

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 1:45 p.m. Tuesday, November 8, 2005
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 20, 2005

1. Amend the 2005-2006 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. 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**

September 20, 2005

Members Present

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of July 19, 2005 were approved as submitted. Chair Galinson appointed Trustees Foster, Hauck, Linscheid, and Smith to the committee for the day.

Amend the 2005/2006 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Vice Chair Esparza presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-05-15).

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Change at San Diego State University

Ms. Elvyra San Juan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, introduced agenda item 2 and noted the presentation is consistent with the information presented in July. This proposed master plan ceiling increase is consistent with the board's direction in 2003 for the campuses to develop a plan to accommodate enrollment growth and better utilize existing campuses to accommodate that growth. The proposed master plan addresses the need for affordable faculty housing, which has impacted the ability to attract and retain faculty. With the use of a visual presentation, the proposed changes to the master plan were identified on a site map: Adobe Falls for Faculty and Graduate Student Housing, Alvarado Campus Park, Alvarado Hotel, East Campus Residence Hall, and the Satellite Student Union. The EIR includes project level analysis for the Education building on the western portion of the Alvarado Campus Park and the Alvarado Hotel. A future development, referred to as the Paseo project, is also planned. That project is proposed as a mixed-use development of student housing, parking, and retail that

has been under development for some time between university entities and the City Redevelopment Agency. There is no element related to the Paseo project included in the proposed master plan.

Following a video presentation prepared by San Diego State University, President Weber stated that increasing access to quality higher education was the single most important challenge faced by San Diego State. The proposed master plan is not just about bricks and mortar on the main campus; it addresses SDSU's fast-growing demand by increasing summer enrollment, developing off-campus centers, and expanding the use of academic technologies. California is at a crossroad in its ability to ensure access to higher education for future generations of students. As a result of Title Wave 2, the state will be faced with a tremendous increase in students seeking higher education. At the same time, California's burgeoning high-technology economy is demanding a more highly educated workforce to fill positions in industries such as biotechnology, telecommunications, and health care. The proposed master plan revision includes five distinct project components, and incorporates ongoing policies that will work together to accommodate future students and ensure that facilities are in place to serve them.

The proposed master plan was developed with careful attention to achieving the state's educational objectives and responding to CSU policies and directives, while having the least impact on the community. It proposes development of existing or affiliated university property. Since the July board meeting the campus has continued its efforts to meet with the community regarding concerns with the proposed master plan. Important outcomes include the letter from Senator Kehoe in support of the master plan revision; the Memorandum of Understanding with the Del Cerro community committing to work with the college area on the faculty housing issue, and the formation of the Del Cerro Community Advisory Committee. In spite of negative comments from some of the community and representatives from Alvarado Hospital, the activities of the past two months have established relationships that will enable the university to carry on discussions as the development moves forward to the project-specific stages of the master plan.

In July, a seven-page list of meetings held between the university and the community was shared with the board. Since then, the efforts to meet with community members, elected officials, and regional organizations to discuss the proposed master plan and address concerns has continued. There are issues that have been raised by community members that are outside the authority of San Diego State University or even the Board of Trustees to address, such as funding off-site traffic improvements as part of the California Environmental Quality Act mitigation process.

Ms. Christine Helwick, General Counsel, gave a brief summary of California law as it pertains to localities not taxing the state for the cost of local improvements. Without such a prohibition, each locality would have authority to tap into the tax revenues paid by all of the taxpayers throughout the state for every local project. The tax burden on citizens would then be unfairly increased to pay for strictly local benefits. The CSU, if taxed, would necessarily have less funds to accomplish its mission to provide higher education for the citizens of this state.

Vice Chair Esparza introduced the first speaker opposing the item.

Mr. Justin Booth, Deputy City Attorney and General Counsel for the Redevelopment Agency, asked the board to delay and put forth another two-month continuance on this process. He stated that there are deficiencies with the EIR that need more time to address.

Mr. Mike Fortney, representing the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency, stated the agency's opposition to the proposed master plan revision and final EIR because it does not conform to the college committee redevelopment plan. Mr. Fortney further states that SDSU should pay for mitigating impacts that are a result of its own development.

Mr. Michael McDade, an attorney representing Alvarado Hospital, stated that the EIR is deficient and fails to analyze significant traffic impacts to the hospital and emergency services. Mr. McDade also expressed the opinion that the project should not proceed until SDSU or another entity takes the responsibility for mitigating impacts created from its development.

Mr. Michael McSweeny, Chairman of the Save Del Cerro Committee and board member of the Del Cerro Action Council, expressed his disappointment on what very little has been done by SDSU during the past 60-days since the July board meeting.

Mr. Bill Vanderway, an attorney representing the Del Cerro Action Council, stated that this project does not serve an educational purpose, shows no evidence that it will support increased FTE, and the EIR does not adequately address unmitigated impacts or properly analyze alternatives.

Vice Chair Esparza introduced the first speaker in support of the proposed master plan revision and EIR.

Mr. Antonio Pizano, President & CEO, MAAC Project, stated that its mission is to promote self-sufficiency for low and moderate income families in communities in Southern California through advocacy and delivery of social, educational, housing, and employment services. The SDSU proposed master plan will provide greater access to higher education, which is one of the most important factors toward achieving self-sufficiency.

Mr. George Walker Smith, community member, sat on the San Diego School Board for 16 years, and was President of the Action School Board Association as well as the Council of Great City Schools, and knew four past presidents of SDSU. Mr. Smith expressed his strong support for the proposed master plan for the university, which will increase enrollment capacity.

Mr. Vincent Mudd, a small business owner in San Diego, a SDSU alumni, and an Executive Board member of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Economic Development Corporation (EDC), stated that both organizations (chamber and EDC) expressed support for the proposed master plan, citing the need for an educational workforce.

Dr. Fred Hornbeck, member of the faculty at San Diego State and chair of the faculty senate, reported positively on the process and development of San Diego State University's proposed

master plan revision and to re-convey the senate's support. Mr. Hornbeck cited the serious need to provide affordable housing to attract and retain quality faculty.

Dr. Eric Riggs, an Associate Professor of Geological Sciences at San Diego State University and a recent tenured faculty member, reinforced the lack of affordable housing options for junior faculty and the resulting difficult retention and recruitment issues facing the university. Mr. Riggs expressed his support of the proposed master plan, which takes specific steps toward alleviating this problem.

Mr. Chris Manigault, a senior at San Diego State and the President of Associated Students, shared the Associated Students' support of the proposed campus master plan revision.

Ms. LaToya Jarrett, a senior at San Diego State and currently the Vice President of External Affairs for the Associated Students, spoke in strong support of the proposed master plan, expressing her sadness regarding the current retention issues of faculty due to the lack of affordable housing.

Mr. Ralph Pesquiera, former CSU trustee, stated that this proposed master plan will provide the opportunity for the university to bring in more faculty with affordable housing close to the campus, and to offer access to every single qualified student to SDSU.

In his closing remarks, President Weber emphasized the importance of staying focused on the bigger picture of providing access to a high quality university education for future generations, and to not be derailed by impacts that will certainly affect all involved parties.

Trustee Gowgani expressed the importance of the project in light of recent conversations he had with SDSU students. Affordable housing is necessary to attract and retain a quality faculty.

Chair Galinson stated that the master plan clearly meets the policy objectives of this board, and that he was satisfied that the EIR has adequately addressed the required issues.

Trustee Smith stated that he certainly admired the way the campus has shared governance on this issue.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-05-16).

Revised Policy on Energy Conservation, Sustainable Building Practices, and Physical Plant Management

With the use of a slide presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item. This policy was presented in July for information as a result of the board's request to staff after the 2004 policy update to establish new conservation goals, and set targets for the purchase of renewable energy and onsite generation of renewable energy.

The highlights to the policy are the provisions that include a renewed energy conservation goal of a 15% reduction, measured against the 2003/04 base line by 2009/10 and an onsite generation goal of 50 Megawatts by 2014, which has the potential to be a significant benefit to the CSU to relieve the local grid congestion and meet the energy independence goal.

The sustainability design goals include exceeding Title 24 by 15% for new facilities and 10% for existing buildings. It is intended for this policy to exceed state energy standards for energy efficiency. It's important to know that the campus facilities have worked over the last number of years to improve energy efficiency in existing buildings, and that progress toward this goal of saving 10% in energy consumption will cost additional dollars in construction to achieve.

With respect to LEED Certification and energy efficient sustainable design, a CSU measurement system will be developed this year that will be complimentary to LEED but will focus more on energy efficiency and appropriate sustainable measures that take into account regional issues that LEED does not currently address, especially the existing central plants that are on campuses.

Renewable energy measures will provide a means to reduce reliance upon the electrical grid, and will depend upon the individual campus in selecting renewable projects such as photovoltaic (PV) panels that prove to be cost effective. To estimate the potential for a systemwide renewable goal of 10 Megawatts, assumptions were made based on 1% of the total rooftop area.

One of the policy debates focused on CSU's ability to achieve a more aggressive renewable goal, moving from 10 Megawatts to 17 Megawatts. The proposed goal of 10 Megawatts is 50% of the available annual funding for photovoltaics. The wait list application for incentive funds currently far outnumbers the available dollars of the 2005/06 program funding. The proposed policy recognizes that the cost effectiveness of renewable energy systems and cogeneration systems are dependent upon many factors, including energy prices, subsidies, new technologies, and state regulations. The policy promotes the implementation of the most cost effective method to support the onsite generation goal.

Trustee Esparza introduced one speaker who spoke regarding the item.

Jennifer Reimer, a student at CSU Fresno, asked if the goal could be scheduled to be revised every two years, and asked that members of the committee consider amending the policy proposal to schedule a revision of the energy independence goal during the 2007/08 year.

Trustee Jackson asked Ms. San Juan if revising the policy every two years was feasible and if it could be done.

Ms. San Juan responded that she wasn't confident that two years would be enough time to show completion of the projects. However, she did think that there will be more campuses interested in PV projects.

Trustee Jackson requested that that the item be reported on an annual basis to keep this board abreast on the goals that are being set forth on a yearly basis.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-05-17).

California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Ms. San Juan gave a brief introduction to the Seismic Review Board (SRB), identifying the 1993 trustee policy that ensures the life safety of occupants in buildings. The SRB is very well received in state levels, where it is currently providing input to the state building code. The SRB has given the state direction on what the seismic requirement should be for existing facilities, as well as for new facilities. This last year the SRB worked on the CSU seismic requirements that were revised in June 2005.

The SRB maintains the CSU's priority list for seismic retrofits. One of its current activities, which will extend into next year, is revisiting campuses since the initial assessment of facilities back in 1992, and then reassessed in 1994 after the Northridge earthquake. The SRB will make certain that it didn't miss any facilities or evaluate them incorrectly, factors that may change the priority list for projects. Another topic that the SRB would like to take further action on is a policy for leased facilities. While the University of California, the California Courts, and the Department of General Services have bought off on this policy, the CSU is assessing the number of facilities that this policy would impact.

State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2006/2007 through 2010/2011

Using a visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the item. The 2006/2007 program has been revised since its approval at the March Board of Trustees' meeting. The Department of Finance has approved escalation to the mid point of construction, which is a positive change that has been advocated in the past and will improve the ability to deliver quality buildings. However, the budgeted project costs have increased since the draft submitted earlier. In capital planning, one of the key drivers is the proposed enrollment growth for the campus and its impact on specific disciplines. The Governor's Compact supports an annual enrollment growth of 2.5%, which has been taken into account in setting priorities.

For capital planning purposes, physical capacity needs are planned around the revised academic year estimate. Prior to the state fiscal crisis, and the push to expand the summer session, it was anticipated that by 2002/2003 the systemwide physical capacity would not be sufficient to meet enrollment demand. Based on current projections, the critical year will occur after the enrollment growth cap of 2.5% is loosened in 2010/2011, should summer sessions not grow to the extent directed by the legislature. Consistent with past practice, smaller campuses are being afforded faster than average growth rates in order to achieve improved efficiencies and economies of scale in campus operations.

In 2006/2007, it has been proposed to continue funding the replacement of building systems that have exceeded their useful life through the new capital renewal program. The objective is to provide campuses with an annual funding mechanism to replace obsolete and inefficient systems. This fund source will be used to secure matching funds to implement energy efficiency projects to extend the use of our limited funding.

The 2006/2007 state capital program is reliant upon funding from existing general obligation bonds, a new general obligation bond anticipated for a November 2006 ballot initiative, or legislative approval of the use of lease revenue bonds. It is anticipated that this would result in funding of \$345 million each year for the California State University capital outlay program, consistent with the Governor's Compact.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-05-18).

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for the Humboldt State University—Forbes Physical Education, Phase II. 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 09-05-19).

Trustee Esparza adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2005-2006 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presented By

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

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2005-2006 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. California State University, San Marcos

The McMahan House

PWCE

\$2,353,000

California State University San Marcos wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a conferencing and dining facility. The proposed project, which is the first phase of the University House and Conference Center (#50), provides meeting and dining accommodations for campus and community members. The 3,520 gross square foot building includes a large room for meeting and dining, a commercial kitchen, foyer, and support areas. The complex also incorporates a 600 square foot covered patio for university gatherings. The project will be completed with donor funds.

2. Sonoma State University

Real Property Acquisition

A

\$1,061,000

Sonoma State University wishes to proceed with the acquisition of 22.205 acres from Sonoma State Enterprises (SSE) for faculty, staff, and student housing and parking. The property is a portion of two parcels located one mile north of the campus. The SSE closed escrow in June 2005 on the acquisition of these two properties totaling 88.82 acres, for \$4,225,000. The Board of Trustees approved the acquisition of 66.615 of the 88.82 acres at the July 19, 2005 meeting for \$3,199,000. It has been determined that the balance of the property (22.205) is needed based on the employee demand assumptions, for a total master plan build-out of the 432 single-family attached and detached housing units. The cost of the additional property is \$1,061,000, which includes the balance of the purchase price plus processing fees.

The properties are currently used as agricultural land, consisting of open grassland fields in an unincorporated section of Sonoma County. Sonoma State University has performed the due diligence responsibilities required by the State University Administrative Manual and has

determined that no conditions exist which would cause liability to the California State University. The planning for the new land use and development of the property is subject to, and will not proceed until the necessary California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance has been completed and the trustees have certified the necessary compliance documentation. In approving this project, it is understood that should the trustees not certify the CEQA analysis for the property and if necessary permit approval by any responsible agency is not obtained, then one option available is to sell the property back to SSE (Educational Code 89048(g) and (h)). The campus envisions a phased development of approximately 432 single-family attached and detached housing at affordable prices. The Environmental Impact Report for the proposed use and development plan will be brought to the board for action in summer 2006. Funding for the acquisition will be provided from campus housing reserves.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2005/06 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: 1) \$2,353,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, San Marcos, The McMahan House project; and 2) \$1,061,000 for the acquisition of Real Property for Sonoma State University.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

- 1. CSU San Bernardino – Parking Structures I and II**
Project Architect: Watry Design, Inc.

Background and Scope

At the July 13-14, 2004 Board of Trustees' meeting, three parking projects were proposed and approved as a part of CSU San Bernardino's campus master plan revision. This project will implement the first of these changes with the design and construction of two parking structures. Based on the findings of the parking feasibility study, Parking Structure I (#101), as identified on the campus master plan, is sited for the northwest quadrant of the campus, east of Parking Lot L and the new access road. Parking Structure II (#102) is sited northwest of the Coussoulis Arena and south of the proposed perimeter road. Parking Structure I will contain 740 spaces and Parking Structure II will contain 748 spaces for a total of 1,488 new spaces.

Multiple options were studied for both sites. The design proposes each structure to be 3-levels with 4 bays with a shear wall seismic system as the option with the best balance between cost and efficiency. The buildings are designed to be cast-in-place concrete and other masonry materials for structural strength, durability, and minimal maintenance. The buildings are recessed into the slope of the site to reduce the impact of strong seasonal winds and to preserve the mountain views. The elevator towers for both structures will make use of glass back cabs for pedestrian visibility and security. Exterior colors vary from light to medium earth tones in keeping with the established palette on campus and to blend in with the natural surroundings.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings
Completion of Working Drawings

December 2005
March 2006

Construction Start May 2006
Occupancy September 2007

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area (Parking Structures I and II) 463,920 square feet
Total Parking Spaces (I: 740; II: 748 spaces) 1,488 spaces

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4328

Building Cost (\$12,663 per space) \$18,843,000

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 10.96
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$ 22.99
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 1.60
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 5.07

Site Development (includes landscaping) \$ 1,236,000

Construction Cost \$20,079,000

Fees 2,689,000

Additional Services 395,000

Contingency 3,531,000

Total Project Cost \$ 26,694,000

Group II Equipment 210,000

Grand Total \$ 26,904,000

Cost Comparison

This project building cost of \$12,663 per space reflects the current construction climate and unique site conditions. Two CSU parking structures were recently bid: the Sacramento six-story Parking Structure 3 has 3,034 spaces and was awarded at \$11,986 per space and the Long Beach four-story Parking Structure 2 has 1,281 spaces and was awarded at \$14,516 per space. The San Bernardino project has seismic strengthening design concerns like the Long Beach project, with foundation and structural system upgrades to respond to the San Andreas fault.

Funding Data

The campus plans to request Board of Trustees' approval at a future meeting to issue bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond (SRB) program to finance construction of the project. The bonds will be paid from the campus's parking program.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Addendum which analyzed the potential impacts of the two new parking structures I and II was filed with the State Clearinghouse in June 2004, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided with the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approved master plan revision for the California State University, San Bernardino, the board finds that:

1. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Addendum were prepared to specifically include the design of Parking Structures I and II pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The Addendum dated June 17, 2004 to the Negative Declaration has been prepared to address additional proposed facilities and technical changes for the master plan revision in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Addendum has adequately analyzed the additional minor changes to the previous analyses and finding of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
3. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the master plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will have no new or previously undisclosed significant effects on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
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, San Bernardino Parking Structures I and II are approved at a project cost of \$26,904,000 at CCCCI 4328.

2. CSU San Marcos – Center for Children and Families
Design/Build Team: Edge Development / NTD Stichler Architecture

Background and Scope

The California State University, San Marcos proposes to construct the Center for Children and Families to serve the childcare needs of university student parents from all campus programs, allowing them to pursue their education while their children attend the Center. The Center will also serve the children of California State University, San Marcos faculty and staff and will provide “hands-on” learning opportunities for university students studying to become early childhood educators. The 21,190 GSF one-story facility will be constructed using the design-build delivery method. The Center, which will be licensed for 152 children, will feature 11 classrooms for children twelve months old through pre-kindergarten and 1 infants’ room, all with support spaces; 3 outdoor play areas; 2 multi-use classrooms for children, parents, and college students; a health center with an assessment and isolation room; administration offices; a commercial kitchen; and a 50-space parking lot.

The new Center will be located on the east edge of campus near the University Services Building on a site formerly occupied by modular classroom structures (to be relocated on campus for use as an emergency operation center) and is adjacent to a neighboring residential development. The building façade and style is designed to be consistent with the campus architectural vocabulary and is scaled appropriately to be in keeping with the residential neighborhood. The exterior walls are neutral-toned cement plaster with aluminum storefront glass and standing seam metal roofing. The structure will include state-of-the-art telecommunications, data, security, and infrastructure support. Sustainable design features include an east-west axis orientation, overhangs and shade structures to prevent heat gain, operable windows for natural ventilation, efficient lighting fixtures and HVAC control systems that minimize energy utilization.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Plans	February 2006
Completion of Working Drawings	April 2006
Construction Start	July 2006
Completion of Construction	June 2007

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	21,190 square feet
Assignable Building Area	16,795 square feet
Efficiency	79.26 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4100

Building Cost (\$217 per GSF)	\$4,618,000
<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	(\$ per GSF) \$14.49
b. Shell (Superstructure and Enclosure)	\$79.33
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$35.25
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$57.88
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$12.18
f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$.47
g. General Conditions	\$18.34
Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>\$ 780,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$ 5,398,000
Fees	931,000
Additional Services	312,000
Contingency	<u>535,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$338 per GSF)	\$ 7,176,000
Group II Equipment	<u>596,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$ 7,772,000</u>

Cost Comparison

The CSU does not have a building cost standard for childcare centers due to varying programmatic differences across campus projects. This project’s building cost of \$217 per GSF at CCCI 4100 is significantly higher than a similar project at San Diego State University (\$115 per GSF, adjusted to CCCI 4100) in 2002. While roughly 30% of the difference in building costs can be attributed to the recent industry-wide cost increases for steel, lumber, cement and fuel, the most significant differences are in the cost for San Marcos’ building shell and substantially larger commercial kitchen than was constructed at San Diego State University.

Funding Data

The project is funded by a \$7,682,000 grant from the First Five Commission San Diego, with an additional \$90,000 from California State University, San Marcos Parking Service Reserves, for total project funding of \$7,772,000. The California State University, San Marcos Foundation

manages the grant funds for the project, while the campus planning, design and construction department manages the design and construction.

California Environmental Quality Act

A Notice of Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on August 9, 2004, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The project is consistent with the campus master plan and Environmental Impact Report approved in 1988.

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 Categorical Exemption for the California State University, San Marcos, Center for Children and Families project has been prepared and filed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The schematic plans for California State University, San Marcos, Center for Children and Families are approved at a project cost of \$7,772,000 at CCCI 4100.