

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, September 20, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 18, 2006

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

Discussion Items

2. California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report, *Information*
3. State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2007-2008 through 2011-2012 *Action*
4. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

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

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

July 18, 2006

Members Present

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Moctesuma Esparza, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg, Chair of the Board
Carol R. Chandler
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman
Andrew LaFlamme
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Craig R. Smith

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 16, 2006 were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2006-2007 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Trustee Tsakopoulos presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. (RCPBG 07-06-12)

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

Ms. Elvyra San Juan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, presented agenda item 2, which as noted in the printed agenda, with the signing of the state budget was a final report. The budget includes \$331 million for the capital budget, an increase over the trustee approved program request of \$303 million, largely due to the reversion and refunding of the Chico Student Services Center project with an augmentation from reserves. The majority of the funding for the 2006/2007 program is reliant upon voter approval of the November 2006 Proposition 1-D. The proposition will provide \$690 million to the CSU for two years, \$345 million per year for the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 programs.

The 2006/2007 budget continues funding for the second year of the capital renewal program, at the increased level of \$50 million. The capital renewal program funds the replacement of building and infrastructure systems that have exhausted their useful life. This is most evident in buildings that are 30 – 50 years old, wherein a majority of CSU facilities fall. These projects are limited to approximately two million dollars. The budget also includes \$25 million for the minor capital outlay program, which typically provides programmatic as well as accessibility

improvements to campus facilities. There is a \$400,000 limit on these projects. The capital renewal and minor capital program funds are being used by campuses to improve energy efficiency and to secure conservation grant matching funds.

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

With a visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the information item, providing the newer trustees with an overview of their roles and responsibilities with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of CEQA is three-fold: 1) to inform decision makers and the public about potential significant environmental impacts; 2) to identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental impacts by use of alternatives or mitigation measures; and 3) to disclose to the public reasons why the decision makers approved the project if significant impacts could not be avoided. The Board of Trustees' role is to act on behalf of the CSU as lead agency to ensure that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) reflects the independent judgment of the CSU, to consider and review the EIR prior to action, to certify the accuracy of the EIR, and to adopt the findings of fact for each significant impact. The trustees' guidelines and procedures have been in place since 1985 and are updated to respond to legislative changes, CEQA guidelines, and judicial decisions.

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

Ms. San Juan presented item 4 as stated in the agenda. The categories and criteria remain essentially unchanged from the last few years and are fairly consistent with the state's categories of projects and the prioritization of capital projects by the Legislative Analyst's Office. The subtle change this year reflects the difficult construction cost escalation problems that the campuses have been experiencing. Almost ten years ago CPDC piloted a lump-sum funding approach where a project would be funded for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction in one appropriation in one budget year. This streamlined CSU's project management and ensured that a project was fully funded within one bond cycle. The restriction on this approach disallowed scope changes or state funded augmentations. With the extreme escalation and cost uncertainty currently being experienced, CPDC has significantly reduced the number of streamlined projects in order to secure augmentations when needed. In this move back to phased funding, the criteria have been changed to permit projects to be funded across bond cycles.

Chancellor Reed remarked that construction cost escalation, running 30 to 40 percent, is one of the biggest challenges facing Ms. San Juan. The recommendation to seek phased funding for the projects will allow the CSU to keep the capital program moving forward.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution. (RCPBG 07-06-13)

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for the CSU Chico—Wildcat Activity Center. With the use of an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item.

An EIR was completed and certified by this board as part of the campus master plan revision in July 2005 that included only program level information for this student recreation center project. As a result, a mitigated negative declaration has been prepared based on greater specifics being developed for this project. A letter from the Chico city manager was received on Friday and copied to this board regarding the need to include bicycles racks, to fund off site improvements, to address traffic impacts, and to complete a historical assessment of the two existing warehouse structures.

The campus has prepared and transmitted a response to the city, which was distributed to this board at this meeting. The campus letter notes that the project design includes the bicycle racks, the traffic light improvements are not on the property under the control of the California State University (but are within the jurisdiction of other agencies), and the traffic impacts are not significant, as most students will attend this recreation center while already on campus for classes. Regarding the historical assessment, the initial study was routed to the State Office of Historic Preservation for review and a negative comment was not received by the campus in response from the state office concerning the study, and the structures are not on the historic directory for Butte County. In the earlier photo shown of the existing site, one of the warehouses in question was shown. The campus letter responds to the concerns raised by the City and with the proposed mitigation measures the project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Staff recommended approval.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-06-14).

Trustee Tsakopoulos 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 two projects:

- | | | |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 1. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona | | |
| Innovation Village, Phase IV | PWC | \$28,098,000 |

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona wishes to enter into a public-private partnership with the Trammell Crow Company to construct Phase IV at Innovation Village. The proposed project consists of a 120,000 square foot commercial office and research space on approximately seven acres within the 65-acre Innovation Village site approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2000. This project is the fourth development in Innovation Village and will also include site improvements to accommodate 520 parking spaces. The Trammell Crow Company has agreed to provide shelled space and to pursue future tenants that can provide internship opportunities for Cal Poly Pomona students as well as employment opportunities for graduates. Trammell Crow will manage and sub-lease the project to future Innovation Village tenants.

The project will be entirely financed by the Trammell Crow Company, which will have sole responsibility for the debt service. State or trustee financing for the building will not be required, nor will the transaction be reflected as a debt on the CSU's financial statements or impact the CSU's credit. The campus anticipates presenting for the trustees' approval a future infrastructure project to support the building.

- | | | |
|--|------------|--------------------|
| 2. San Francisco State University | | |
| Greenhouse No. 2 | PWC | \$2,255,000 |

San Francisco State University wishes to proceed with the construction of a new 8,640 GSF greenhouse for instructional and research use by the biology department. This new greenhouse will have state-of-the-art equipment to create different climate conditions for the study of desert, temperate, and rainforest environments in twelve equal-sized but separate rooms. Environmental

CPB&G

Agenda Item 1

September 19-20, 2006

Page 2 of 2

variations will be achieved through the use of natural gas unit heaters, evaporative cooling, air circulation fans, and grow-lights for each room. The new structure will be located north of Hensill Hall, where the biology department is located, thus providing convenient access for students and faculty. This project will be funded from donor funds.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2006/07 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: 1) \$28,098,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Innovation Village, Phase IV project; and 2) \$2,255,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the San Francisco State University, Greenhouse No. 2 project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Presentation By

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

Summary

This information item presents the CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report. This reporting period spans September 2005 to September 2006.

Seismic Policy and History

The CSU initiated the assessment of the seismic hazards posed by CSU buildings as directed by former Governor Deukmejian's executive order and legislative provisions. In 1993, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted the following policy:

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that to the maximum extent feasible by present earthquake engineering practice, to acquire, build, maintain, and rehabilitate buildings and other facilities that provide an acceptable level of earthquake safety for students, employees, and the public who occupy these buildings and other facilities at all locations where CSU operations and activities occur. The standard for new construction is that it meets the life-safety and seismic hazard objectives of the pertinent provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations; the standard for existing construction is that it provides reasonable life-safety protection, consistent with that for typical new buildings. The California State University shall cause to be performed independent technical peer reviews of the seismic aspects of all construction projects from their design initiation, including both new construction and remodeling, for conformance to good seismic resistant practices consistent with this policy. The feasibility of all construction projects shall include seismic safety implications and shall be determined by weighing the practicality and cost of protective measures against the severity and probability of injury resulting from seismic occurrences. [Approved by the Board of Trustees of the California State University at its May 19, 1993 meeting (RCPBG 05-93-13)]

Out of this policy the CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) was established to advise and assist in determining the condition of CSU buildings and to technically oversee the trustees' seismic

policy. The CSU has identified the seismic hazard within its existing building stock and is in the process of completing their mitigation.

Seismic Review Board

The SRB is comprised of:

Charles Thiel Jr., Ph.D., President, Telesis Engineers (Chair)
Gregg Brandow, Ph.D., S.E., President, Brandow and Johnston, Adjunct Professor, University of Southern California
John Egan, G.E., Principle Engineer, Geomatrix Consultants
John A. Martin, Jr., S.E., President, John A. Martin and Associates, Inc.
Svend Nielsen, S.E., Principle, Johnson and Nielsen
Richard Niewiarowski, S.E., Principle, Rutherford and Chekene
Thomas Sabol, Ph.D., S.E., Principle, Englekirk and Sabol
Theodore C. Zsutty, Ph.D., S.E., Consulting Structural Engineer, Professor, San Jose State University, Retired (Vice Chair)

Seismic Mitigation and Oversight

The California State University seismic mitigation and oversight planning effort has six elements:

1. **Mitigate urgent falling hazard concerns.** Mitigate significant life-safety threats posed by falling hazards as a priority. All such hazards at all 23 campuses and off-campus centers have been mitigated.
2. **Identify and broadly prioritize existing seismic deficiencies.** Identify existing buildings that pose a significant life-safety threat and mitigate these hazards as soon as practical. Prioritize these buildings into two listings; urgent and less urgent. Of the more than 200 buildings identified as potentially highly hazardous since inception, most have been retrofitted. The current published priority listing identifies 18 buildings as a first priority for seismic retrofit and 15 buildings as a second priority. As an update to our report last year, two projects merit special note:

Warren Hall (CSU East Bay) - A seismic retrofit for Warren Hall was originally approved for funding in the 2004/05 capital program. Reassessment of the project changed the scope to: a) construct the Student Services/Administrative Replacement Building for the services/programs currently housed in the upper levels of Warren Hall; b) move those students and staff from Warren Hall into the completed replacement building; and c) as a priority, request future funding for the seismic upgrade of Warren Hall, which will include demolition of the upper levels. The

Student Services Administration building is currently in construction documents with a construction start anticipated in June 2007. Feasibility and cost assessment for Warren Hall is underway.

University Park (San Francisco State University) - The SFSU campus acquired University Park (Stonestown Apartments) in a purchase agreement in 2005. A seismic retrofit plan is currently being developed by the campus and an initial seismic retrofit design is underway for the complex. Due to cost limitations it is expected that the remaining seismic strengthening will occur when the buildings are fully renovated.

3. **Perform periodic re-evaluation of existing facilities.** The current assessment was started in 2005 and will be completed by the end of this year. The purpose is to confirm a building's structural life-safety hazards in light of code changes and lessons learned since 1992 and to ensure that the priority listing is reflective of the condition and content of the CSU building stock as it evolves over time. A few buildings are likely to be added to the priority lists once the campus re-evaluations are completed.
4. **Provide peer review for all major construction.** Assure that all CSU new construction and modification of existing structures have independent, technical peer review of the earthquake performance aspects of the plans. The California Building Code includes provisions applicable to renovation work for state projects. Specifically, Division VI-R contains criteria and triggers that work to systematically raise the level of seismic safety for existing building stock over time whenever any structural modification, alteration or addition to the structure is undertaken. The SRB closely monitors for VI-R compliance as a part of its peer reviews.
5. **Have in place a Seismic Event Response Plan.** The CSU has an established and tested methodology in place to respond in the case of a significant seismic event.
6. **Conduct seismic related staff training.** CSU facilities planning and construction staff are afforded systemwide training on project management, building code, building official responsibilities and seismic emergency response and assessment procedures.

Lease and Real Property Acquisition Requirements Added to CSU Seismic Requirements

An important standard consistent with the underlying trustees' seismic policy has been added to the administrative section *CSU Seismic Requirements*.

The new Common Lease and Building Acquisition standard establishes a uniform, common, seismic safety standard for newly leased and newly acquired buildings. Minimum life-safety is the goal that drives this proposal. This new lease standard would be common to the California State University, the University of California, the State Department of General Services, and

other state agencies. Under this proposed standard, relative to the CSU and its foundations and auxiliary organizations, an *off-campus* building or space would need to meet this standard for occupancy under the trustees' seismic policy. Current policy requirements would continue to govern for all *on-campus* CSU locations.

The formation of this common standard will make the leasing of space to the State, and its allied organizations, more attractive to private owners in that all of these agencies would use a common set of requirements to qualify a proposed building as meeting minimal seismic life-safety standards. The standard is designed to be a practical document and includes appropriate waivers and exceptions for small spaces and short term uses. The standard would apply to future leased spaces and building acquisitions. Property and leases currently in place would not be affected until the lease is being considered for renewal.

The SRB completed its trial review to assess the impact of this standard on existing leases at several representative campuses. In some cases, accompanying campus personnel were asked to conduct supervised individual building assessments to ensure that typical campus facilities and planning staff would be able to conduct the self-evaluation that determines compliance.

The table below summarizes the survey results. Most buildings (40 out of 57) passed the initial self-assessment. An additional twelve buildings were identified as needing an engineering assessment, but are likely to meet the common safety standard after the supplemental engineering review. When needed, the engineering assessments are scoped to be a one-day effort designed to provide a stamped professional assessment letter with the cost on the order of \$2,000. The last column indicates five buildings that had clear seismic safety issues, such as being constructed of un-reinforced masonry, and the outcome of an engineering assessment is uncertain.

| Campus | SRB Reviewer | Total buildings reviewed | Pass campus self-assessment | Engineering assessment needed. Outcome likely positive | Engineering assessment needed. Outcome uncertain |
|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Chico | Niewiarowski | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| East Bay | Niewiarowski | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Humboldt | Thiel | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Long Beach | Brandow | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| San Diego | Brandow | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| San Francisco | Thiel | 14 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| San Jose | Zsutty | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Totals | | 57 | 40 | 12 | 5 |

In a survey that purposely included an overweighting of seismically active campuses, 91% (52 of the 57) would likely be found acceptable (70% of leased facilities passed the self-assessment criteria and another 21% are considered likely be found acceptable after the engineering review). The five instances where the outcome is uncertain serve to highlight potential seismic concerns that might not be readily apparent.

2005/2006 Seismic Review Board Activities

The SRB met six times during the reporting time period, four meetings at the Chancellor's Office and two meetings at campuses (San Luis Obispo and Monterey Bay). The SRB members continue to provide peer review of construction activities at all of the campuses and technical support to the CSU Building Official and the Deputy Building Officials at each campus.

Notable activities of the SRB since the last report to the trustees include the following:

1. Revised administrative sections of the trustees' *CSU Seismic Requirements*. New to this revision are standards defining baseline life-safety standards for off-campus lease and acquisitions.
2. Developed a lease/purchase standard for use by CSU. The SRB and Chancellor's Office spearheaded efforts for joint adoption of the standard by the University of California (UC) and the Department of General Services (DGS) for the seismic evaluation of acquired facilities. The standard, now pending similar adoption by UC and DGS, will set the same procurement standard on seismic evaluation of properties and should increase the availability and competitiveness of leased property.
3. Lead the effort of state agencies (UC, DGS, Administrative Office of the Courts, and others) to propose existing building regulatory requirements for existing state buildings to be incorporated into the new edition of the State Building Code. The previous editions used VI-R language keyed to the previously adopted Uniform Building Code. The Building Standards Commission adopted the 2006 International Building Code as a replacement to the Uniform Building Code. Its technical requirements are significantly different than the old code, thereby requiring a thorough reworking of the provisions. The board reviewed and drafted changes to the existing code language in order to provide technical input to the state as part of the new code adoption process. The CSU was successful in having the Division of the State Architect submit this amendment on its behalf to the Building Standards Commission for inclusion in the pending major revision to the California Building Code. The CSU's amendment was one of the very few amendments prepared, submitted, and accepted by the Building Standards Commission without modification. It is now under public review.
4. The SRB acted as a systemwide resource providing respected technical expertise to investigate the construction of the Humboldt State University Behavioral and Social Science facility being constructed under a design/build contract. Continued construction of this

facility was in jeopardy after the general contractor raised concerns whether a heretofore unknown subsurface fault had been unearthed during excavation for the building's foundation. The SRB team met on site and conducted an in-depth review of supplemental trenching site excavations to determine if indeed active fault traces were present, which would have ended construction at this location if true. Based on careful direct examination within multiple test trenches, fault traces were determined not to be present at the project site and construction was allowed to continue.

5. Continuation of a comprehensive re-assessment of the seismic characteristics of the current existing CSU building stock. This is the first general re-assessment to take place since the CSU seismic program was begun in 1993. The purpose is to ensure that buildings with potential life-safety hazards to students, faculty, and staff have not been inadvertently overlooked. Sixteen campuses have been re-assessed, and the balance are planned to be completed by the end of 2006.
6. Maintained the CSU priority list for the seismic retrofits. There are two parts: first, those projects that are priority actions that should be undertaken solely because of the seismic hazard posed by the building; and second, those buildings that have significant seismic issues that need to be recognized when the campus is contemplating alterations or modifications of the building. The latter is to recognize the seismic issues of the building during the planning stage for such modifications or alterations. A revised priority listing incorporating findings from campus building re-assessments is scheduled to be published January 2007.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2007-2008 through 2011-2012

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests approval of the final 2007-08 through 2011-12 state and nonstate funded five-year capital improvement program totaling \$5.9 billion and \$3.6 billion respectively. The 2007-08 action-year request totals \$513.5 million for state projects and \$247.7 million for nonstate projects. The 2007-08 through 2011-12 capital program document is included with the agenda mailing.

Background

The Board of Trustees approved the Draft State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2007-08 through 2011-12 at the March 2006 meeting. Funding for the 2006-07 as well as the 2007-08 state funded programs will depend on passage of the bond measure, Proposition 1D, in November 2006. Proposition 1D will provide a total of \$690 million to fund the two years of the trustees' program. Based on the legislatively approved 2006-07 capital program funding, it is anticipated that approximately \$391 million will be available for the 2007-08 program after covering the cost of issuance and reserves, and using \$20 million in existing bond funding.

Funding sources for the nonstate five-year program include campus auxiliary organizations; donations; grants; and the student union, housing, and parking programs.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2007-08 through 2011-12 totaling \$5,933,346,000 and \$3,598,082,000 respectively are approved.
2. The 2007-08 State Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at \$513,510,000.

3. The 2007-08 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at \$247,664,000 and the chancellor is authorized to proceed in 2006-07 with design documents for fast-track projects in the 2007-08 nonstate program.
4. The chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.
5. The chancellor is authorized to make adjustments, as necessary, including priority sequence, scope, phase, project cost and total budget request for the 2007-08 State Funded Capital Outlay Program within the \$513,510,000.

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, Stanislaus—University Bookstore
Project Architect: HMC Architects

Background and Scope

CSU Stanislaus proposes to construct a 12,900 GSF bookstore south of the University Union and north of Science Building I, along a main pedestrian pathway near the center of campus. This project will relocate the current bookstore out of the University Union to the new facility, which is more visible and accessible for students, faculty and staff and will nearly double the existing square footage. The new bookstore will include retail space for textbooks, general reading/school spirit merchandise, and other customer-oriented amenities, reading areas, and storage space.

The building will consist of structural steel concentric braced frame and steel moment frame construction, with a sloped asphalt shingle roof. The exterior will be a combination of brick, plaster, and punched windows. Design features include a veranda on the east side to provide shaded outdoor seating, open space throughout for operational flexibility, and daylighting via light-wells at the south side of the structure.

Sustainable features of the design include building orientation placed to receive natural sunlight: Large windows on the north, protected windows on the east and south, and clerestory windows in the central spine bring natural light into the building, reducing energy requirements during the day. Lighting with motion detectors will be installed at the back of house service area. Wi-Fi (wireless fidelity) capability will reduce the need for multiple data connections, thereby increasing the efficiency of the building's use of materials. Installation of an energy efficient transformer (reducing conversion of electricity to unwanted heat) and an energy efficient mechanical system tied to the campus central plant will further reduce the building's energy consumption.

Timing (Estimated)

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Completion of Preliminary Plans | November 2006 |
| Completion of Working Drawings | May 2007 |
| Construction Start | October 2007 |
| Occupancy | August 2008 |

Basic Statistics

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Gross Building Area | 12,900 square feet |
| Assignable Building Area | 9,396 square feet |
| Efficiency | 73 percent |

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4890

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Building Cost (\$238 per GSF) | \$3,071,000 |
|-------------------------------|-------------|

| <i>System Breakdown (includes Group I)</i> | <i>(\$ per GSF)</i> |
|--|---------------------|
| a. Substructure (Foundation) | \$16.98 |
| b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure) | \$98.91 |
| c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) | \$33.57 |
| d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) | \$86.67 |
| e. Group I Equipment | \$ 1.94 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Site Development | <u>\$ 476,000</u> |
| Construction Cost | \$3,547,000 |
| Fees | 591,000 |
| Additional Services | 160,000 |
| Contingency | <u>575,000</u> |
| Total Project Cost (\$378 per GSF) | \$4,873,000 |
| Group II | <u>500,000</u> |
| Grand Total | <u>\$ 5,373,000</u> |

Cost Comparison

This project's building cost of \$238 is consistent with the CSU construction cost guideline of \$235 per GSF for bookstores including Group I equipment.

Funding Data

The project will be owned and operated by CSU Stanislaus, Auxiliary Business Services. The project will be funded through the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program. Repayment of the bonds will be made from bookstore revenues.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

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

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Notice of Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Stanislaus, University Bookstore project has been prepared pursuant to requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and will be filed with the State Office of Planning and Research.
2. The proposed project will not have potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Stanislaus, University Bookstore are approved at a project cost of \$5,373,000 at CCCCI 4890.