

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: **10:00 a.m., Tuesday, July 23, 2019**
 Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Rebecca D. Eisen, Chair
Romey Sabalius, Vice Chair
Jane W. Carney
Wenda Fong
Jack McGrory
Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana
Peter J. Taylor

- Consent** 1. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of May 21, 2019, *Action*
- Discussion** 2. California State University, Long Beach Housing Expansion Phase 1 – Parkside North, *Action*
3. Progress on Tracking Environmental Sustainability Goals, *Information*
4. Overview of Capital Project Approval Process, *Information*

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

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

May 21, 2019

Members Present

Rebecca D. Eisen, Chair
Romey Sabalius, Vice Chair
Jane W. Carney
Wenda Fong
Christopher Steinhauser
Peter J. Taylor
Adam Day, Chairman of the Board
Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Trustee Rebecca D. Eisen called the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds to order.

Public Speakers

Public comment was received regarding transparency and sharing of auxiliary meeting information. Two speakers expressed support for the San Diego State Aztec Recreation Center expansion project.

Consent Agenda

The minutes of the March 19, 2019 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds were approved as submitted.

San Diego State Aztec Recreation Center Expansion

Information about a proposed expansion of the San Diego State University Aztec Recreation Center was presented for approval. The project aims to expand services to meet demand.

CPB&G
Agenda Item 1
July 23-24, 2019
Page 2 of 2

Following the presentation the trustees asked questions relating to student fees, including which are and are not approved by the Board of Trustees. They further asked questions about student engagement in the consultation process for the proposed fee.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-19-03).

Trustee Eisen adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University, Long Beach Housing Expansion Phase 1 – Parkside North

Presentation By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests approval of schematic plans and the 2008 Master Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the California State University, Long Beach Housing Expansion, Phase 1 – Parkside North.

The project was approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2018 as part of the 2019-2020 Five-Year Plan. Financing for the project will be presented for approval at this July 2019 meeting of the Committee on Finance.

Project

Project Architect: Gensler
Collaborative Design-Build Contractor: McCarthy Building Companies, Inc.

Background and Scope

California State University, Long Beach has not built a new housing project in over 30 years. With 2,000 beds on campus and full-time equivalent enrollment of 30,500 students, the campus has great need to expand its residential offerings to serve students and aid in academic success. A requirement for first-year freshmen to live on campus has been in place for five years. Some students are granted an exemption from this requirement but there still is a need for additional housing. Currently, of the 5,700 first year freshmen, approximately 2,000 students are exempt from the requirement.

Currently freshmen are housed in suite-style residences that are more appropriate to sophomores and upper division students. With its emphasis on community-style housing, the proposed new residential building would add high quality living space and common areas for these first-year students.

The project includes the demolition of the existing Housing and Residential Life Administration building (#89¹) and construction of a 79,475 assignable square foot (ASF)/120,700 gross square foot (GSF) residential building (#101) with 476 student beds. The bed spaces consist of approximately 412 student beds in a mix of single- and double-occupancy bedrooms, 64 student beds in 16 four-bed suites, and four one- and two-bedroom apartments for faculty and staff.

The building will be three stories in height on the north side along East Atherton Street (public facing), and four stories on the south side along an unnamed access road. The north building elevation would be a maximum height of 41 feet and set back 34 feet from East Atherton Street. The south building elevation would be a maximum height of 52 feet and would be set back 18 feet from the edge of the project site.

The building is configured with an internal courtyard. The south half of the building is lifted so the ground floor is open to the courtyard and connects directly to the existing Parkside student housing community. The outdoor spaces within the new housing project will be shared amenities with the existing Parkside student housing community.

The new residence building will be designed to be highly sustainable and energy efficient. The project will target Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum certification and will be a zero net energy building in accordance with the campus Climate Commitment. The building will include photovoltaic panels on rooftop canopies to offset building electricity usage. It will include low flow water fixtures and the use of reclaimed water for non-potable uses such as toilet flushing and landscape.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	August 2019
Working Drawings Completed	August 2019
Construction Start	September 2019
Occupancy	August 2021

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	120,700 square feet
Assignable Building Area	79,475 square feet
Efficiency	66 percent

¹ The facility number is shown on the master plan map and recorded in the Space and Facilities Database.

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) 6840²

Building Cost – Residence Hall (\$591 per GSF)	\$71,318,000
<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 15.86
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 228.06
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 91.94
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 156.26
e. Built-in Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 7.79
f. Special Construction & Demolition	\$ 1.07
g. General Requirements	\$ 14.61
h. General Conditions and Insurance	\$ 75.28
Site Development	<u>6,846,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$78,162,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>22,090,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$831 per GSF)	\$100,252,000
Fixtures, Furniture & Movable Equipment	<u>4,035,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$104,287,000</u>

Cost Comparison

Housing Building

The project's building cost of \$591 per gross square foot (\$149,828 per bed) is higher than the \$389 per GSF (\$106,604 per bed) cost for the Pomona Student Housing Replacement project approved in January 2017 and the \$508 per GSF (\$115,383 per bed) cost for San José State University Campus Village II approved in May 2014, all adjusted to CCCI 6840. The reasons for the higher cost per bed compared to these recent projects are the fewer number of beds, resulting in less economy of scale, and the highly sustainable design features that include the use of reclaimed water in irrigation and toilets, operable windows in all rooms, and Zero Net Energy goals which include solar panels for power generation. Additional factors impacting costs include site work and foundation requirements related to poor soil conditions and a high water table, high cost of electrical service to the building, and community space included in this project that will also serve the existing Parkside College Residence Halls.

² The July 2018 *Engineering News-Record* California Construction Cost Index (CCCI). The CCCI is the average Building Cost Index for Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Funding Data

The project will be funded from Housing and Residential Life designated reserves of \$18 million and Systemwide Revenue Bond financing of \$86.256 million (excludes cost of financing).

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An addendum to the 2008 Master Plan Update EIR was prepared to comply with CEQA requirements. Implementation of this project will not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts as identified in Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The addendum to the 2008 EIR is available at: <https://www.csulb.edu/physical-planning-and-facilities-management/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa-compliance>.

Recommendation

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. The Board of Trustees finds that the 2008 Master Plan Update EIR, prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, was certified by the Board of Trustees in May 2008.
2. The project before the Board of Trustees is consistent with the previously certified Master Plan Update Final EIR.
3. With implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the 2008 Master Plan Update Final EIR previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will not have any new or substantially more severe impacts upon the environment beyond those described in the 2008 Master Plan Update EIR and the project will benefit the CSU.
4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Long Beach Housing Expansion, Phase 1 – Parkside North project are approved at a project cost of \$104,287,000 at CCCI 6840.
5. 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 project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Progress on Tracking Environmental Sustainability Goals

Presentation By

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

Ellie Perry
Sustainability Coordinator
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Summary

This item provides an update on tracking of campus sustainability metrics and administrative efforts to support the campuses.

Background

The 2014 Sustainability Policy adopted by the California State University Board of Trustees in May 2014 established sustainability goals for the CSU across a broad range of operational areas (RJEPCPBG 05-14-01). This policy applies sustainable principles across all areas of university operations, including academics, student life, climate action and adaptation planning, and business operations. This expansion was both a reaction to and a catalyst for the changing sustainability landscape within the CSU and higher education in general.

Status Update

Based on the Board of Trustees' policy, a progress report, *Sustainability in the California State University, The First Assessment of the 2014 Sustainability Policy, 2014-2017*,¹ was prepared and an overview presented to the board in March 2018. At the time, sixteen CSU campuses were using the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating System™ (STARS) developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) as a framework for assessing sustainable practices on their campuses. STARS assesses the implementation of sustainable practices in academics, community engagement, campus operations, planning and administration, and innovation and leadership.

¹ <https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/sustainability/Documents/2014-17-Sustainability.pdf>

In addition to providing an assessment of sustainability programs across all areas of university operations, using a third-party system such as STARS provides opportunities for public recognition of the CSU's sustainability efforts. In March 2018, fourteen of the sixteen campuses held STARS ratings, with several CSUs ranking among the highest-rated university campuses participating in STARS.

This information item updates the number of CSU campuses participating in STARS from sixteen to twenty-two. The growth in the number of campuses participating or planning to participate, in addition to the significant number of campuses rated as Bronze (3), Silver (10), or Gold (6), provides confirmation to the Board of Trustees that the CSU continues to make progress on sustainability goals. Based on the number of campuses voluntarily participating in STARS, the Chancellor's Office proposes to adopt the STARS reporting tool to streamline the data gathering process, promote a standardized evaluation methodology, and promote a platform that can lead to national recognition. For example, campuses that complete a STARS assessment can elect to share this data with The Princeton Review or The Sierra Club to be rated and included on the Green Colleges and Cool Schools lists, facilitating national recognition for their sustainability efforts.

Next Steps

In order to further a strategic partnership with AASHE, the Chancellor's Office is working on the following:

- Recognition of the academic, student services, and sustainability goals of the Board of Trustees that result in the CSU System being awarded "points" in certain STARS categories based on policies, programs, and practices.
- This should result in those "points" being automatically awarded to any CSU campus that is participating in STARS.
- Initial discussions on systemwide pricing to reduce campus costs by approximately 20 percent.

Many of the observed benefits of participation include transparency, accessibility, standardization of definitions and metrics, and national recognition. The data is publicly accessible and archived on the AASHE website at <https://www.aashe.org/>, and can be benchmarked against peer institutions within the AASHE member community.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Overview of Capital Project Approval Process

Presentation By

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

Summary

The California State University Board of Trustees is responsible for approving the systemwide Capital Outlay program. The approval generally comes in the form of approval of the Five-Year Plan, which is presented as a preliminary plan at the September Board of Trustees meeting and as a final plan at the November Board of Trustees meeting. The Board of Trustees takes other action related to project approvals including approval of revisions to campus master plans and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) actions, amendments to the capital plan, and approval of schematic design. In addition, the Committee on Finance considers approval of financing for the projects.

The Board of Trustees has delegated the following approvals to the chancellor:

- Approval of the capital outlay budget, scope, and debt financing for projects with a value up to \$40 million;
- Approval of the schematic design and authorization for debt financing of all remodels, parking structures and utilitarian projects, regardless of cost, unless the design is architecturally significant, or the project requires an Environmental Impact Report or includes significant unavoidable environmental impacts;
- Approval of minor master plan revisions;
- Purchase, sale and exchange of any interest in or use of real property; and
- Oversight of construction, and authority to sign all construction contracts.

Capital Planning, Design and Construction uses the Five-Year Plan to document projects approved by the Board of Trustees, including those amended to the capital plan under delegated authority.

Capital Project Approvals

The chart below serves to illustrate the number of projects that have come before the Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds Committee for approval by the Board of Trustees as well as the approvals that have been delegated to the chancellor.

Year	Approval	BOT Total Actions	Delegated Total Actions
2016	Amend	18	0
	Schematic	10	28
	Master Plan Revisions	3	8
Totals		31	36
2017	Amend	15	17
	Schematic	15	31
	Master Plan Revisions	8	3
Totals		38	51
2018	Amend	2	12
	Schematic	6	19
	Master Plan Revisions	7	6
Totals		15	37
2019	Amend	1	12
	Schematic	2	17
	Master Plan Revisions	1	4
Totals		4	33
Grand Totals		88	157

The delegated approval process has served to reduce the number of items that the Board of Trustees has to review and approve, and has shortened the approval timeframe for smaller, less complex projects.