

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting:**     **1:15 p.m., Tuesday, July 12, 2011**  
                  **Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Bob Linscheid, Chair  
Linda A. Lang, Vice Chair  
Carol R. Chandler  
Margaret Fortune  
William Hauck  
Hsing Kung  
Peter G. Mehas  
Lou Monville  
Glen O. Toney

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 10, 2011

1. Amend the 2010-2012 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded, *Action*

#### **Discussion Items**

2. Status Report on the 2011-2012 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
3. Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2013-2014 through 2017-2018, *Action*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

**REVISED**

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

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

**May 10, 2011**

**Members Present**

A. Robert Linscheid, Vice Chair  
Nicole M. Anderson  
William Hauck  
Hsing H. Kung  
Peter G. Mehas  
Lou Monville  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes for the March 2011 meeting were approved as submitted.

**Amend the 2010-2011 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded**

With the concurrence of the committee, Trustee Linscheid presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-11-04).

**Amend the 2010-2011 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

With the concurrence of the committee, Trustee Linscheid presented agenda item 2 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-11-05).

**Status Report on the 2011-2012 State Funded Capital Outlay Program**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra F. San Juan presented an update on the 2011-2012 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, reporting that to date the CSU has approval for one equipment project (\$2.79 million) out of the \$204 million governor's budget. The CSU is still working to have a \$15 million request for the capital renewal program included in the May revise. This request would be funded from old general obligation bonds, but as yet the support side of the Department of Finance (DOF) has not backed the proposal. The five projects included in the governor's budget will be considered by the legislature in committee. Four of the five projects were appropriated for design in 2010-2011 but to date a general obligation bond sale has not

occurred so there is no currently no cash to fund the projects. The CSU has been working with DOF and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) for approval to internally pre-fund those projects and be reimbursed once the bonds are sold as an option to proceed. This approach will better justify the 2011-2012 request for construction funding. The fifth project, the Warren Hall Replacement Building for CSU East Bay, will be in a similar situation if approved for funding, still needing cash for design while waiting for a bond sale to fund the construction component.

### **Draft State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2012-2013 through 2016-2017**

Ms. San Juan presented the draft state and non-state funded five-year capital improvement program to the board for approval that included the 2012 action year request. The trustees approved the categories and criteria for this program at the July 2010 board meeting. Although the likelihood for capital dollars is not great, program documents are still due to the DOF by July 1, and it is part of the planning process to prepare a five-year draft program that will be brought back to the board as final in September with equipment and construction costs increases as well as possible scope refinements and priority adjustments. For capital planning purposes, the CSU projected that enrollment would return to 2009-2010 levels by 2014-2015 with an assumed 2 percent average systemwide growth from that point. These numbers may be optimistic should the CSU have to weather an additional \$500 million support budget reduction.

The projected backlog of deferred maintenance is estimated at \$1.6 billion based upon a statistical model that the CSU has been operating for about ten years that looks at the age of facilities and the lifecycle of major building systems. The CSU support budget documentation identifies a deferred maintenance need of \$470 million. This represents the highest priority projects out of the \$1.6 billion backlog.

Trustee Hauck inquired if a list existed of facilities in such need of repair that they may be closed for health and safety purposes should the work not be completed.

Ms. San Juan responded that there is a list of capital renewal projects for \$15 million used to request funds for 2011-2012. In addition, the CSU has a list of unfunded capital renewal projects for a total cost of \$200 million. The CSU does not have a list of projects for which campuses will use support budget funding to address critical repairs.

Trustee Hauck suggested staff look closely for any facilities that could be in danger of being closed due to inability to repair/replace.

Executive Vice Chancellor Benjamin F. Quillian agreed that a survey of campuses for that information can be made.

Ms. San Juan added that while one of the primary objectives for the 2011-2012 \$15 million capital renewal request was to focus on energy savings projects to help the support budget and secure \$9 million in utility rebates, campuses have stated that they have critical repairs that are more important than energy efficiency in a world of limited dollars. Thus, the CSU has adjusted priorities and allowed campuses to substitute projects of a critical need.

In summary, the state request for the draft 2012-2013 capital program is \$662 million. The non-state program is \$137 million, of which 80 percent is for a student housing project at CSU Northridge and a student recreation center at San Francisco State University.

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

### **Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the 2011 Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University**

Trustee Lang recused herself from participating in the discussion or action on the item due to the close proximity of a Jack in the Box® restaurant to the area impacted by the master plan revision.

With the use of a PowerPoint presentation Ms. San Juan gave an overview of the growth and development of San Diego State University since 1996 when President Weber joined the campus. In addition to its growth in stature as a research university, President Weber has also overseen a physical transformation with more than \$670 million in new facilities built over the past 14 years with only 25 percent of the funding coming from the state. The proposed master plan revision focuses on the east side of campus where it proposes a mixed-use project, Plaza Linda Verde, Phase I and II, adjacent to the trolley station and College Avenue. A boundary change is also proposed expanding the campus beyond Plaza Linda Verde.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) completed for this project is a project-level analysis for 7 facilities and one green space, sufficient to allow construction if approved. The primary components of the revision are mixed-use student housing and retail with associated parking, including a parking structure. An open green space for passive and active recreation is included. The potential environmental impacts are traffic congestion and parking. The university's fair share, primarily for roadway improvements, is estimated at \$686,000. An amount of the fair share is for the City of San Diego, and a smaller amount for the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for creating an additional lane towards Interstate 8.

Trustee Hauck asked if the \$686,446 fair share amount had been agreed to by the City of San Diego. Ms. San Juan confirmed that it had not. The university's consultant calculated the number based upon the cost of improvements and the amount of traffic moving through the noted intersections and road segments in accordance with the *City of Marina* decision.

Trustee Hauck asked where the City of San Diego stood with regard to the fair share amount. Ms. Sally Roush, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, San Diego State, responded stating that the city did not propose an alternate number, rejecting the notion of negotiation under the *City of Marina*. The city and the university agreed to disagree. The city indicated that they would let matters take their course through litigation.

Ms. San Juan addressed the other contested issues besides the fair share for off-site mitigation for traffic congestion and parking. These included: 1) Local redevelopment groups' concern over the plan's consistency with local land use. The CSU, as a state agency, is not subject to local land use laws and, as such, the proposed master plan revision is not required to be consistent with those local plans. Nonetheless, the proposed master plan revision would be consistent with the overall goals and

objectives of those plans; 2) whether there are adequate fire and sewer services. Appropriate mitigation is identified that would reduce the identified impacts to a level less than significant. The FEIR determined that the proposed master plan revision would have no significant impact relative to fire service; 3) The extent of the master plan boundary adjustment and whether the CSU would go after condemnation. The CSU will not seek condemnation and many local land owners have expressed support for the plan to reduce the number of mini dorms in the neighborhood and replace with student housing.

Trustee Monville inquired about the strategy to pay an amount of the fair share forward against future commercial rents, and how that seems different than the CSU's previous approach. Ms. San Juan compared the strategy to the Campus Pointe development at CSU Fresno where the private developer was asked to pay for off-site mitigation directly. In this case, with a retail component whereby fees can be collected from tenants, it seemed a good strategy for negotiation with the city recognizing that the CSU would not ask the state for those monies.

Trustee Monville asked if there was adequate sewer and fire protection included in the fair share estimate. Ms. San Juan noted the fair share was primarily for roadways and intersections. No significant impacts were identified for sewer or fire services in this project.

Trustee Monville commented on potential conflict with the redevelopment agency as noted in the item, where there was concern of losing tax increment revenue with the university taking over development in the area. Ms. Roush responded that the redevelopment agency believes that if there is private development tax revenue would be generated. However, the area has been under redevelopment for 20 plus years and there has not been a successful redevelopment project. The university feels it can deliver a project in a timely manner and one that is directly related to the needs of the local community, including the student population. Sales tax will be generated from the retail component, and student housing doesn't obligate the city in the same way as affordable housing.

President Weber highlighted the important milestone this master plan revision represented for both San Diego State and the surrounding community to revitalize the blighted area located south of the campus. The Plaza Linda Verde development will serve as an important gateway between the campus and the close neighborhoods located immediately adjacent to the San Diego State Trolley Station and the Aztec Center, providing a positive first impression upon entering the campus community from that direction. It will be both mass-transit oriented pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly to the campus. The project will be designed to achieve at minimum LEED Silver certification.

Because this area has been of such interest to the campus and community over the years, the university took great effort to seek input on the project from a variety of campus and neighborhood stakeholders. As a result San Diego State has support for the project from property owners within the master plan revision area, the College Area Business Improvement District, College View Estates Association, El Cerrito Community Council, San Diego State Associated Students, San Diego State Faculty Senate, and the Aztec Parents organization.

While the university owns all of the parcels included in the first phase of Plaza Linda Verde, it will need to acquire parcels from private sellers to complete the project in its entirety. Ensuring that this land is included in the master plan will allow the university to acquire the needed parcels when the project is ready to move forward based on enrollment demand.

Trustee Achtenberg inquired as to the risk of a lawsuit the CSU may be taking if this proposed master plan revision is approved. President Weber responded that the San Diego State master plan revision approved by the board in 2007 has a pending lawsuit and as such, is a test case for the *City of Marina* decision. Until that case moves through the courts it is difficult to anticipate further outcomes. The campus believes that under the *City of Marina* there is a provision for good faith negotiation but the City of San Diego did not share that view and thus there was no room to work out a reasonable agreement.

Ms. Roush noted that the interaction with the City of San Diego was not acrimonious. She felt their position was driven by financial pressures and fundamental disagreements with the university's interpretation of the *City of Marina* decision. San Diego State won the first round of the 2007 Master Plan litigation; the city has appealed.

General Counsel Christine Helwick added that the issues before the board in this EIR are precisely the same issues that are in the 2007 Master Plan that is in the appellate court. Whatever decision occurs in the court will govern these issues as well. The *City of Marina* decision states that while the CSU is obligated to negotiate with the city, ultimately the CSU determines the good faith fair share amount.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-11-07). Trustee Lang recued herself from the vote.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

The proposed item on the agenda requests the approval of schematic plans for California State University, Chico—Parking Structure 2; and California State University, Fresno—Sports Medicine Building. With an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item. All CEQA requirements on these projects have been completed and staff recommends approval.

Trustee Anderson requested that her vote for the parking structure at CSU Chico be recorded as an abstention in light of the many concerned comments from students and other campus community members she has received.

Trustee Monville asked President Zingg to address the comments received from students regarding the parking structure. President Zingg explained that a ballot measure to not construct the structure was supported by a class of students who annually bring forward an environmentally-related measure. The measure, as written, asked the students to consider the construction of a parking structure that would double their parking fees; it did not describe any of the many sustainable components that make up the project. The measure passed. The consultative process that was used by the administration included receiving approval for a parking fee increase from the Campus Fee Advisory Committee, and then consulting with the Associated Students, to receive their endorsement as well.

Trustee Linscheid noted that as a member of the City of Chico community, by proposing a campus parking structure the campus responded positively to the concerns from downtown businesses that students park in the 10-hour metered lots which are adjacent to the campus

because it is cheaper than buying university parking passes. The city is united in its support for this proposed parking structure.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-11-08) with one abstention.

Trustee Linscheid adjourned the meeting.

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDING AND GROUNDS**

**Amend the 2011-2012 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded**

**Presentation by**

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

**Summary**

This item requests approval to amend the 2011-2012 non-state funded capital outlay program to include the following five projects:

**1. California State University, Fresno  
Bulldog Stadium Turf Replacement**

**PWC     \$1,200,000**

California State University, Fresno wishes to proceed with the design and construction of site improvements to the Bulldog Stadium (#91) football field. The project will provide a more durable playing surface.

The move to synthetic turf is consistent with the standard of the colleges in the NCAA Mountain West division, which the university has recently joined. The project will include removing the existing Bermuda grass on the two-acre field and replacing it with Field Turf Revolution synthetic playing surface and associated drainage. The all-weather surface will help meet the competitive demands of Division I football, allowing for off-season drills during inclement months, while also realizing reduced maintenance and water/irrigation costs.

The project will be funded from donor funds.

**2. California State University, Long Beach  
Bob Cole Conservatory Music Pavilion and Plaza**

**PWC     \$2,487,000**

California State University, Long Beach wishes to proceed with the design and construction of an addition to and renovation of the University Music Center (#71), located on the northern side of campus, serving the Bob Cole Conservatory of Music. The new addition will be a high-traffic hub that serves as a vibrant point of connection for all music students and faculty, and as an accessible, welcoming, and highly visible portal for both campus and community.

The Music Pavilion addition (570 GSF) will provide exhibition space to honor and highlight the legacy of Bob Cole with his piano, photos, artifacts, and memorabilia; a new entry plaza; and related site improvements to the accessible walking paths connecting the entry plaza to the pavilion. The project will also include a small renovation of 3,446 GSF of faculty and general administrative spaces in the University Music Center to accommodate and improve the flow and function of the connection to the Music Pavilion.

The project will be funded from donor funds.

**3. California State University, Long Beach  
Walter Pyramid Locker Rooms Renovation** **PWC** **\$1,300,000**

California State University, Long Beach wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a renovation in the Walter Pyramid (#73) to support men's and women's basketball and volleyball. The project will renovate 9,100 GSF of the existing locker rooms, enabling intercollegiate athletics to provide enlarged and upgraded facilities for student athletes and visiting teams competing in the Big West Conference. The current cramped and non-compliant locker rooms are unsuitable for Division I play and place these athletic programs at a competitive disadvantage. The project will also provide lounges for team meetings, review of scouting reports, and study space.

The project will be funded from donor funds.

**4. California State University, Northridge  
Student Union Computer Lab Renovation** **PWCE** **\$1,163,000**

California State University, Northridge wishes to proceed with the renovation of 11,700 GSF in the 35-year-old University Student Union Building (#24). The project will accommodate a new computer lab, upgrade the mechanical and lighting systems, and improve the building envelope with a new cool roof and insulation for the concrete block structure. The renovation will result in an improvement in energy efficiency by 10 percent beyond the current Title 24 code requirements.

The project will be funded from the University Student Union reserve fund.

**5. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
University Police Department Renovation** **PWC** **\$1,000,000**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo wishes to proceed with the completion of design and renovation of 6,040 ASF in building 36 to enable the relocation and consolidation of the University Police Department (UPD). Some of the UPD are currently housed in building

36 and the remainder of the force will relocate from their current antiquated 1941 facility (#74) that will be demolished in the future. This project will provide the UPD with a more functional space for a modern police facility.

This project will be funded by parking reserves.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2011-2012 non-state funded capital outlay program is amended to include: 1) \$1,200,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Fresno Bulldog Stadium Turf Replacement project; 2) \$2,487,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Long Beach Bob Cole Conservatory Music Pavilion and Plaza project; 3) \$1,300,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Long Beach Walter Pyramid Locker Rooms Renovation project; 4) \$1,163,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Northridge Student Union Computer Lab Renovation project; and 5) \$1,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo University Police Department Renovation project.

## **COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

### **Status Report on the 2011-2012 State Funded Capital Outlay Program**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

A summary of the spring legislative budget deliberations on the California State University's 2011-2012 state funded capital outlay program request is provided in Attachment A.

#### **Background**

The CSU's proposed state funded 2011-2012 capital outlay program was presented at the September 2010 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved the entire state funded priority list (31 projects) of \$579.7 million for the 2011-2012 capital outlay program.

The governor's January budget proposed capital outlay funding for six projects totaling \$204 million in 2011-2012. Those projects are: Warren Hall Replacement Building at CSU East Bay; the J. Paul Leonard Library at San Francisco State University; the Renovation of Spartan Complex at San José State University; the CSU Fresno Faculty Office/Lab Building; the CSU Chico Taylor II Replacement Building; and West Hall at CSU Channel Islands.

The Department of Finance subsequently approved both an April Technical revision and May amendment to the budget which approved a CSU request for the substitution of an existing general obligation bond fund as the source for funding a previously appropriated equipment project at CSU Los Angeles (Corporation Yard and Public Safety) and various reappropriations and extensions of liquidation period.

#### **Legislative Budget Hearings**

Legislative consideration of the governor's budget has proceeded. The Senate Budget Committee and the Assembly Budget Committee approved funding to equip the J.P. Leonard Library at San Francisco State in SB 69; that bill has been enrolled but not yet enacted (as of the date of this agenda item preparation).

In May, legislative budget hearings continued and the five remaining projects were considered for the second time. On May 25 and 26, 2011, the Assembly and Senate Subcommittees, respectively, voted approval of capital outlay funding totaling \$201 million for the five CSU projects. In addition, the legislature approved all DOF technical letter and budget amendments, including the substitution of funds for the CSU Los Angeles Corporation Yard and Public Safety project and various reappropriations and extensions of liquidation periods.

Budget Act Provisional Bill Language was also approved that will expand the use of any realized capital outlay project savings funded with specified general obligation bonds to be used for minor capital outlay.

On June 8, 2011 the Senate and Assembly approved a United Budget Plan that incorporated all capital budget items previously approved by the Subcommittees. As that plan was then vetoed by the governor, any further update to the capital outlay budget will be reported at the meeting.

**State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2011-2012 Priority List**

Cost Estimates are at Engineering News Record California Construction Cost Index 5732 and Equipment Price Index 3016

Rank Order	Category	Campus	Project Title	FTE	Trustees' Request		2011-2012 Governor's Budget*			Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 1 on Higher Education			Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2 on Education Finance		
					Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Notes	Phase	Dollars	Notes	Phase	Dollars	Notes
1	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall Deconstruct/Renovate (Seismic) ◊	-526	PW	3,969,000									
1A	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall Replacement Building **	-876			PWC	48,975,000	(a)	PWC	48,975,000	(a)	PWC	48,975,000	(a)
2	IA	Statewide	Capital Renewal	N/A	PWC	100,000,000									
3	IB	San Francisco	Joint Library: J. Paul Leonard Library and Sutro Library	N/A	E	2,799,000	E	2,799,000	(b)	E	2,799,000	(b)	E	2,799,000	(b)
3A	1A	Los Angeles	Corporation Yard and Public Safety	N/A	E	648,000				E	648,000	(c)	E	648,000	(c)
4	IA	Los Angeles	Seismic Upgrade, Administration Building	N/A	PWC	3,149,000									
5	IA	Humboldt	Seismic Upgrade, Van Duzer Theatre	N/A	PWC	7,580,000									
6	IA	Bakersfield	Seismic Upgrade, Dore Theatre	N/A	PWC	1,624,000									
7	IA	Humboldt	Seismic Upgrade, Library	N/A	PWC	5,111,000									
8	IA	Pomona	CLA Replacement Facility (Seismic)	-781	PWC	78,194,000									
9	IB	San José	Spartan Complex Renovation (Seismic)	62	C	51,479,000	C	51,479,000	(a)	C	51,479,000	(a)	C	51,479,000	(a)
10	II	Fresno	Faculty Office/Lab Building	75	C	9,819,000	C	9,819,000	(a)	C	9,819,000	(a)	C	9,819,000	(a)
11	II	Chico	Taylor II Replacement Building	700	C	52,891,000	C	52,891,000	(a)	C	52,891,000	(a)	C	52,891,000	(a)
12	II	Channel Islands	West Hall	555	C	38,021,000	C	38,021,000	(a)	C	38,021,000	(a)	C	38,021,000	(a)
13	IB	East Bay	Telecommunications Switch Relocation	N/A	PWC	2,330,000									
14	II	San Francisco	Creative Arts Building ◊	240	WC	65,089,000									
15	II	San Bernardino	Theater Arts Building ◊	205	WC	59,752,000									
16	IB	Sacramento	Science II, Phase 2 Renovation ◊	-52	PW	3,760,000									
17	IA	Statewide	Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts	N/A	PWC	14,000,000									
18	IB	Monterey Bay	Infrastructure Improvements, Phase 2	N/A	PWC	34,834,000									
19	IB	Los Angeles	Utilities Infrastructure	N/A	PW	2,311,000									
20	IB	Long Beach	Utilities Infrastructure ◊	N/A	PW	1,574,000									
21	IB	Dominguez Hills	Cain Library Remodel (Seismic)	N/A	P	922,000									
22	II	San Marcos	University Services Building Renovation	N/A	PWC	1,090,000									
23	IB	Fullerton	Physical Services Complex Replacement	N/A	PWC	25,780,000									
24	IB	Maritime	Student Services Building	N/A	P	475,000									
25	IB	San Diego	Physical Plant Storage Relocation	N/A	PWC	4,995,000									
26	II	Sonoma	Professional Schools Building	513	P	1,000,000									
27	II	Bakersfield	Humanities Complex, Phase I	475	P	651,000									
28	IB	Humboldt	Corporation Building Acquisition	N/A	A	3,058,000									
29	II	San Luis Obispo	Academic Center and Library ◊	401	P	1,536,000									
30	IB	Stanislaus	Library Addition and Renovation, Phase I	-15	P	1,103,000									
31	II	Northridge	Sierra Hall Annex, Phase I	1,165	PW	822,000									
<b>Totals</b>				<b>2,667</b>		<b>\$ 580,366,000</b>		<b>\$ 203,984,000</b>			<b>\$ 204,632,000</b>			<b>\$ 204,632,000</b>	

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

**Notes:** (a) Lease Revenue Bond Fund  
 (b) 2006 General Obligation Bond Fund  
 (c) 2002 General Obligation Bond Fund

\* Includes April and May Department of Finance letters

\*\*Alternative Program Scope Approved by DOF includes demolition of Warren Hall and relocation of MDF

◊ This project is dependent upon state and non-state funding.

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

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2013-2014 through 2017-2018**

**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 2013-2014 through 2017-2018 categories and criteria, which is 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:

1. The Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2013-2014 through 2017-2018 in Attachment A of Agenda Item 3 of the July 12, 2011 meeting of the trustees' committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds be approved; and
2. 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  
2013-2014 through 2017-2018 State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

**General Criteria**

A campus may submit a maximum of one project for the 2013-2014 budget year, and one project for the 2014-2015 planning year, including health and safety projects. A campus may submit a maximum of three prioritized projects per year, including health and safety projects, for the 2015-2016 through 2017-2018 planning years. Exceptions to these limits 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 subject to the approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Financial Officer.

Approval of multi-phase projects may require the project funding to be allocated over more than one bond cycle. Campus requests for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction (PWC) lump sum funding will be considered on an individual project basis in consideration of the project's complexity, scope, schedule, and the availability of non-appropriated funds to augment the project.

Current trustee approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus seat 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.

Priorities will be determined based upon the strategic needs of the system in consideration of existing deficiencies in the type, amount and/or condition of campus space to serve the academic master plan.

Consistent with past practice 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 non-state sources. At least \$5 million must be raised from non-state 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 and 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, BUILDING, 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 Maritime Academy—Dining Center Replacement**

*Project Architect: FLAD Architects*

*CM at Risk Contractor: McCarthy Building Companies*

#### **Background and Scope**

California Maritime Academy proposes to design and construct a 25,400 GSF two-story Dining Center to replace the existing 1950s facility which cannot adequately serve the current or future enrollment with its limited capacity (9,611 GSF). The Dining Center (#40) will be constructed on three levels with a 280-seat main dining room on the first floor, a 130-seat dining space on the mezzanine level, and a 290-seat meeting room on the second level.

The main dining room faces the waterfront to the south with the servery centrally located and connected directly to the kitchen. The large meeting room on the second level overlooks the bay and will feature operable partitions to create up to three separate meeting rooms to support ongoing campus use and to host large meetings and events benefiting Cal Maritime.

In order to clear the site for the project, the scope includes removal of the bookstore modulares and the relocation of their function to a renovated 2,600 GSF space replacing the abandoned racquetball courts (#14), as well as the temporary relocation of the Career Center modulares west of the Auditorium (#13). Upon the completion of the new Dining Center, the Career Center will relocate to the existing vacated dining facility (#16) and the temporary modulares will be removed.

Building materials were selected for durability, economy, and compatibility with campus context. Brick masonry, matching the campus standard in color and coursing, will be used as a feature material on the east and south walls of the entry lobby. The primary south elevation of

the building will provide views to the waterfront, using a storefront floor to ceiling window system. Fixed exterior window louvers will provide shade from direct sunlight and protection from glare. East and west building elevations will act as retaining walls to the steep embankment to the west. Other exterior wall materials selected for economy and thermal performance are insulated metal panel and metal siding systems. The structural system will be a concrete wall system that is poured in place.

The building is being designed to achieve LEED Silver certification or better. Sustainable features will include significant day lighting, natural ventilation, and energy efficient HVAC and lighting systems, including daylight and occupancy sensors. Additional features include high performance glazing with solar protection and a durable, long life exterior skin made of brick and metal. The project will also incorporate sustainable kitchen features and operation: Energy Star rated equipment, 80 percent waste reduction volume, and the use of waste heat to preheat domestic hot water.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Preliminary Plans Completed	August 2011
Working Drawings Completed	December 2011
Construction Start	May 2012
Occupancy	August 2013

**Basic Statistics**

Dining Center Gross Building Area	25,400 square feet
Assignable New Building Area	20,070 square feet
Efficiency	79 percent
Bookstore Renovation Gross Building Area	2,660 square feet
Assignable Existing Building Area	2,430 square feet
Efficiency	91 percent

**Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5565**

Dining Center Building Cost (\$430 per GSF)	\$10,921,000
---	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	(\$ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 42.48
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 105.47
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 61.38
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 117.13

e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 57.40
f. General Conditions	\$ 46.10
Site Development (including landscape)	<u>970,000</u>
Dining Center Construction Cost	\$11,891,000
Bookstore Renovation (including demolition)	1,076,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>4,171,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$675 per GSF)	\$17,138,000
Group II Equipment	481,000
Grand Total	<u>\$17,619,000</u>

### **Cost Comparison**

The project's cost of \$430 per GSF is higher than the \$279 CSU cost guide but less than the \$452 per GSF for CSU Fullerton's recently opened dining facility approved in September 2008, adjusted to CCCI 5565. The higher cost may be attributed to a number of factors, chief among them the severely constrained site set between two hills, the existing Student Center on the east, and the Bay Conservation Development Commission setback from the waterfront.

Additional building and site cost impacts include the mezzanine which was required to accommodate sufficient seating, the west exterior wall which also functions as a 15-foot retaining wall to support the potentially sloughing hillside, the cost of connecting to distant utility lines, the avoidance of existing underground infrastructure, shoreline stabilization using rows of rammed earth piers along the entire south boundary, and the exterior louvers for shade from direct sunlight and protection from glare.

### **Funding Data**

This project will largely be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program (\$16,746,000), which will be repaid from housing program and bookstore revenues. The project balance will be funded from housing program reserves (\$700,000) and from bookstore reserves (\$173,000).

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

A minor master plan revision was completed substituting the Dining Center Replacement project (24,000 GSF) for the Student Center Addition (2,100 GSF), which was analyzed as part of the 2002 Master Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). To analyze the effects of the

proposed Dining Center Replacement project, an Addendum to the FEIR has been prepared. The Addendum determined that the substituted project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the Addendum to the Final EIR for the California Maritime Academy's 2002 Campus Master Plan and finds that the Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA guidelines, and reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees.
2. The board hereby approves and certifies the Addendum as complete and adequate in that it addresses all potential environmental effects of the Dining Center Replacement project, which remains consistent with the project uses and impacts as described in the Final EIR for the 2002 Master Plan, previously certified by the board in May 2002.
3. The Addendum has determined that the new project, including additional building area, would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and therefore no new or additional environmental analyses, or additional mitigation measures, are required.
4. With the implementation of the mitigation measures previously adopted and set forth in the certified Final EIR, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
5. As previously resolved by the board, the mitigation measures adopted as part of the previously certified Final EIR will be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
6. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.
7. The schematic plans for the California Maritime Academy, Dining Center Replacement project are approved at a project cost of \$17,619,000 at CCCI 5565.