Projects</th>
<th>All Projects</th>
<th>State Projects</th>
<th>Nonstate Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,246,809,204</td>
<td>607,691,765</td>
<td>639,117,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,822,814,708</td>
<td>895,887,260</td>
<td>926,927,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 &lt;current report&gt;</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,008,193,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$946,029,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,062,164,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reported total value of project construction will vary significantly over time. These swings are due to the presence of some very large projects moving through the reporting system. In the current report two projects, in particular, out of the 95 currently reported, represent 18% ($357 million) of the total reported program value. Information on these two projects, the San Jose Joint Library and the San Jose Campus Village Housing I, is included in the Individual Project Report.

The second column under Budget Performance identifies that, out of the 95 projects, 17 had some form of budget revision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Performance (Actual/Planned)</th>
<th>Total number of projects with revisions to original budget</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Nonstate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 &lt;current report&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 7 State projects with budget changes 4 were due to phased funding, 2 were reductions due to reversion of bid savings, and 1 was a campus approved increases funded via additional campus fundraising or other nonstate sources (Example: Maritime Academy, Engineering Building Renovation).

Comparisons with earlier reports are not provided. Project data collection on earlier reports did not include original starting budget information. This information has been compiled for the current report and will be available for future comparisons.

2. Project Status (Design/Construction)

The Project Status columns in the summary report simply breaks out the number of projects in design versus those in construction. In the current report, out of 95 total projects, 52 are in design and 43 are in construction.

3. Design Phase Performance

The 2003 Summary Report compares ‘Planned’ versus ‘Actual’ design phase performance. For this report 60% of projects, to some degree, overshot their planned schedule. Only 40% of projects accurately allocated the amount of time necessary to complete design. Of interest is that the same ratio is present for state and nonstate projects. The table below shows that initial planning assumptions, regardless of funding source, continue to be too optimistic systemwide.
The summary report shows that the average amount of design phase delay is one month shorter on nonstate projects. This is a reflection that nonstate projects tend to be in general less expensive, more repetitive (housing, parking), and less programmatically complex.

Overall, when delays occur they tend to be distributed throughout all design phases; schematic, preliminary and working drawings. The occurrence of delays is at least partially attributable to an insufficient allocation of time for plan review and revisions within each phase.

The impact of inaccurate planning forecasts tends to ultimately manifest itself in compressed construction schedules as campuses work to minimize delays to final project occupancy.

Compressed construction schedules incrementally result in increased bid costs and higher design/construction errors as mistakes are made to meet a tighter than optimum schedule. To the extent that we can realize improved scheduling and shorten (somewhat) the total duration of the design process we can reduce compressed construction schedules and realize cost and time benefits.

CPDC will incorporate the information and implications from this data in future systemwide project management training to improve schedule forecasts on future projects.

**Special Situations Relative to Design Delay**

**Telecommunications Infrastructure Projects:**
Throughout the system Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade projects tended to experience significant design delays. The average reported telecom project design delay is approximately 9 months. In large part this was an unknowable situation where key service providers elected to withdraw mid-stream from the telecom design business during the design phase. This occurred statewide and affected most projects within the system. There was a resulting time lag as new providers were found and brought up to speed.

**Projects on Hold:**
Within this report 7 projects are classified as ‘On Hold’. These projects are all in the design phase. There are no projects on hold in construction. Projects on hold in the current report average 6 months in design delay.

A project going ‘on hold’ is the result of an unanticipated event that must be resolved before the project can move forward. Most often when a project goes on hold there is a budget discrepancy that requires additional funds be secured for a project. In some cases projects are on hold to resolve a legal challenge such as the CEQA issues relative to the San Luis Obispo H-8 Housing project.

### 4. Construction Phase Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase Performance</th>
<th>Percentage of projects with time extension to original construction schedule</th>
<th>Mean average of construction schedule extension relative to original Notice of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All projects</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>&lt;1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Projects</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>&lt;1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstate Projects</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>&lt;1 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2003 report indicates that while a majority of projects endured some ‘planned’ versus ‘actual’ construction schedule extension, the actual average delay itself was very slight at less than one month for both state and nonstate projects.

Most state projects face inflexible streamline funding reversion deadlines. As projects have grown in size and complexity we are seeing that projects are running very close to these limits for completion. We are working on implementing alternate delivery methods, such as CM@Risk, to facilitate timely project completion.

Nonstate projects are usually linked to an academic start date (student housing, bookstore, parking, etc.) and similar to state funded projects are held to firm fixed completion dates.

Together this points to the need to carefully monitor a project’s schedule progress during the design phase so that the construction phase does not become unduly constrained.

This report out of necessity focuses on our misses and identifies areas for improvement. We are confident that improvement will occur over time. Overall, in a complex and challenging environment, we see a program that is successfully delivering an impressive array of capital improvements in support of the CSU educational mission.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS


Presentation By

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

Summary

Attachment A provides a status report on the trustees’ 2003/04 capital outlay budget request. The legislature has approved all ten projects requested by the trustees and included in the governor’s budget proposal. A final report will be presented if the 2003/04 Budget Act has been enacted.

2003/04 State Funded Capital Outlay Program Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustees’ Request</th>
<th>Governor’s Budget, Plus 4/1 Amendment</th>
<th>Legislative Analyst</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$206 Million</td>
<td>$199.5 Million</td>
<td>$199.5 Million</td>
<td>$199.5 Million</td>
<td>$199.5 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2003/2004 Priority List

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index 4019 and Equipment Price Index 2564

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Trustees’ Request Dollars</th>
<th>April 1 Governor’s Budget Amendment Dollars</th>
<th>Legislative Analyst’s Office Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Senate Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Assembly Phase Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Minor Capital Outlay Program</td>
<td>PWCE</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000 (a)</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Science II Replacement</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Student Services Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Science II Replacement Bldg. (Seismic)</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>WC 46,401,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Science Buildings Reno./Add., Phase II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PWCE 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWCE 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWCE 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWCE 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWCE 21,786,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Renovate Darwin Hall</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>PWCE 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWCE 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWCE 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWCE 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWCE 26,012,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000 (c)</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Soc. Scis./Art Gallery/Prkg. Struct. 8</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>PWCE 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWCE 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWCE 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWCE 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWCE 25,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PWCE 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWCE 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWCE 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWCE 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWCE 18,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Joint Library - Secondary Effect</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>PWCE 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWCE 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWCE 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWCE 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWCE 19,633,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

| 5,087 | 206,006,000 | 199,495,000 | 199,495,000 | 199,495,000 | 199,495,000 |

**Notes:**

- GOVERNOR’S PROPOSAL
  - (a) Amount reduced to fund bond reserve.
  - (b) Amount budgeted for inflation reduced.
  - (c) Recommendation subsequent to receipt of additional information.

**Categories:**

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

◊ This project is dependent upon state and nonstate funding.

A = Acquisition    P = Preliminary plans    W = Working drawings    C = Construction    E = Equipment
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University, Long Beach

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests that the Board of Trustees certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approve a campus master plan revision for CSU Long Beach. The proposed revision maintains the university’s enrollment of 25,000 full-time equivalent students. Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan with revisions indicated in hexagons and Attachment B is the existing campus master plan approved by the board in November 1994. The FEIR and the Findings of Fact and the Environmental Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are available for review by the board and the public at http://www.ppfm.csulb.edu.

Background

CSU Long Beach enrollment has been rising steadily over the last six years. The university’s 2002 fall semester actual enrollment totaled 34,566, including part time students. The campus has a predominantly commuter student population with a relatively high ratio of part-time students. Approximately 1,900 students reside on campus, which represents the maximum capacity of available campus student housing. Due to recent and projected enrollment growth, two new parking structures and recreation facilities are proposed in the northeastern portion of the campus. Approximately 1,000 net new parking spaces must be provided to maintain an adequate parking supply to serve the current and future needs of the campus. Additionally, the university currently maintains offices in temporary trailers located west of Parking Lot 11. As part of the scope of work to provide the two parking structures, these temporary trailers would be removed and a new two-story, 16,000 gross square foot building will be constructed on the site southwest of the existing Pyramid.

Proposed Revisions—Attachment A

The campus master plan revision includes the addition of a parking office building (hexagon 1), two parking structures (hexagon 2), and a recreation center (hexagon 3). Temporary trailers (#77) west of Parking Lot 11 will be deleted from the master plan due to the construction of the parking structures.
Purpose of the EIR

The FEIR is a Project Level EIR. A Project EIR is the most common type of EIR that examines a specific development project. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15161, this type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation. A Project EIR can be used for:

1. separate but related projects;
2. projects consistent with general plan or zoning;
3. individual projects not covered by the Campus Master Plan EIR; or
4. projects that may have a significant effect not discussed in the Campus Master Plan.

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision to provide two parking structures, a parking office building and a recreation center adds nonstate funded improvements at an estimated $75 million in current dollars.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the CSU’s CEQA Handbook. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. To determine the scope of the environmental topics to be addressed in the Draft EIR, a Notice of Preparation was prepared and circulated to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and persons in order to receive input on the proposed project. The review period began on July 29, 2002 and ended on August 27, 2002. The subsequent Draft EIR was made available for public and agency comment beginning on March 18, 2003 to comply with the required 45-day public review period. The Notice of the Availability/Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR was published in the Long Beach Press Telegram and made available for public review at the Long Beach City Main Library, Long Beach City Clerk’s Office, Los Angeles County Clerk’s Office, the University Library, and the office of Physical Planning and Facilities Management. The public review period ended on May 1, 2003. During the review period, fourteen written comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR were submitted to the university’s Office of Physical Planning and Facilities Management from interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and individuals. These are summarized below. Specific Comments and Responses to Comments on the proposed campus master plan revision are included in Appendix J of the FEIR at http://www.ppfin.csulb.edu.
Public Agency Comments

Three public agencies submitted written comments on the Draft EIR: Department of Toxic Substances Control, City of Long Beach Traffic and Transportation Bureau, and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Their comments and the campus’ responses are listed below:

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

This agency expressed concern relative to potential soil contamination at the project sites based on a history of oilfield activities in the vicinity of the campus dating back to the early 1920s. An Environmental Data Resources search was performed to determine whether any recorded hazardous materials spill incidents or violations have occurred within the project area. There are no recorded sites on the campus. The campus hired a geotechnical engineering firm, to conduct soil studies during the advanced feasibility study associated with this project. Although no material-specific testing for contaminants or hazardous materials was performed on samples during our field exploration and sampling operations, no obvious signs (visual or olfactory) were observed in the materials extracted from the ground.

City of Long Beach Traffic and Transportation Bureau

The Bureau’s concerns were primarily related to traffic distribution and future road improvements at selected intersections adjacent to the project sites. Subsequent to receiving these comments, campus representatives and Kaku and Associates, the campus’ consulting traffic engineer, met with the city staff to discuss their concerns. The outcome of the meeting resulted in revisions to the final mitigation measures that not only addressed the city’s concerns but also benefit the campus and the proposed projects.

Department of Transportation

Caltrans was concerned about the impact of student population for the campus on the 605, 22, and 405 freeways as well as the ramps and access point from State route 22, which is due east of the campus. The primary impact of the new parking structures will be the re-distribution of traffic on the local streets and highways. As such, the EIR concentrated on the potential impact on city streets in Long Beach where this re-distribution would occur. The implementation of the project will not cause any change to the traffic on the freeway system and will not, therefore, have an impact.

Public Review Comments

Six letters were received from community residents. Most of these comments expressed concerns that the project would have negative impacts on air quality, traffic, and noise. There was concern about inadequate public notice and review time. Mitigation measures associated
with air quality, traffic, and noise are addressed in the FEIR. The public notice and review time was conducted in accordance with CEQA law and provisions. Five letters were received from the Native American community. These comments were primarily related to the lack of time provided to review the Draft EIR, lack of reference to “Puvungna”, and the confidentiality of the Cultural Resources Technical Report. The public review period was conducted in accordance with CEQA law and provisions.

The proposed development sites identified in the Draft EIR may be associated with a possible archaeological site referred to as “Puvungna”. Over the past ten years, the campus, with the assistance of a third-party professional archaeologist, has conducted archaeological studies associated with numerous capital improvements across the campus. The cost for these studies is estimated to be more than $2.3 million. However, out of an abundance of caution, a qualified archaeological monitor and Native American monitor will be retained as needed during earth moving activities as a precautionary measure against negatively impacting buried deposits (e.g., tangible evidence of Native- or Euro-American peoples) should such deposits be uncovered during project construction. Excavation as part of a mitigation plan would be implemented by qualified professional archaeologists, assuring that cultural resources discovered during project construction would be identified and dealt with appropriately.

In 1996, the campus adopted a policy on Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objectives, and Other Cultural Patrimony. This policy serves as a mechanism for consultation with the Native American community, providing an opportunity for Native American stakeholders to review proposed projects with the potential to affect cultural resources prior to construction. The Native American monitor noted above is a sitting member of the NAGPRA committee.

The Confidential Technical Report was prepared to protect the location of sensitive, non-renewable cultural resources from destruction through vandalism and/or looting. The CEQA guidelines (as amended February 1, 2001) address this issue and can be found at: http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/art9.html.

The EIR has identified the following resources with potentially significant impacts:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Noise
- Traffic and Circulation

All of the above potentially significant impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.
The EIR identified the following resources with no potential for significant impacts and for which no mitigation measures are required:

- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Hazardous and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems

Alternatives

The EIR includes an analysis of various alternatives to the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the proposed project, including revisions to the CSULB campus master plan as indicated on Attachment A. The alternatives shown below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project in the Draft EIR.

**Alternative 1 – No Project** Under this alternative, the proposed parking structures and recreation center would not be built. CSULB would continue to utilize existing facilities for parking and recreation needs. This alternative is not an option due to current and projected enrollments and the need to keep students, faculty and staff on campus without impacting the surrounding neighborhoods. The No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the university.

**Alternative 2 – Alternative Location Parking Lot 7** Under this alternative, a parking structure would be constructed on Parking Lot 7. Lot 7 is approximately 81,000 square feet and is located at the south end of the campus. Access to the lot is provided from Seventh Street and East Campus Road. The lot has limited potential for 527 net new stalls. A recreation center would not be included as part of this alternative due to the limited lot size.

**Alternative 3 – Alternative Location Parking Lot 16** Under this alternative, a parking structure would be constructed on Parking Lot 16. Lot 16 is approximately 146,000 square feet and is located at the western area of the Campus. Access to the lot is provided from Merriam Way or Atherton Street to Earl Warren Drive. The internal roads are inadequate to support the increased volume of traffic trying to access the parking structure, as well as navigating to other major facilities along these roadways. Existing facilities along these roads prohibit widening of the
roadways. A recreation center would not be included as part of this alternative due to the limited lot size.

**Alternative 4 – Six Story Parking Structure Lot 11** Under this alternative, a six-story parking structure would be constructed on Parking Lot 11. The upper two levels of the structure would be stepped back and open. Although Lot 11 could accommodate this size of structure, impacts such as aesthetics, noise, light glare to the neighborhood east of the project site resulted in this alternative being deemed unacceptable.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The FEIR for the California State University, campus master plan revision was prepared to address the potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives. Comments and responses to comments on the proposed campus master plan revision are included in Appendix J of the FEIR at [http://www.ppfm.csulb.edu](http://www.ppfm.csulb.edu).

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2002071131) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the State CEQA Guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which require that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project (along with a statement of facts supporting each finding).

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures prepared for Agenda Item 5 of the July 15-16, 2003 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are hereby incorporated by reference.

5. Prior to the certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR and finds that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the California State University, Long Beach campus master plan revision as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprised the following:
a. The Draft EIR for the California State University, Long Beach, campus master plan revision;

b. The FEIR including comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to comments;

c. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced prior to or at the meeting; and

d. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (a) through (c) above.

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210, and California State University, Long Beach, Office of Physical Planning and Facilities Management, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Brotman Hall, Suite 370, Long Beach, CA 90840-0127.

6. The board certifies the FEIR for the California State University, Long Beach, campus master plan revision and for the construction of the parking office building, the parking structures 2 and 3, and the recreation center.

7. The board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the campus master plan revision, and the parking office building, the parking structures, and recreation center projects. The board shall consider the FEIR in connection with any future project approvals.

8. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

9. The chancellor or his designee is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

10. The California State University, Long Beach, campus master plan revision dated July 2003 is hereby approved.
California State University, Long Beach

Campus Master Plan
Master Plan Enrollment: 26,000 FTE
Proposed Revision Date: July, 2003
Main Campus Acreage: 322
Parking Spaces: 13,214
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Existing Facility</th>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brotman Hall</td>
<td>FACULTY OFFICE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
<td>PETERSON HALL 1 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>PETERSON HALL 2 / PETERSON HALL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Soroptimist House</td>
<td>SCIENCE LECTURE HALLS / MICROBIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY C / COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University Student Union</td>
<td>FACULTY OFFICE 4 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>ANIMAL HOUSE / FACILITY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>GREENHOUSE 1 AND 2 / LIBERAL ARTS 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (NORTH) / SOCIAL SCIENCES / FACULTY OFFICE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Liberal Arts 5</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY GYMNASIUMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Liberal Arts 4</td>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Liberal Arts 3</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY GYMNASIUMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Liberal Arts 2</td>
<td>HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Liberal Arts 1</td>
<td>HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS / HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Faculty Office 3</td>
<td>VIVIAN ENGINEERING CENTER / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty Office 2</td>
<td>ENGINEERING 2 / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lecture Hall 150-151</td>
<td>ENGINEERING 3 / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KKJZ</td>
<td>DESIGN / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>FACULTY OFFICE 4 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>HUMAN SERVICES &amp; DESIGN / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Multi-Media Center</td>
<td>ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Education 1</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY POLICE / FACILITIES MANAGEMENT / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Education 2</td>
<td>CORPORATION YARD / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>McIntosh Humanities Office Building</td>
<td>PATTERTON CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Language Arts Building</td>
<td>LOS ALAMITOS HALL / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Studio Theater</td>
<td>LOS CERRITOS HALL / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University Theater</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALLS AND COMMONS / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>RECYCLING CENTER / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Telecommunications Center</td>
<td>GREENHOUSE 3 / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Art Annex</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (SOUTH) / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fine Arts 1</td>
<td>REPROGRAPHICS / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fine Arts 2</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY A / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fine Arts 3</td>
<td>RESTROOMS / FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fine Arts 4</td>
<td>FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fine Arts 4</td>
<td>FACULTY OFFICE 5 / FACULTY OFFICE 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND: EXISTING FACILITY / Proposed Facility
Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Database (SFDB)
California State University, Long Beach
CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

1. BROTMAN HALL 36. FACULTY OFFICE 4
2. STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES 37. PETERSON HALL 1
3. NURSING 38. PETERSON HALL 2
4. SOROPTIMIST HOUSE 39. PETERSON HALL 3
5. FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES 40. SCIENCE LECTURE HALLS
6. UNIVERSITY STUDENT UNION 41. MICROBIOLOGY
7. CAFETERIA 42. ANIMAL HOUSE
8. BOOKSTORE 43. GREENHOUSE 1 AND 2
9. PSYCHOLOGY 44. ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (NORTH)
10. LIBERAL ARTS 5 45. FACULTY OFFICE 5
11. LIBERAL ARTS 4 46. SOCIAL SCIENCES/PUBLIC AFFAIRS
12. LIBERAL ARTS 3 47. UNIVERSITY GYMNASIUMS
13. LIBERAL ARTS 2 48. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS
14. LIBERAL ARTS 1 49. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES
15. FACULTY OFFICE 3 50. VIVIAN ENGINEERING CENTER
16. FACULTY OFFICE 2 51. ENGINEERING 2
17. LECTURE HALL 150-151 52. ENGINEERING 3
18. KKJZ 53. ENGINEERING 4
19. LIBRARY 54. DESIGN
20. ACADEMIC SERVICES 55. HUMAN SERVICES & DESIGN
21. MULTI-MEDIA CENTER 56. ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY
22. EDUCATION 1 57. UNIVERSITY POLICE/FACILITIES MANAGEMENT
23. EDUCATION 2 58. CORPORATION YARD
24. MCINTOSH HUMANITIES OFFICE BUILDING 59. PATTERSON CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER
25. LANGUAGE ARTS BUILDING 60. LOS ALAMITOS HALL
26. STUDIO THEATER 61. LOS CERRITOS HALL
27. UNIVERSITY THEATER 62. RESIDENCE HALLS AND COMMONS
28. UNIVERSITY THEATER 63. RECYCLING CENTER
29. TELECOMMUNICATIONS CENTER 64. GREENHOUSE 3
30. ART ANNEX 65. ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (SOUTH)
31. FINE ARTS 1 66. REPROGRAPHICS
32. FINE ARTS 2 67. COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY A
33. FINE ARTS 3 68. RESTROOMS/STORAGE
34. FINE ARTS 4 69. SOFTBALL FIELD RESTROOMS
35. FINE ARTS 5 70. COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY C
36. FACULTY OFFICE 4 71. UNIVERSITY MUSIC CENTER
37. PETERSON HALL 1 72. CARPENTER PERFORMING ARTS CENTER/DANCE CENTER
38. PETERSON HALL 2 73. PYRAMID
39. PETERSON HALL 3 74. PARKING ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
40. SCIENCE LECTURE HALLS 75. INTERNATIONAL HOUSE
41. MICROBIOLOGY 76. EARL BURNS MILLER GARDEN
42. ANIMAL HOUSE 77. TEMPORARY OFFICE BUILDING
43. GREENHOUSE 1 AND 2 78. VISITOR INFORMATION CENTER
44. ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (NORTH) 79. COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY B
45. FACULTY OFFICE 5 80. UNIVERSITY POLICE
46. SOCIAL SCIENCES/PUBLIC AFFAIRS 81. OUTPOST FOOD SERVICE
47. UNIVERSITY GYMNASIUMS 82. ENGINEERING/COMPUTER SCIENCE
48. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CLASSROOMS 83. HORN CENTER
49. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES OFFICES 84. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
50. VIVIAN ENGINEERING CENTER 85. CENTRAL PLANT
51. ENGINEERING 2 86. TELECOMMUNICATIONS CENTER
52. ENGINEERING 3 87. CAMPUS HOUSING
53. ENGINEERING 4 88. PARKING STRUCTURE NO. 1
54. DESIGN 89. HOUSING ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
55. HUMAN SERVICES & DESIGN 90. GREEN AND GREEN HOUSE
56. ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY 91. MOLECULAR & LIFE SCIENCES CENTER
57. UNIVERSITY POLICE/FACILITIES MANAGEMENT 92. TELEPHONE BUILDING
58. CORPORATION YARD 93. SOFTBALL FIELD RESTROOMS
59. PATTERSON CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER 94. MUSEUM OF ART
60. LOS ALAMITOS HALL 95. REPROGRAPHICS
61. LOS CERRITOS HALL 96. RESIDENCE HALLS AND COMMONS
62. RESIDENCE HALLS AND COMMONS 97. SOFTBALL FIELD RESTROOMS
63. RECYCLING CENTER 98. TELEPHONE BUILDING
64. GREENHOUSE 3 99. MUSEUM OF ART
65. ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION (SOUTH) 100. REPROGRAPHICS
66. REPROGRAPHICS 101. RESIDENCE HALLS AND COMMONS
67. COMMUNICATIONS - MAIN DISTRIBUTION FACILITY A 102. SOFTBALL FIELD RESTROOMS
68. RESTROOMS/STORAGE 103. TELEPHONE BUILDING
69. SOFTBALL FIELD RESTROOMS 104. MUSEUM OF ART

LEGEND: EXISTING FACILITY / PROPOSED FACILITY
Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Database (SFDB)
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COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS, AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

1. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona—University Village Phase III
   Project Architect: RBB Architects, Inc.

Background and Scope

The California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, University Village Phase III project will be located on the existing 20-acre university village site. The proposed project was included in the trustees’ 2002/03 nonstate funded capital outlay program in September 2002. The project consists of five three-story structures. There will be 118 four-single bedroom apartment units and two resident director units totaling 474 beds. The proposed phase III project will have red tile roofs and a stucco exterior that will blend with the existing village housing. The project proposes to remodel and expand the existing community center to incorporate new laundry facilities, and will relocate the existing basketball court and maintenance building to better utilize the site. The phase III project also includes 327 new parking spaces for a total capacity of 1,057 spaces, including reconfiguration of the existing 730 parking spaces. Additionally, the project will provide improvements to the entire university village including a new pedestrian and vehicle access bridge, new security gates, circulation improvements, site lighting and signage.

Timing (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Plans</td>
<td>August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>August 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area 138,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area 117,700 square feet
Efficiency 85 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019

Building Cost ($122 per GSF) $16,797,000

Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF)

a. Substructure (Foundation) $  5.36
b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure) $43.37
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $27.74
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $43.09
e. Equipment and Furnishings $  1.99

Site Development (includes landscaping) 3,274,000
Construction Cost $20,071,000
Fees, Contingency and Services 6,150,000
Total Project Cost ($190 per GSF) $26,221,000
Group II Equipment 1,200,000
Grand Total $27,421,000

Cost Comparison

This project’s $122 per GSF building cost is comparable to the Pomona phase I housing project at $114 per GSF, and is within the CSU construction cost guidelines.

Funding Data

The project was presented to the Housing Proposal and Review Committee on August 28, 2002. The campus is presenting a request to the Committee on Finance for the Board of Trustees to approve issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program to finance the construction of the project at a future board meeting.
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An initial study was prepared and a Mitigated Negative declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on March 14, 2003, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The 30-day public review period ended on April 15, 2003. No adverse comments were received during the public comment period. Subsequent to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, an Addendum dated May 2003 was prepared specifically to evaluate technical changes to the site of the project having improvements and a change in the roadway intersection configuration at the entrance to the housing site. The changes came about as a result of the schematic design phase. The Board of Trustees is the Lead Agency for the University Village Phase III project and is required to consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration with the Addendum in the board’s review and actions on this project. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration with the Addendum will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, University Village Phase III project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not result in adverse significant impacts on the environment because potential impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be mitigated to less than significant levels.

3. An Addendum dated May 2003 was prepared to address technical changes in the siting of improvements for the University Village Phase III project as a result of the final schematic design in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA guidelines.

4. The board hereby concurs with the findings of fact and related mitigation measures of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Addendum dated May 2003, that the proposed project will reduce the potential significant effects on the environment to less than significant.

5. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.
6. The Addendum has adequately analyzed the minor changes that this project makes to previous analyses and findings.

7. The project will benefit the California State University in the implementation of its statewide mission to provide postsecondary higher education.

8. The schematic plans for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, University Village Phase III project are approved at a project cost of $27,421,000 at CCCI 4019.

2. California State University, Sacramento—Parking Structure III

Project Engineer: International Parking Design

Background and Scope

The CSU Sacramento, Parking Structure III project has two major components of work: a new parking structure and an adjacent building for offices for University Transportation and Parking (UTAPS) operations. The parking structure contains 3,200 spaces resulting in a net increase of approximately 2,700 parking spaces. The UTAPS office will be 8,000 gross square feet. The structures will be constructed in parking lot 8 located in the south central portion of the campus. The parking facility will be five stories including parking on the roof level for a total of six levels. The structure will be poured-in-place, post-tensioned concrete with a ductile moment frame. The design includes full size parking spaces and adequate cueing space, and focuses on safety and security in and around the structure with landscape improvements on the north, east and west elevations. The project also includes a minor component to upgrade the adjacent parking lot 7 with new landscaping, lighting, slurry coating and re-striping of the lot plus a new access road into the parking structure from State University Drive East.

Timing (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Plans</td>
<td>August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>February 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>April 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Area (Parking Structure III)</td>
<td>1,052,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>3,200 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gross Building Area (UTAPS Office) 8,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area 6,000 square feet

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

Parking Structure ($8,500 per space) $27,200,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown</th>
<th>($ per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation)</td>
<td>$ 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure)</td>
<td>$18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)</td>
<td>$ 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)</td>
<td>$ 4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTAPS Office Building (includes Group 1 equipment) 1,550,000
Site Development (includes landscaping) 850,000

Construction Cost $29,600,000
Fees, Contingency and Services 6,254,000

Grand Total $35,854,000

**Cost Comparison**

This project’s $8,500 per space cost is consistent with the cost range of recent parking projects at Northridge ($8,346) and Fullerton ($8,078), and is within the CSU construction cost guidelines.

**Funding Data**

Project funding is from two sources: a campus request for Board of Trustees’ approval at a future meeting to issue bonds through the Systemwide Revenue Bond program to be serviced with parking fee revenue, and a $13.4 million campus contribution from parking program reserves.

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

An initial study was prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on June 11, 2003, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The 30-day public period will end on July 10, 2003, and any adverse comments will be reported to the board. A copy of the Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:
RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University that:

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California State University, Sacramento, Parking Structure III has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

3. The chancellor is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Sacramento, Parking Structure III project are approved at a project cost of $35,854,000 at CCCI 4019.