

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 3:45 p.m. Tuesday, July 18, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Moctesuma Esparza, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
George G. Gowgani
Andrew LaFlamme
A. Robert Linscheid
Melinda Guzman Moore
Craig R. Smith

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 16, 2006

1. Amend the 2006/2007 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Status Report on the 2006-2007 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
3. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, *Information*
4. Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2008/2009–2012/2013, *Action*
5. 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 16, 2006

Members Present

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 14, 2006 were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2005-2006 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Trustee Esparza presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. (RCPBG 05-06-07)

Amend the 2005-2006 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

Ms. Elvyra San Juan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, presented agenda item 2 using a visual presentation. Many CSU campuses have taken steps toward achieving the trustees' energy efficiency goal by implementing a variety of renewable energy and infrastructure projects. This item presents five projects for trustee approval. Three campuses are implementing photovoltaic projects using power purchase agreements and third party financing. CSU San Bernardino is expanding the central plant, improving building efficiencies with traditional energy retrofits such as lighting and HVAC improvements, installing a photovoltaic system, and adding thermal energy storage. CSU Northridge is expanding its central plant by building a satellite facility and utilizing hydrogen fuel cell technology to generate electricity. This report highlights the fuel cell project, which will be the largest installation of any university in the country, the eleventh largest in the world, and the first for the CSU.

CSU Northridge is proposing to use a one megawatt fuel cell to meet current and future energy demand, complementing the existing central plant that includes a thermal energy storage system

that provides chilled water to campus buildings and allows the campus to reduce the electrical load on peak. The fuel cell combines hydrogen extracted from natural gas with oxygen to produce electricity. The project will reduce campus energy consumption by four percent, placing the university on track with the trustees' goal for energy conservation. The \$8.7 million project will be funded through energy savings, utility incentives, and capital renewal funds.

Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante asked if there would be any additional costs to the campuses for the photovoltaic projects, as the item states that Sun Edison will be financing construction and operation of the system and as a result of this program, the campuses will yield a savings in avoided energy cost.

Ms. San Juan affirmed that there would be no additional costs to the campuses for the projects. There were some peripheral costs: for one project the CSU paid to remove trees, and for another, there was a need to replace a roof whose remaining life was less than that of the photovoltaic panels that would be placed upon it.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-06-08).

Acceptance of Interest in Real Property

With an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item to accept real property at San Francisco State University's Tiburon Marine Field Station as detailed in the agenda. She stated that all CEQA actions on the acquisition have been completed and staff recommended approval.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-06-09).

Status Report on the 2006-2007 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Ms. San Juan presented agenda item 4 using a handout. The 2006/07 Capital Outlay Program is dependent upon a voter approved general obligation bond; proposition 1D on the ballot in November 2006. The dollar amount for higher education is \$3.087 billion where 50% of these funds will be going to the community colleges, the University of California will receive \$890 million, of which \$200 million is for medical education programs, and the CSU will receive \$690 million or 25% of the bond funds. This amount will fund both the 2006/07 and 2007/08 capital programs. The Senate has approved the CSU's request at \$331.6 million, which is an increase from what the trustees approved earlier [September 2005] and the governor's budget. The CSU amended the governor's budget to include a project at Chico, a student services replacement building that had come in over budget. The revised project was introduced with an increased budget via the April letter; it has been approved by the Senate and the Assembly. The Assembly has not approved the capital renewal program at this time, but it is fully expected to be considered as part of the support budget.

Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Francisco State University

With a visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item as stated in the agenda. The primary objective of the plan is to relocate and site future facilities and change the designation of one building from permanent to temporary. The negative declaration has been completed and filed in accordance with CEQA requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bustamante inquired whether there would be a loss of an athletic field as a result of the proposed master plan changes, and what were the fields, baseball or softball. Ms. San Juan responded that once construction is completed there will be no loss of fields. President Robert Corrigan, San Francisco State University, affirmed this point and stated that there are two fields, one for men's baseball and one for women's softball.

Mr. Bustamante asked if there would be a permanent reduction in recreation land. Ms. San Juan responded that there would be no loss, explaining that once the modular units that will be used for surge space during the renovation of a science building are removed, the field underneath will be recovered.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-06-10).

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for the CSU Bakersfield—Recreation Center and the CSU San Bernardino—Palm Desert Off-Campus Center, Phase III. 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.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-06-11).

Trustee Esparza recognized a request from Board Chair Murray Galinson to return to agenda item 1 that was approved on consent. Chair Galinson remarked on the high cost per square foot (\$364/square foot) for the CSU Stanislaus University Bookstore. Ms. San Juan responded noting the significant increase in construction budgets that the CSU uses today versus just a couple of years ago. Science buildings were budgeted at \$260 per square foot not too long ago; today the number is closer to \$400 per square foot.

Trustee Esparza remarked that state buildings have a different standard of construction than private, in terms of earthquake safety and longevity. In addition, the price of cement and steel has significantly gone up.

Chair Galinson asked if there are different construction standards for classroom buildings versus something that could be the equivalent to a retail facility. Ms. San Juan stated that in developing the budget such projects would begin at the same level, anticipating a long life building. On the nonstate side there are compromises based upon limited revenue and the type look desired in a particular type facility. However, the projects are held to the same standards for access compliance, seismic safety, and plan check as are state projects.

Trustee Corey Jackson inquired, with regard to the Sustainability Policy, on the status of the advisory committee that was to look at sustainable design guidelines for LEED equivalency standards. Ms. San Juan responded that different subcommittees have been forming based on campuses that have participated in LEED training and the level of interest on a campus for a specific subcommittee. The committee is scheduled to meet in June at the UC/CSU Sustainability Conference, to be held at UC Santa Barbara.

President Horace Mitchell, CSU Bakersfield, thanked the trustees for their approval of schematic plans for the Recreation Center for the university. He remarked on the significance of this first major project as part of a new vision for the future of the campus, which has garnered support from every component of the campus community and most notably, the students. President Mitchell recognized three people from CSU Bakersfield who had a key role in the success of the project: first, Mr. Dan Gianoutsos, Student Body President, who was instrumental in the prior year in the passage of a student fee referendum that resulted in the student's decision to pay for the Recreation Center; second, Mr. Mike Neal, Vice President for Business and Administration, who has been responsible for shepherding this project through development; and third, Dr. Shelley Ruelas, Vice President for Student Affairs, the newest member of the administrative team, who will be responsible for the programmatic aspects of the building once it is designed.

Trustee Esparza adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2006/2007 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests approval to amend the 2006/2007 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- | | | |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 1. California State University, Fresno | | |
| Solar Photovoltaic Project | PWC | \$10,450,000 |

California State University, Fresno wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Solar Photovoltaic project. The proposed project will install a shade shelter structure with 87,700 square feet of solar photovoltaic panels in the Parking Lot V located at the southeast corner of the campus. The array will provide one (1) megawatt of power for campus operations during daylight hours. This project will be funded through a private investor, Chevron, with whom the campus will enter into a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for 20 years. Chevron will finance the infrastructure improvements and provide design, construction and operation services for the system. The campus will benefit by paying a lower overall electric rate and realizing a projected avoided cost of \$4.0 million over the contract term. Chevron will benefit from federal and state energy tax credits valued at \$1.5 million and the utility incentive of \$2.8 million secured by the campus.

- | | | |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 2. California State University, Northridge | | |
| Parking Structure G3 | PWC | \$30,409,000 |

California State University, Northridge proposes to proceed with the design and construction of a new 1,500-stall parking structure in the location of the existing G3 surface lot, providing a net increase of approximately 1,000 parking spaces. The project also includes construction of two major access roads to serve the new structure and connect the inner-campus to adjoining city streets. The project will provide parking facility growth in the eastern portion of campus, as recommended in the 2005 master plan parking study, and will accommodate event parking for the new Performing Arts Center. The project will be funded through campus parking reserves and the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program.

**3. California State University, Northridge
Student Housing, Phase I**

PWCE \$30,286,000

California State University, Northridge proposes to proceed with the design and construction of a new 400-bed, 94,000 GSF housing project in order to meet enrollment growth and housing demand on the campus. The project will be four stories and wood framed construction, and will include exterior program spaces. Based on extensive research of student preferences, the residential floors will be divided into identifiable communities or “pods” consisting of approximately 32–36 students, with three pods per floor. The complex will be designed with double occupancy rooms and bathrooms shared between two bedrooms. The project will be located within the existing University Park student housing complex and will be geared toward lower division students. The new facility will include support spaces, administrative offices, study lounges, meeting spaces, and social/community spaces. The project will be funded through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program.

**4. Sonoma State University
Solar Photovoltaic Project**

PWC \$680,000

Sonoma State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Solar Photovoltaic project. The proposed project will install 10,192 square feet of solar photovoltaic panels on the roof of the Recreation Center (#35A). The array will provide 80 kilowatts of power for campus operations during daylight hours. The project will remove over 1.5 million pounds of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions assuming a 20-year life of the system, which is the equivalent of taking 191 vehicles off the road for one (1) year. The campus will benefit by paying less for on peak electricity. This project will be funded through project savings from the Recreation Center construction fund and augmented with student union reserve funds.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2006/2007 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: 1) \$10,450,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Fresno, Solar Photovoltaic project; 2) \$30,409,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Northridge, Parking Structure G3 project; 3) \$30,286,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Northridge, Student Housing, Phase I project; and 4) \$680,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the Sonoma State University, Solar Photovoltaic project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2006-2007 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

Attachment A provides a status report on the trustees' 2006/07 capital outlay budget request. The legislature has approved all 20 projects requested by the trustees and included in the May Revision of the governor's budget. This budget reflects the reversion and refunding of the Student Services Center project for CSU Chico and \$50 million to fund the Capital Renewal Program.

A final report will be presented if the 2006/07 Budget Act has been enacted.

2006/07 State Funded Capital Outlay Program Budget Summary

<i>Trustees' Request</i>	<i>Governor's Budget with May Revision</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst</i>	<i>Senate</i>	<i>Assembly</i>
<i>\$303.3 M</i>	<i>\$331.6 M</i>	<i>\$260.4 M</i>	<i>\$331.6 M</i>	<i>\$331.6 M</i>

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	Cat.	Campus	Project Title	Trustees' Request			Amended Governor's Budget		Legislative Analyst's Office		Senate		Assembly	
				FTE	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IA	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay		PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000
2	IA	Statewide	Capital Renewal		PWC	50,000,000	PWC	50,000,000	PWC	50,000,000	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	E	4,397,000	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)	E	2,229,000	E	2,229,000	E	2,229,000
5	II	East Bay	Business and Technology	N/A	E	1,544,000	E	1,544,000	E	1,544,000	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	E	1,573,000	E	1,573,000	E	1,573,000
7	II	Maritime Academy	Simulation Center	N/A	E	3,618,000	E	3,618,000	E	3,618,000	E	3,618,000	E	3,618,000
8	II	Monterey Bay	Infrastructure Improvements	N/A	E	257,000	E	257,000	E	0 (c)	E	257,000	E	257,000
9	IB	Stanislaus	Science II (Seismic)	N/A	E	4,951,000	E	4,951,000	E	4,951,000	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	E	2,438,000	E	2,438,000	E	2,438,000
11	IB	East Bay	Student Services Replacement Building	N/A	C	39,438,000	C	38,938,000 (a)	C	36,186,000 (b)	C	38,938,000	C	38,938,000
12	IB	Channel Islands	Infrastructure Imps., Ph.1a and 1b	0	PWC	11,264,000	PW	2,533,000 (a)	PW	0 (d)	PW	2,533,000	PW	2,533,000
13	IB	Los Angeles	Corporation Yard and Public Safety	N/A	PWC	3,057,000	PW	787,000 (a)	PW	787,000	PW	787,000	PW	787,000
14	IB	Bakersfield	Nursing Renovation	-7	PWC	1,979,000	PWC	1,979,000	PWC	1,979,000	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	C	71,226,000 (b)	C	82,696,000	C	82,696,000
16	II	Northridge	Performing Arts Center	380	WC	56,528,000	WC	56,528,000	WC	47,571,000 (b)	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	P	0 (e)	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	A	6,930,000	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	P	0 (f)	P	1,078,000	P	1,078,000
20	IB	Chico	Student Services Center	0			C	42,252,000 (g)			C	42,252,000	C	42,252,000
Totals				2,260		\$303,284,000		\$331,594,000		\$260,429,000		\$331,594,000		\$331,594,000

Governor's Budget

- Notes: (a) Amount reduced by the Department of Finance.
(g) Amount approved by Department of Finance for Budget Bill amendment.

Legislative Analyst's Office

- (b) Recommended reduction in funding due to original increase (previously approved by the Legislature) exceeding construction inflation.
(c) Recommended deleting this request due to questions regarding the use of capital outlay funding.
(d) Recommended deleting this request due to insufficient justification of specific project elements.
(e) Recommended deleting this request due to issues related to the increase in instructional space, renovating as an alternative solution, and inclusion of central plant project elements.
(f) Recommended deleting this request due to insufficient projected enrollment.

- 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

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

Presentation By

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

Summary

Pursuant to the Board of Trustees' policy, this information item provides the annual report on the CSU's compliance actions required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The board must certify all Final Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) and other CEQA compliance documents for major capital projects and major master plan revisions before approving the implementation and construction of new facilities. Certain minor projects are delegated for approval administratively to the assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction.

Background

CEQA became law in 1970. It is further implemented with administrative procedures (State CEQA Guidelines), and University CEQA procedures. The Board of Trustees must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act 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.

As the Lead Agency, the board has a responsibility to ensure that all relevant information on potential environmental impacts of a project is disclosed. They must also determine when the benefits to the educational mission of the CSU, of any particular project, will outweigh any adverse impacts that may result from the construction of improvements on a campus. The essential requirement in making these decisions is that the board, in its Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations must, through the Administrative Record, set forth the basis for such a decision. The chancellor is delegated responsibility for implementing actions to ensure compliance for campus development projects. Campuses are, in turn, delegated the responsibility for Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting for the life of a project. The assistant vice chancellor of capital planning, design and construction (CPDC) is delegated authority to approve certain capital projects (architecturally not significant and utility projects) and their related environmental compliance documents (primarily Negative Declarations). A Negative Declaration signifies that a determination has been made that a project does not have the

potential for adverse environmental impacts. Both Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations require public notice to provide opportunity for comments from agencies and the public regarding proposed CEQA related project actions. Minor changes and adjustments to facilities typically are exempt from CEQA analysis through defined Categorical Exemptions.

CSU Compliance Actions

Attachment A lists CEQA activity during 2005. In summary:

- Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) were certified for the master plan revisions for the Chico and San Diego campuses. Environmental Impact Reports were also certified for specific projects at Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Monterey Bay, San Bernardino, San Diego and Sonoma. Some of these projects for which EIRs were certified met CEQA compliance requirements through the preparation of either a Supplement or Addendum to an existing approved EIR, thus reducing duplication of effort and time to prepare the project for trustee approval. For other projects, only a Finding of Consistency with the previously approved EIR was necessary to meet CEQA compliance requirements, again streamlining the trustee approval process.
- One Negative Declaration was certified for a capital project at the Maritime Academy.
- Seven Categorical Exemptions were submitted for Major Capital Outlay projects at seven campuses and are reported on Attachment A.
- Not included in Attachment A are administratively approved minor capital outlay projects and minor master plan revisions for which a Notice of Exemption was submitted by the respective campus directly to the State Clearinghouse.

CEQA Updates

No substantive amendments to the basic statutes were enacted during 2005/2006 that impact CSU procedures or policy.

CPDC continues to monitor legislative bills that propose changes to CEQA compliance requirements that affect CSU policies and procedures. Of particular concern have been a number of initiatives dealing with the issue of CSU responsibility for the costs of off-site mitigation of impacts from university capital projects needed to accommodate growing enrollment demand. Broad constitutional protections and case law interpreting these protections currently exempt the CSU from funding these types of improvements on non-CSU owned property, and the CSU by policy does not pay for or construct such improvements. These mitigations include all off-site street, traffic, infrastructure, and mass transit improvements. This issue has consistently been a

factor in litigation that attempts to exact monetary contributions and fees from the CSU for mitigation costs that statutorily are the recognized responsibility of other public agencies.

CPDC staff continues to conduct training seminars in CEQA compliance procedures for campus staff that provide review of the technical and practical aspects of CEQA compliance that can reduce the time and costs to meet environmental review requirements.

AB 2951 Capital Facilities Fee Bill

Assembly Bill 2951 (Goldberg), legislation which would fundamentally change current law regarding the imposition of capital facilities fees on public agencies, was recently passed by the Assembly and approved by the Senate Local Government Committee the last week of June and awaits further action in the Senate Education Committee in August. The CSU, in conjunction with coalition partners of public schools, community colleges, universities and state agencies, opposes this legislation as it has several prior attempts by the proponents including municipal utilities, special districts and the League of California Cities.

AB 2951 would allow public utility districts to embed previously unauthorized fees in the CSU's monthly service charges to pay for their capital projects. Because capital facilities fees would not have to be negotiated and could exceed inflation limits agreed to in current law, CSU campuses would be subsidizing the costs of utility district capital improvements that actually serve others.

By increasing the CSU's facilities-related charges by up to 30 percent, AB 2951 would cost at least \$4 million annually. This is equivalent to funding more than 5,570 students, 480 tenure-track faculty, or 3,840 courses over the next decade. The bill would overturn current law which requires public entities such as the CSU to pay their fair share of fees to cover the ongoing costs of utility service, but protects them from the imposition of discriminatory charges by requiring that such fees be negotiated with utility districts.

California Supreme Court Case: City of Marina v. CSU Trustees

In a significant step on the off-site mitigation issue, the California Supreme Court on May 2, 2006, heard the long-standing case involving the CSU Monterey Bay Master Plan Revision (City of Marina v. CSU Trustees). The City of Marina had sought to impose significant local infrastructure costs, up to \$20 million, upon the CSU Monterey Bay campus in response to the growth contemplated in its master plan. The essential issue is whether a local jurisdiction (city, county, special district) can compel the CSU to fund or otherwise participate in shared funding for major roadway and related off-site infrastructure improvements that are identified in an EIR as necessary to mitigate potential future impacts related to the growth and development of a CSU campus. The Court of Appeal sustained the university's objection to these charges in a previous decision. The Supreme Court decision is anticipated by July 31, which is 90 days after the May 2 hearing.

**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ANNUAL REPORT
 January 2005 through December 2005**

CAMPUS/Project	CEQA Action Prepared					
	Exempt	MIT. N.D.	N.D.	E I R	BOT Action	NOD Filed
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD Math and Computer Science Building, Schematic Plan Approval	√				5/11/2005	
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Increase				√	7/20/2005	7/21/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS Educational Resources Center, Schematic Plan Approval Academy of Math and Science, Phase II, Schematic Plan Approval Home Depot Center, Phase II Master Plan Revision	√			√	1/26/2005 3/16/2005 5/11/2005	1/27/2005 5/12/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO Library Addition and Renovation, Schematic Plan Approval				√	3/16/2005	3/17/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON College of Business and Economics, Schematic Plan Approval Student Recreation Center, Schematic Plan Approval				√ √	7/20/2005 7/20/2005	7/21/2005 7/21/2005
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY Forbes Physical Education Building, Phase II, Schematic Plan Approval				√	9/21/2005	9/23/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH Peterson Hall 3 Replacement, Schematic Plan Approval	√				5/11/2005	
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES Student Union, Schematic Plan Approval	√				5/11/2005	
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY Simulation Center, Schematic Plan Approval			√		1/26/2005	1/27/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, MONTEREY BAY Cogeneration Plant and Infrastructure Improvements, Schematic Plan Approval North Campus Faculty Staff Housing, Phase I, Schematic Plan Approval	√			√	5/11/2005 7/20/2005	7/21/2005
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO College of Education, Schematic Plan Approval Parking Structures I and II, Schematic Plan Approval				√ √	5/11/2005 11/9/2005	5/12/2005 11/10/2005
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY Campus Master Plan Revision (Housing Acquisition)	√				1/26/2005	
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY Pool Complex, Schematic Plan Approval Campus Master Plan Revision and Enrollment Ceiling Increase				√ √	5/11/2005 9/21/2005	5/12/2005 9/23/2005
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO Housing Administration Building, Schematic Plan Approval	√				5/11/2005	
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY Green Music Center and Music/Faculty Office Building, Schematic Plan Approval				√	1/26/2005	1/27/2005

EXEMPT **Categorical Exemption**
MIT. N.D. **Mitigated Negative Declaration**
N.D. **Negative Declaration**
EIR **Environmental Impact Report**
BOT Action **Meeting Date Action Taken (or Delegated Approval)**
NOD Filed **Date Notice of Determination Filed with State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research**

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program,
2008/2009–2012/2013**

Presentation By

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

Summary

The Board of Trustees annually adopts categories and criteria that are used in setting priorities for the state funded capital outlay program. Attachment A contains the proposed CSU 2008/09–2012/13 categories and criteria, which is fairly consistent with those approved by the board last year. Campus administrative staff has reviewed the proposed categories and criteria.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

The Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2008/09–2012/13 in Attachment A of Agenda Item 4 of the July 18-19, 2006 meeting of the trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds be approved; and

The chancellor is directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the CSU State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.

Categories and Criteria to Set Priorities
2008/09–2012/13 State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

General Criteria

A campus may submit a maximum of one project for the 2008/09 budget year, and one project for the 2009/10 planning year, including health and safety projects. A campus may submit a maximum of three projects per year, including health and safety projects, for the 2010/11 through 2012/13 planning years. Exceptions to this limit will be considered on an individual project basis. Equipment and seismic strengthening projects are excluded from this limit. Seismic strengthening projects will be prioritized according to recommendations from the CSU Seismic Review Board.

Campuses are to typically prepare their project requests for the five-year program using preliminary plan (P) phase funding separate from the working drawing and construction (WC) phases for new project starts. Campus requests for PWC lump sum funding will be considered on an individual project basis. Approval of a phased project may require the project to be funded (PWC) over one or more bond cycles.

Current trustee-approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus station count enrollment only. These numbers are to be used as the basis of comparison for justifying capital projects that address enrollment demand to be accommodated on campus. Enrollment estimates that exceed these figures should be accommodated through distributed learning and other off-campus instructional means. Proposed renovation projects are expected to include additional instructional capacity (a minimum of 10% increase in the building's existing capacity) as a means to address enrollment demand in these types of projects. Projects that increase capacity will receive higher priority consideration than renovation projects without enrollment capacity increases. Priorities will be determined based upon the relative deficiency in campus space.

If there are two or more auditoriums or large lecture hall projects, priority shall be given to the project for which 50 percent or more of its funding will be from nonstate sources. At least \$5 million must be raised from nonstate sources for an auditorium project.

Individual Categories and Criteria

I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure

A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies

These funds correct structural, health and safety code deficiencies by addressing life safety problems and promoting code compliance in existing facilities. Projects include seismic strengthening, correcting building code deficiencies, and addressing regulatory changes which impact campus facilities or equipment. These funds also include minor capital outlay and capital renewal projects.

B. Modernization/Renovation

These funds make new and remodeled facilities operable by providing group II equipment, and replacing utility services and building systems to make facilities and the campus infrastructure operable. These funds also meet campus needs by modernizing existing facilities or constructing new replacement buildings in response to academic, support program needs and enrollment demand as appropriate.

II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

These funds eliminate instructional and support deficiencies, including new buildings and their group II equipment, additions, land acquisitions, and site development.

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 project will be presented for approval:

California State University, Chico—Wildcat Activity Center
Project Architect: Sasaki Associates, Inc.

Background and Scope

CSU Chico proposes to construct a 130,000 GSF recreation center at the southwest corner of the campus. The Wildcat Activity Center will encompass a vacated city street, a university parking lot, and a former railroad spur as shown on the campus master plan approved by the Board of Trustees in September 2005. Two existing university warehouses will be removed from the proposed site; the warehouse contents and services will be relocated to acquired warehouse space off campus.

This project will provide a 15,000 ASF weight and fitness area, three multi-purpose studios for dance and aerobics, an indoor track, gymnasiums, a multi-activity court, a rock climbing wall, locker rooms for men and women, meeting and lounge space, administrative offices, and an outdoor aquatics area that includes a 25 meter by 25 foot heated pool and spa.

The design intent of the facility is to meet LEED silver certification. The sustainable features of the project include the recycling of material during site demolition and the extensive use of recycled materials in the new facility. The Wildcat Activity Center will feature a high efficiency HVAC system and the roof will be engineered for the possible future installation of solar photovoltaic panels.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Plans
Completion of Working Drawings

August 2006
December 2006

Construction Start March 2007
Occupancy August 2008

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area 130,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area 85,000 square feet
Efficiency 65 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4328

Building Cost (\$268 per GSF) \$34,874,000

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$11.83
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$87.21
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$64.03
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$79.63
e. Group I Equipment	\$ 5.02
f. General Conditions	\$20.54

Site Development (includes demolition, pool, and landscape) 13,638,000

Construction Cost \$48,512,000
Fees 6,245,000
Additional Services 1,335,000
Contingency 7,388,000

Total Project Cost (\$488 per GSF) \$63,480,000
Group II Equipment 2,000,000

Grand Total \$65,480,000

Cost Comparison

The California State University does not have a building cost guideline for student recreation centers due to varying programmatic differences across campus projects. The project's building cost of \$268 per GSF is reasonable based on recent cost trends and comparable to the San Bernardino Student Recreation Center at \$253 per GSF approved in May 2003, both adjusted to CCCI 4328. The Chico project reflects higher costs due to its rural location, exterior skin to

match the campus's architectural vocabulary, and a constrained site that limits the contractor's staging area.

Funding Data

The CSU Chico students approved a student fee referendum to fund the Wildcat Activity Center. The project will be financed through the issuance of CSU Systemwide Revenue Bonds, which will be paid from student fees.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project and was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 5, 2006 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. A 30-day public comment period ended on May 6, 2006 and no adverse comments were received. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting. Title transfers associated with vacation of a Chico city street and a Southern Pacific railroad spur have not yet been consummated. In each case, all due diligence activities have been completed and agreement reached on all issues. Transfer documents are expected to be fully executed within three months and no construction contracts shall be awarded until that process is complete.

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 University, Chico, Wildcat Activity Center has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. With implementation of the recommended Mitigation Measures, the proposed project will not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The recommended Mitigation Measures are hereby approved and incorporated as a requirement for implementation of the project, along with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan which is also approved and incorporated by reference, and which meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.
4. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.
5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Chico, Wildcat Activity Center are approved at a project cost of \$65,480,000 at CCCI 4328.