

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Tuesday, January 31, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Moctesuma Esparza, Vice Chair
Robert G. Foster
George G. Gowgani
William Hauck
Melinda Guzman Moore
Corey Jackson
A. Robert Linscheid
Craig R. Smith

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 8, 2005

1. Status Report on the 2006/2007 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget, *Information*

Discussion Items

2. Report on Active Capital Projects, *Information*
3. Certify the Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Report for California State University, Dominguez Hills Home Depot Center Track and Field Lighting and Approve Permanent Lighting for the Track and Field Stadium, *Action*
4. 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**

November 8, 2005

Members Present

Moctesuma Esparza, Vice Chair
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman Moore
Corey Jackson
A. Robert Linscheid
Craig R. Smith
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 20, 2005 were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2005/2006 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Vice Chair Esparza presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-05-20).

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for the San Bernardino—Parking Structures I and II and the San Marcos—Center for Children and Families. With the use of an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item. She stated that all CEQA actions on the projects had been completed and staff recommended approval.

Chair Galinson stated that the San Marcos Center for Children and Families is a great project and that it will provide services for university personnel, their children, and people of the community.

Vice Chair Esparza addressed his concerns about the fees that students will be paying to park in the parking structures in contrast to what the faculty will be paying as collective bargaining froze their parking fees. Vice Chair Esparza asked for more clarification of what the impact might be.

Ms. San Juan responded that she would let him know what the student parking fee increases would be.

Chancellor Reed asked Vice Chair Esparza to restate his request for additional information.

Vice Chair Esparza responded that due to general increases in the cost of construction, student fees may need to be raised to afford parking in the two structures. He would like to see what those increased fees are compared to what the faculty is charged.

Chancellor Reed concurred that student fees would be raised to help pay for the two parking structures.

Vice Chair Esparza remarked that the increased fees will impact a student's ability to attend the university and thus affects the broader understanding of student support and how it fits into the overall picture of access and retention.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 11-05-21).

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2006/2007 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents a comparison between the CSU 2006/07 state funded capital outlay program request and the funding level included in the governor's budget.

Background

The California State University's proposed 2006/07 Capital Outlay Program and the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2006/07 through 2010/11 were presented at the September 2005 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved a 2006/07 priority list totaling \$427 million to complete previously approved projects, perform seismic upgrades, renovate older facilities, and provide new academic space for existing and projected campus enrollments.

Funding for this program is dependent on California voter approval of a future general obligation bond. Of the \$427 million in requests, it is anticipated that \$345 million would be available for the 2006/07 program to fund projects, cost of bond issuance, and reserves consistent with the Governor's Compact.

Currently AB 58 (Nunez) proposes the 2006 Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act and includes \$345 million for 2006/07 and 2007/08 for both the California State University and the University of California. It proposes \$1.507 billion for the California Community Colleges for the same two-year period.

For the governor's budget, see Attachment A. The Department of Finance considered 19 projects totaling \$303.3 million based on the trustees' priority list. The governor's budget was published on January 10, 2006, and included \$289.3 million for 19 CSU projects based on the following adjustments:

CPB&G

Agenda Item 1

January 31 – February 1, 2006

Page 2 of 2

- Channel Islands – Infrastructure Improvements, Phases 1a and 1b (PWC) request was reduced by \$8,731,000 to fund PW only for \$2,533,000, shifting the requested C funds for 1a out of the action year.
- East Bay – Student Services/Administration Replacement Building (C) \$500,000 increased site work cost request was rejected by the Department of Finance.
- Humboldt – Behavioral and Social Sciences (E) request was reduced by \$2,441,000 to keep the amount consistent with the previously approved Supplemental Language Report.
- Los Angeles – Corporation Yard and Public Safety (PWC) request was reduced by \$2,270,000 to fund PW only for \$787,000, shifting the requested C funds for public safety out of the action year.

Trustees' priorities 20 through 31 totaling \$123.7 million were not included in the governor's budget. They may be resubmitted for the Board of Trustees' consideration for the 2007/08 state funded capital outlay program pending the individual campus priority submittal for that budget year.

State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2006/07 Priority List

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index 4633 and Equipment Price Index 2726

Rank Order	Category	Campus	Project Title	Trustees' Request			Governor's Budget	
				FTE	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IA	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay		PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000
2	IA	Statewide	Capital Renewal		PWC	50,000,000	PWC	50,000,000
3	IB	San Luis Obispo	Eng./Architecture Reno./Replace., Ph. IIB	N/A	E	4,397,000	E	4,397,000
4	IB	Humboldt	Behavioral and Social Sciences	N/A	E	4,670,000	E	2,229,000 (a)
5	II	East Bay	Business and Technology	N/A	E	1,544,000	E	1,544,000
6	IB	San Bernardino	Science Buildings Reno./Add., Phase II	N/A	E	1,573,000	E	1,573,000
7	II	Maritime Academy	Simulation Center	N/A	E	3,618,000	E	3,618,000
8	II	Monterey Bay	Infrastructure Improvements	N/A	E	257,000	E	257,000
9	IB	Stanislaus	Science II (Seismic)	N/A	E	4,951,000	E	4,951,000
10	II	San Bernardino	College of Education	N/A	E	2,438,000	E	2,438,000
11	IB	East Bay	Student Services/Admin. Replace. Bldg.	N/A	C	39,438,000	C	38,938,000 (a)
12	IB	Channel Islands	Infrastructure Imps., Ph. 1a and 1b	0	PWC	11,264,000	PW	2,533,000 (a)
13	IB	Los Angeles	Corporation Yard and Public Safety	N/A	PWC	3,057,000	PW	787,000 (a)
14	IB	Bakersfield	Nursing Renovation	-7	PWC	1,979,000	PWC	1,979,000
15	IB	Long Beach	Peterson Hall 3 Replacement	1,177	C	82,696,000	C	82,696,000
16	II	Northridge	Performing Arts Center	380	WC	56,528,000	WC	56,528,000
17	IB	San Luis Obispo	Center for Science	66	P	1,866,000	P	1,866,000
18	II	San Francisco	School of the Arts Acquisition	N/A	A	6,930,000	A	6,930,000
19	II	San Marcos	Social and Behavioral Sciences Building	644	P	1,078,000	P	1,078,000
Totals				2,260		\$303,284,000		\$289,342,000

Notes: **Governor's Budget**
 (a) Amount reduced by the Department of Finance.

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

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

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Report on Active Capital Projects

Presentation By

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

Summary

This report provides a summary of active CSU major capital projects, for both state and nonstate funded projects. In 2005, there has been a 22 percent increase (\$490 million) in the dollar value of the projects underway, fueled by the growth in the nonstate funded projects, which now exceeds state funded projects by \$351 million. The total value of active projects is approaching \$2.7 billion.

Number of Projects

For this reporting period 99 projects are considered ‘active.’ Of these, 38 are state funded, 49 are nonstate funded, and 12 have mixed funding. There were six fewer projects on the active projects list in 2005 as compared with last year. This report excludes 22 smaller state funded capital renewal projects that total \$26 million.

Active Projects	All Projects	State Projects	Nonstate Projects	Mixed Projects
2001	78	40	38	0
2002	102	54	46	2
2003	95	45	43	7
2004	105	49	47	9
2005	99	38	49	12

Project Budget

The total budget for active projects in 2005 is approximately \$2.7 billion, which exceeds the total 2004 project budget amount by over \$490 million. The value includes hard construction costs and soft costs (fees and contingency), but not funds for moveable (group II) furnishings.

Total Value of Active Projects (Dollars in 000's)	All Projects	State Projects	Nonstate Projects	Mixed Projects
2001	\$1,246,809	\$ 607,692	\$ 639,117	—
2002	\$1,822,815	\$ 895,887	\$ 926,927	—
2003	\$2,008,193	\$ 946,029	\$1,062,164	—
2004	\$2,191,706	\$1,179,054	\$1,012,652	—
2005	\$2,681,643	\$ 925,184	\$1,276,673	\$479,786

The reported total value of project construction can vary significantly over time due to the presence of some very large projects moving through the reporting system. In this report 15 out of the 99 active projects are budgeted at more than \$45 million each, and account for 52 percent of the total reported program value. Over time there has been a noticeable trend in the increased value of the individual project budgets. Both large projects and significant increases in construction costs have contributed to increased average project budgets.

Project Design Phase Performance

Projects on average exceeded their planned design schedule by ten months. The widespread occurrence of design delays is directly correlated with the escalation in project costs that have triggered the need for extensive value engineering and redesign, in some cases requiring reductions in program scope, and/or requests for additional appropriations or donor funds. An analysis of factors affecting design completion found that after budget impacts, the most frequently reported cause of poor design performance is unrealistic or overly optimistic scheduling, followed by plan check or code review delays, and increased project size and complexity.

Project Construction Phase Performance

On average, 75% of the projects required more time for construction than anticipated at the original planning, or initial schedule development of the project. As with the design phase, unrealistic or overly optimistic scheduling appears to be a key factor accounting for this change. However, subsequent to the construction contract award and the establishment of the construction duration, project delays have typically been due to encountering unforeseen site or building conditions, rain delays due to an increase in the actual number of rainy days than the average anticipated, and poor contractor or subcontractor performance. To date, such instances are managed in consideration of contractor requested time extensions and cost increases, and are being managed within the project budget. CSU project managers work to address these issues on an on-going basis in order to mitigate contractor claims.

Program Improvements

Based on performance during this very difficult period of significant cost escalation, the following areas are targeted to improve our project delivery:

- Monitor the construction bid climate, assess building code changes, provide unit cost comparisons and increase the cost guide as appropriate.
- Be more conservative on design and construction schedules to reflect additional time required.
- Promote the submittal of comprehensive feasibility studies, inclusive of a sufficient analysis of existing conditions, site constraints, code compliance issues, project alternatives, construction phasing, occupant relocation and delivery method assessments.
- Continue training campuses in the development of improved project planning and project management to facilitate timely project completion.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Report for California State University, Dominguez Hills Home Depot Center Track and Field Lighting and Approve Permanent Lighting for the Track and Field Stadium

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests approval of the following proposed actions by the Board of Trustees for California State University, Dominguez Hills:

- Certify the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Final SEIR)
- Approve the permanent lighting on the Track and Field stadium to remain as installed.

Approval of this item would impose mitigation measures as identified in the SEIR to reduce spillover lighting impacts of the project to less than significant levels.

The Final SEIR dated December 2005, and corresponding Final EIR certified in June 2001, with the Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are separate documents that can be viewed at <http://www.csudh.edu/admfin/hdcseir.htm>.

Potential Contested Issues

In accordance with the Board of Trustees' desire to be informed of issues that are of substantial community concern early in their consideration of major projects, the following potential contested issues and the CSU response for each are identified below:

1. Concern has been expressed that with implementation of recommended mitigation measures, spillover lighting impacts from the proposed Project would remain as a potential nuisance to surrounding residences.

CSU Response: Mitigation measures are identified in the SEIR that will reduce potential adverse impacts from the existing lighting to a "less than significant" level. Measures to reduce the spillover lighting that have been implemented when the lighting was installed include adding: landscaping to campus areas and select University Heights homeowners' backyards; scrim material (finely woven fabric) screening added to 50 foot high bleachers and in the tennis court

areas; and hoods on the light fixtures to limit the angle of light coming from the fixtures. Additional mitigation measures are proposed based on a recent lighting analysis and are noted in section 3.2.4 and include aiming lights to the lowest vertical angle to direct illumination to the field and additional landscaping suitable to reach a minimum of 25 feet high within 2 years. Mitigation Measure L3 provides that a budget be established to allow individually affected property owners to install blinds, shades, or similar window coverings that will be effective in reducing exterior illumination levels by 80 percent and Mitigation Measure L5 requires that affected residents be notified prior to operation of the track and field lighting.

Any remaining spillover effects from the lighting will be carefully monitored and any identified issues from the lighting will be addressed by the university as the primary user of the facility, in conjunction with community representatives. The existing settlement agreement with University Heights established a Citizens Advisory Committee which meets at least quarterly to address ongoing issues. This committee includes three residents of the University Heights Neighborhood as well as two representatives from the Anschutz group and a representative from the university. In this regard, a comment has suggested that the effectiveness of mitigation should be evaluated by members of the community rather than by the Lead Agency (CSU University representatives), as would be appropriate. In this regard, the university is required to prepare and make available to the public a Mitigation Monitoring Report at prescribed intervals. This report can be reviewed and discussed among the concerned parties should there be remaining issues once all mitigation measures are implemented.

2. An issue of concern is the appropriateness of the methodology used for measurement and the selection of the lighting threshold criteria used to evaluate impacts.

CSU Response: As neither the City of Carson, nor the CSU has established spillover lighting standards, a survey of various zoning and municipal codes throughout the country has been undertaken to investigate lighting thresholds. The SEIR consultant that prepared the lighting impact study has used their professional judgement for the threshold criteria, and has used industry recognized computer simulation software to prepare the report. The university staff and the Home Depot Center (HDC) staff have worked closely together with community representatives to evaluate potential impacts with professional standards for lighting and the most technically effective engineering solutions.

3. A number of additional alternatives have been suggested in comments received.

CSU Response: The university has prepared a thorough list of the feasible alternatives with respective mitigation measures, and is recommending approval of the alternative that is most compatible with the university needs and the adjacent residential community desire for maintaining their residential environment. The other alternatives proposed through public comments either do not add any additional environmental improvements or negatively impact functionality and/or safety. The alternatives considered removal or disabling of permanent lights, use of temporary lights, and reduction of the height of the permanent lights.

Background

In May 2000, the Board of Trustees approved the public/private partnership that led to the construction of the \$150 million Home Depot Center sports complex on the campus of California State University, Dominguez Hills. In June 2001, the Board of Trustees approved the campus master plan revision and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report siting the sports complex. The Home Depot Center opened for operation on June 1, 2003, as a world-class sports complex with state-of-the-art venues for top amateur and professional events in soccer, tennis, track and field, and cycling. In November 2004, the Board of Trustees approved the concept plan for a second phase of development at the Home Depot Center including a conference center that will allow the campus to further develop its corporate training programs and create a hotel management program.

The proposed project would allow the permanent lighting system that has been installed at the track and field stadium to remain for the university to expand its intercollegiate activities and for Home Depot Center on occasions as needed. The track and field stadium was redeveloped as part of the agreement between CSU Dominguez Hills and Anschutz Southern California Sports Complex, LLC (ASC). As part of the agreement, the track and field stadium was upgraded to provide Olympic level venues for pole vault, high jump, triple jump, and shot put, as well as intercollegiate field sports, such as football and soccer. Use of the track and field stadium is to be shared between university-related activities and occasional events scheduled and hosted by HDC. The primary user of the track and field stadium is CSU Dominguez Hills athletic programs and the larger university community. As part of the redevelopment of the track and field stadium, a permanent lighting system was installed in 2002-2003 to illuminate the track and field area. The extended hours allowed by the lights provide for soccer team practice, evening competition events, and community activities. HDC has used the lighting system for invitational track meets that have extended into the late afternoon and evening hours. The installed permanent lighting is not consistent with the operational assumptions of the Home Depot Center project as approved by the Board of Trustees and as set forth in the Certified Final EIR.

The objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- Provide a track and field stadium that can accommodate university-sponsored and community athletic events that extend into the evening hours.
- Provide the university with a wider window in which to program use of the field for athletic team practices, as well as intercollegiate and intramural sports programs;
- Enable the university to provide the facility for use by charitable and public service organizations that need to stage events extending into the evening hours;
- Enable daytime use of the lights as additional illumination for events that will be televised and that require greater visual definition;
- Allow greater programming flexibility for events such as the Olympic trials; and

CPB&G

Agenda Item 3

January 31 – February 1, 2006

Page 4 of 10

- Avoid the cost and disruption of erecting and dismantling temporary lighting for events that would require night lighting.

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Final SEIR) for the Home Depot Center Track and Field Lighting project has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Final SEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item.

Project Design Features

The track and field stadium is located north of the velodrome, approximately 400 feet to the northeast of University Heights and approximately 500 feet north of University Drive. The lighting system, which surrounds the track and field stadium, illuminates the inner grass playing field as well as the perimeter 400-meter Olympic track. This lighting system is intended to illuminate the infield and surrounding track to approximately 30 to 50 foot-candles (fc). According to the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA), illuminating the field to 50 fc is appropriate for the types of activities and competition typically taking place in a track and field arena.

The permanent lighting system consists of 10 poles with 7 to 10 light fixtures mounted on each pole. Three poles are located on the east side of the facility, three poles on the west side, and two poles each on the north and south sides of the facility. This arrangement provides balanced lighting for the various types of events that may be held in this facility. The placement of the poles and the aiming of each light fixture ensure optimal light coverage and illumination on the field for players, spectators, and televised broadcasting.

The support poles are approximately 90 feet in height above the surface ground level. The height of the support poles allows the lights to be aimed downward as much as possible. To reduce the potential for spillover light and glare, all installed lights are equipped with cut-off hoods that further confine the angle of light to illuminate only the intended area.

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

The 45-day public review period for the Draft SEIR began on October 21, 2005 and ended on December 5, 2005.

Thirty-four letters in total were received from public agencies, organizations, and individuals commenting on the Draft SEIR. Public agencies included the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the City of Carson. Most of the letters expressed support for the proposed project. The Draft SEIR dealt with one topic, spillover lighting impacts.

The comments received from public agencies, organizations, and individuals include concerns about:

- Remaining spillover lighting impacts
- Methodology of the lighting analysis
- Alternatives

Responses have been prepared to address the concerns raised and to indicate where and how the Final SEIR addresses the issues. The following is a summary of the comments received and responses to the comments:

1. Remaining spillover lighting impacts. Concern was stated that even with mitigation measures as proposed, issues would remain including the possibility that lights would not be turned off after each event; the effectiveness of landscaping as screening; and the effect of weather conditions on spillover lighting impacts.

CSU Response: Timing of the operations of the track and field lighting is not relevant to the discussion of impact and would not serve to reduce potential impacts. However, lights will not remain on unnecessarily after an event is over. Mitigation measures L1 through L3 ensure that spillover lighting impacts will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level during each event, irrespective of the time the event is held. It should be noted that the lights are turned on and off at the Central Control Center at HDC. The lights require manual activation by HDC staff. Therefore, HDC staff in the Central Control Center would acknowledge any failure of lighting controls at the track and field stadium, and appropriate measures would be undertaken to resolve the issue.

Regarding the effectiveness of screening methods, according to the simulation model used, screening of approximately 25 feet in height would reduce spillover lighting to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, temporary trees or scrim that offer immediate mitigation would need to be at least 25 feet in height. Trees of this size are difficult to obtain. Provisions for the installation of window treatments would mitigate any remaining impacts until the trees reach sufficient height. It should be noted that the erection of scrim (finely woven fabric which is often used in front of lighting to soften the light beam) was considered, however, due to the aesthetic impact of a 25-foot high screen and the resulting noise impacts from wind blowing through the screen, this measure was deemed infeasible.

It has further been determined that weather conditions would not result in an increase in spillover lighting impacts. The track and field lights have a directional aim downward towards the infield and the surrounding track, rather than upward towards the sky. Therefore, cloudy conditions would not exacerbate the spillover lighting impact.

2. Methodology of the lighting analysis. Concern was expressed about the appropriateness of the methodology and threshold used to determine the level of spillover lighting impacts.

CSU Response: The methodology undertaken by the SEIR consultant utilized actual measurement of existing field lighting levels and spillover lighting levels (i.e., at adjacent sensitive residential areas). In addition, the computer simulation software used in the lighting analysis is considered highly effective software engineered to provide a comprehensive analysis of lighting projects and related illumination levels.

The Lead Agency, the Board of Trustees, has not adopted a threshold for significance for lighting impacts. To develop a significance threshold, a survey of 21 zoning and municipal codes throughout the United States provided a range of spillover lighting standards. Due to the sensitivity of the perceived spillover lighting impact to adjacent residential uses, a conservative threshold was adopted based on the survey results. The threshold used in this document is 0.2 foot candles (fc), which is highly conservative (a low level of illumination). For example, a threshold of 0.2 fc is less than half the light level of parking lots at CSU Dominguez Hills, which are lit to 0.5 fc. In addition, the City of Los Angeles, a jurisdiction adjacent to the City of Carson, uses a spillover lighting standard of 2.0 fc (similar to light levels found in supermarket parking lots).

3. Alternatives. The removal of Light Pole F1 was recommended to be added as an alternative.

CSU Response: Removal of Light Pole F1 will be listed as Alternative 6 in the Final Supplemental EIR, Section 4.2, Analysis of Alternatives to the Project. Alternative 6 is also discussed below under Alternatives.

Summary of Alternatives

The Final SEIR alternatives section has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the proposed project. The alternatives shown below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project in the Final SEIR and the ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified and considered in the Final SEIR.

Alternative 1: The No Project Alternative. Remove permanent lights and allow temporary east-facing lights only, consistent with the operational assumptions of the Home Depot Center Final EIR.

Alternative 2: Disable permanent west-facing lights and use east-facing permanent lights only.

Alternative 3: Remove permanent lights and bring in temporary lights, including west-facing lights.

Alternative 4: Disable, but not remove, permanent lights. Bring in temporary lights, including west-facing lights.

Alternative 5: Retain permanent lights, but reduce height of mounted fixtures to height assumed in Home Depot Center Final EIR for temporary lights.

Alternative 6: Disable Light Pole F1 (west facing).

Description of Alternatives

Alternative 1 – This alternative would not result in adverse spillover lighting impacts on adjacent residences. However, the removal of permanent lights and operation of only temporary east-facing lights would not achieve the project objective of providing required illumination for the track and field stadium during nighttime events without undesirable shadows. Further, short-term noise and air quality impacts would occur during removal of the permanent track and field lights and during setup of temporary lighting for each sporting event. Alternative 1 would have less lighting impacts than the Proposed Project, but other short-term impacts would occur.

Alternative 2 – The impacts of this option would be similar to Alternative 1 but would not have the short-term construction impacts related to the removal of the lights. Similar to Alternative 1, the use of strictly east-facing lights would limit the use of the facility for both university and HDC purposes.

Alternative 3 – This alternative would have spillover lighting impacts similar to the Proposed Project. In order to minimize the impacts of Alternative 3, implementation of mitigation measures would also be recommended.

Alternative 4 – Impacts related to spillover lighting would be similar to Alternative 3 but would not have construction impacts associated with the removal of the lights.

Alternative 5 – This option would limit the mounting height of the permanent lights to 70 feet (from the current 90 feet). This would require that the number of light fixtures on each pole be increased to provide the same illumination level as the installed project. Most importantly, the lower pole heights require that the lighting target aiming angles be increased to create a more horizontal rather than vertical beam spread direction to provide coverage across the playing field and track. This would mean that a greater proportion of the more intense part of the light beam would be directed toward the west and homes in University Heights. A computer simulation of the reduced pole heights indicates a result in spillover lighting levels virtually identical to the 90-foot pole height project, which would therefore require the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 6 – Impacts of this alternative would be similar to Alternative 1 but would not have the short-term construction impacts related to removal of the track and field lighting. While spillover lighting impacts on affected University Heights residences would be eliminated, basic project objectives would not be met. An alternative configuration of the remaining poles and light fixtures would be required to avoid unsafe shadows and dark areas on the field.

A detailed description and analysis of these alternatives is found in Section 4.0 of the Final Supplemental EIR.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Final SEIR for CSU Dominguez Hills lighting for the Track and Field Stadium was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed project and all discretionary actions related thereto, including the component existing lighting structures as identified in the Project Description in the Final SEIR.
2. The Final SEIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and CSU CEQA procedures.
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 approval of a project along with statements of facts supporting each finding.
4. This board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and related mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for Agenda Item 3 of the January 31-February 1, 2006 meeting of the Board of Trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and impose mitigation measures to reduce those impacts where feasible to a less than significant level, which are hereby incorporated by reference and made a condition of project approval.
5. The Final SEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the CSU Dominguez Hills lighting for the Track and Field Stadium as previously constructed and currently existing facilities pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.
6. The board has adopted Findings of Fact that include specific overriding considerations that outweigh the remaining unavoidable significant impacts specific to construction noise and impact on university operations.

7. Prior to certification of the Final SEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the prior-certified Home Depot Center Final EIR as revised by the Final SEIR and finds that the Final SEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the Final SEIR for the CSU Dominguez Hills lighting for the Track and Field Stadium as previously constructed and currently existing facilities as complete and adequate in that the Final SEIR addresses all significant environmental impacts of the proposed project required to be addressed pursuant to Section 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the administrative record of the proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:
 - a. The Final EIR for the master plan revision and the Home Depot Center, Phase I, certified in June 2001; and
 - b. The Draft SEIR for the CSU Dominguez Hills lighting for the Track and Field Stadium as previously constructed and currently existing facilities project; and
 - c. The Final SEIR, including all comments received on the Draft SEIR and responses to comments; and
 - d. 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
 - e. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (a) through (d) 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, Dominguez Hills, Office of Facilities Planning and Construction Management (Physical Plant building), 1000 E. Victoria Street, Carson, California 90747.

8. The board certifies the Final SEIR is complete and adequate for the CSU Dominguez Hills lighting project for the Track and Field Stadium.
9. The board finds that the Final SEIR together with the prior-certified Home Depot Center Final EIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts of, and mitigation measures for, the Track and Field Stadium lighting project identified in the Final SEIR, and that the resolutions and approvals previously provided by the board apply to the construction of the stadium lighting

CPB&G

Agenda Item 3

January 31 – February 1, 2006

Page 10 of 10

project. The board shall consider the Final SEIR together with the prior-certified Home Depot Center Final EIR in connection with the approval of this project.

10. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Dominguez Hills lighting project for the Track and Field Stadium.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS, AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

- 1. California State University, Channel Islands—Student Housing, Phase II**
Project Architect: David J. Flood Associates
Contractor: Valeo Construction, Inc.

Background and Scope

This project is the second phase of Student Housing for CSU Channel Islands. Phase I was completed for occupancy in fall 2004; the 353 beds are full with a significant waiting list. Student Housing, Phase II will provide critically needed student beds to support current and future student enrollment as outlined in the master plan.

The Student Housing, Phase II project will be a 2- and 3-story complex including adaptive reuse of existing buildings as well as new construction. As proposed, the project will provide a minimum of 464 beds in approximately 127 semi-suite units. Each semi-suite will include two or three bedrooms, accommodating single and double occupancy, with a shared bathroom. The project will include nine studio units for resident assistants, two studio units for assistant resident directors, and one two-bedroom apartment for the resident director. The project also provides for study lounges, laundry facility, common meeting room, and small recreational rooms. Site development, landscaping, and approximately 300 parking spaces complete the project scope. Parking will be provided by the paving, lighting, and striping of an existing gravel lot adjacent to the housing site.

The project will retain the existing structures along the edge of the south quad, and continue the existing Mission/Spanish revival style architecture of the campus as directed by the trustees. Some existing buildings will be selectively demolished to improve constructability and increase efficiency.

The project design includes numerous sustainable features: adaptive re-use of existing buildings, natural ventilation (in lieu of air-conditioning), energy efficient lighting and mechanical systems, and drought-tolerant plantings. The provision of on-campus housing will also reduce vehicle trips to and from the campus.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Working Drawings	July 2006
Construction Start	April 2006
Occupancy	August 2007

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area (new and renovated)	132,200 square feet
Assignable Building Area	86,000 square feet
Efficiency	65 percent
Parking	300 spaces

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4633

Building Cost (\$200 per GSF)	\$26,427,000
-------------------------------	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 5.20
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$53.25
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$35.25
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$74.02
e. Equipment & Furnishings	\$.60
f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 5.67
g. General Conditions	\$26.07

Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>\$1,573,000</u>
---	--------------------

Construction Cost	\$28,000,000
Fees	3,490,000
Additional Services	1,196,000
Contingency	<u>3,000,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$270 per GSF)	\$35,686,000
Group II Equipment	<u>2,978,000</u>

Grand Total	<u>\$38,664,000</u>
-------------	---------------------

Cost Comparison

The building cost of \$200 per GSF is much greater than the \$164 per GSF cost for the San Luis Obispo Student Housing North project and the \$158 per GSF for the East Bay Pioneer Heights, Phase II project, both adjusted to CCCI 4633. The comparison projects were approved in September 2003, and significant inflation in overall construction costs have occurred in the intervening 28 months. The higher unit cost is also indicative of the limited availability of local contractors in the area, the additional work to integrate the new construction with the existing buildings, and the considerable hazardous materials abatement costs included in the renovation.

Funding Data

The project was presented to the Housing Proposal Review Committee on April 14, 2005 and October 19, 2005. Design-Build proposals have been received, and there is a request before the Committee of Finance for the Board of Trustees to approve the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance the construction of the project. Parking costs will be funded from the campus parking reserves.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Notice of Exemption (Class 32) has been prepared for this project, and filed with the State Office of Planning and Research. No further CEQA action is required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the California State University, Channel Islands Student Housing, Phase II project is consistent with the campus master plan revision approved in May 2004, and a Notice of Exemption was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Act.
2. The schematic plans for the California State University, Channel Islands, Student Housing, Phase II project are approved at a project cost of \$38,664,000 at CCCI 4633.

2. California State University, Northridge—Science I Replacement
Project Architect: Cannon Design

Background and Scope

CSU Northridge proposes to construct the 90,600 GSF Science I Replacement building for the College of Science and Mathematics. The new building will accommodate 112 FTE (62 FTE in LD laboratory space and 50 FTE in UD laboratory space) in wet and dry laboratories and 1,794 FTE in lecture space. The Science I Replacement building will have thirteen lecture rooms including larger 120- and 150-station rooms with tiered seating. The building will be a four-story steel braced frame structure with concrete filled metal decks. The building exterior will be finished with a durable panel system with integral color and glass curtain-wall or storefront at entry points.

The site improvements for this project will enhance the campus by providing landscape and walkway connections to the surrounding campus and improved on-campus vehicle circulation. The new building will be served by a loading dock and service drive from Bertrand Avenue. The project will utilize existing utility locations including water, firewater, sewer, storm water, and gas service. The project will also be connected to the central plant and the campus electrical service grid.

Sustainable features have been incorporated into each part of the building's design. Energy efficient lighting and control systems will be used in conjunction with natural lighting. The main lobby, building entries, stairways, and circulation spaces will use natural lighting and daylight sensors to minimize energy use. Further sustainable features include a durable building skin with increased life cycle performance and durable sustainable interior materials and finishes.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	April 2006
Completion of Working Drawings	November 2006
Start of Construction	January 2007
Occupancy	January 2009

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	90,603 square feet
Assignable Building Area	55,800 square feet
Efficiency	62 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4100

Building Cost (\$381 per GSF) \$34,488,000

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure	\$ 13.40
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$105.76
c. Interior (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 52.83
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$137.06
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 28.35
f. Special Construction & Demolition	\$.66
g. General Conditions	\$ 42.58

Site Development (includes landscaping) \$2,167,000

Total Construction Cost \$36,655,000

Fees 4,794,000

Additional Services 994,000

Contingency 3,750,000

Total Project Cost (\$510 per GSF) \$46,193,000

Group II Equipment 4,108,000

Grand Total \$50,301,000

Cost Comparison

This project's building cost of \$381 per GSF is higher than the \$363 per GSF for Peterson Hall 3 at Long Beach, approved in May 2005. The increase in construction costs stems primarily from the rising costs of steel and cement, used for the substructure, shell, and interiors of the building. In addition, costs are included for sustainable design measures and code compliance for the recently expanded Title 24 California Building Code requirements for energy reduction and sustainability elements: efficient exterior glazing, highly reflective roofing materials, a durable building skin system, and high efficiency lighting.

Funding Data

The project received state funds in the amount of \$46,193,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction from the 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund. Future state funds of \$4,108,000 will be requested for Group II equipment.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Notice of Exemption has been prepared for this project and filed with the State Office of Planning and Research. No further CEQA action is required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the California State University, Northridge, Science I Replacement project is consistent with the campus master plan revision approved in May 1998, and a Notice of Exemption was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Science I Replacement project are approved at a project cost of \$50,301,000 at CCCI 4100.