AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: **11:00 a.m., Tuesday, November 13, 2012**
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Peter Mehas, Chair
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair
Kenneth Fong
Lupe C. Garcia
William Hauck
Lou Monville
J. Lawrence Norton
Jillian Ruddell
Glen O. Toney

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 19, 2012

1. Amend the 2012-2013 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded, *Action*
2. Amend the 2012-2013 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

3. California State University Troops to Trades Apprenticeship Program, *Information*
4. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, *Information*
5. California State University Seismic Safety Program Annual Report, *Information*
6. Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2014-2015 through 2018-2019, *Action*
7. 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
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

September 19, 2012

Members Present

Peter Mehas, Chair
Kenneth Fong
Lupe C. Garcia
William Hauck
Lou Monville
Jillian Ruddell
Glen O. Toney
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the July 19, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2012-2013 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Trustee Mehas presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-12-11).

2013-2014 State and Non-State Funded Capital Outlay Program and the 2013-2014 through 2017-2018 State and Non-State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra F. San Juan presented the state and non-state funded five-year capital improvement program 2013-2014 through 2017-2018 to the board for approval that included the 2013 action year request. Ms. San Juan reported on the primary objective of the capital outlay program, the development of the CSU since 1998 under Chancellor Charles B. Reed's leadership, and the status and priorities for the program today in an environment of minimal state funding.

Ms. San Juan highlighted capacity to serve students versus enrollment over the timeframe when the board approved master plan enrollment ceiling increases for 11 campuses and established four new sites: California State University Channel Islands, and off-campus centers at Stockton, Palm Desert and Brawley, bringing the enrollment ceiling to about 475,000 FTE for long-range development.

Trustee Monville asked Ms. San Juan to clarify how capacity is calculated. Ms. San Juan stated that full time equivalent student capacity for lecture and laboratories is calculated based on the number of student seats occupied for a specific number of hours per week.

Ms. San Juan gave an update on the trend of increasing square footage of non-state supported space in the CSU's physical plant. Today, state supported space represents only 54.9 percent of the total CSU square footage, down from 70.9 percent in 2000. Primarily, the academic growth was seen in libraries designed not only with space for collections, but with space for collaborative group study as well as multimedia development for students and faculty. Lecture space constructed has trended towards flexible program space that can be used for multimode instruction, which provides lecture space as well as lab space in one classroom and large lecture space and case study classrooms. Science facilities were prioritized for renovation, replacement and new capacity due to the age and obsolescence of existing facilities and inadequate building systems to meet current codes. Support for the systemwide nursing initiative included expanded and improved nursing simulation labs to place more nurses into the workforce.

Non-state funded space growth was predominantly comprised of housing and parking, with student unions and recreation centers as a close second. The increase of student residential campus living has expanded the need for gathering spaces for students such as the student unions and recreation centers.

During the last 12-year period, voter approved general obligation (GO) bonds were the primary source of funding through 2008 (the last GO bond was in 2006) for major capital, minor capital, and capital renewal programs. Since 2008, the necessary shift towards legislatively approved lease revenue bonds (LRB) has left the capital renewal program largely unfunded as LRB require an asset or new facility for its financing structure.

The capital renewal or deferred maintenance backlog stands at $1.7 billion. The CSU's facility condition index (FCI), which equals the backlog of renewal divided by the current replacement value is approximately 12 percent; NACUBO rates any FCI over 10 percent as poor. The renewal model used to calculate the backlog and replacement values suggests the CSU invest $200 million annually; $100 million for renewal needs or those items which have reached the end of their useful life, and $100 million to address the backlog, those items that have long exceeded their useful life.

Trustee Monville asked Ms. San Juan to bring an updated report to the board on urgent backlog projects especially in the category of health and safety.

Of the 2013-2014 capital program total need ($520.6 million), the $391.3 million request relies on the use of previously approved GO bonds ($12.6 million) with the balance funded by typical LRB ($286.0 million) and asset transfer LRB ($92.7 million). The asset transfer LRB, supported by the Department of Finance, provides an avenue to fund infrastructure and renovation projects which otherwise would not qualify for LRB. The structure requires the CSU to lease a facility to the Public Works Board as the valued asset against which bonds are sold. In the absence of GO bonds this is a viable financing option for infrastructure and renovation projects. The 2013-2014 program priorities are systemwide programs to address infrastructure improvements, equipment

for campus buildings that are under construction or soon to start construction, seismic retrofits of facilities with critical life safety issues, and renovations and replacements to address program deficiencies.

In summary, the state request for the 2013-2014 capital program is $520.6 million; the non-state funded program request is $24.1 million. The state and non-state funded five-year capital improvement program request for 2013-14 through 2017-18 is $6.3 billion and $3.9 billion, respectively. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-12-12).

Approval of Schematic Plans

Ms. San Juan presented the approval of schematic plans for California State Polytechnic University, Pomona Collins College Expansion. All CEQA requirements for the project have been completed and staff recommends approval.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-12-13).

Trustee Mehas adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2012-2013 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 2012-2013 non-state funded capital outlay program to include the following two projects:

1. **California State University San Marcos**
   School of Nursing Renovation **PWCE** **$2,488,000**

California State University San Marcos wishes to proceed with the renovation of on-campus space in University Hall to relocate the School of Nursing. In 2006, the School of Nursing was established within the College of Education, Health and Human Services, and initially housed in an off-campus leased facility located on the corner of Twin Oaks Valley Road and Craven Drive. In fall 2007, the School of Nursing began a partnership with Extended Learning and expanded its program in order to meet the health care needs of the region; the program occupies approximately 10,560 GSF in the leased facility. As the current lease will expire in 2015, the university has decided to renovate an existing campus facility to bring the nursing program onto campus, rather than renew the lease.

University Hall (#15) houses the balance of the College of Education, Health and Human Services. This project will renovate 10,790 ASF of the third floor, affording space for an expanded nursing program including nursing skills and simulation labs, and faculty and administrative offices.

This project will be funded by Continuing Education Reserves.

2. **Sonoma State University**
   Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons-MasterCard Pavilion **PWCE** **$31,508,000**

Sonoma State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons-MasterCard Pavilion on the east lawn of the Green Music Center

Complex (#50) with a high-end outdoor performance venue. The centerpiece of this project is the proposed permanent outdoor pavilion (performance shell) and stage including VIP seating, acoustical banners, theatrical lighting poles, stage rigging and an amphitheater audio-visual package. The project scope includes required infrastructure, restrooms, concessions, accessible pathways, fire lane, site lighting and landscaping. The program will provide for 2,500 terraced amphitheater fixed seating along with 7,500 informal lawn seating within the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons for a total of 10,000 seats.

The project will be funded through a combination of donor funds and a corporate sponsorship negotiated with MasterCard Worldwide. Use of bond financing or commercial paper is anticipated until all of the funds are received from the MasterCard corporate sponsorship.

> **RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2012-2013 non-state funded capital outlay program is amended to include: 1) $2,488,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University San Marcos, School of Nursing Renovation project; and 2) $31,508,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the Sonoma State University, Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons-MasterCard Pavilion project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2012-2013 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item requests approval to amend the 2012-2013 state funded capital outlay program to include the following project:

California State University, Northridge		
Oviatt Library Renovation and Renewal	**PWC**	**$2,900,000**

California State University, Northridge wishes to proceed with the renovation and renewal of areas of the first and third floors of the Oviatt Library Addition (#20). The renovation will improve student access to technology and enhanced study spaces while addressing facility renewal needs to replace old carpet, ceiling tiles, electrical distribution and lighting in the 89,290 GSF facility built in 1991. Approximately 24,300 square feet across the two floors will be included in the project to reconfigure use of the library stack and study areas and better serve the students. Study area enhancements include the creation of library classrooms, a computer lab, subject area tutoring and writing labs, group study rooms and general use computer workstations.

This project will be funded by interest earnings on student tuition fees and campus operating funds.

> **RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2012-2013 state funded capital outlay program is amended to include $2,900,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Northridge, Oviatt Library Renovation and Renewal project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University Troops to Trades Apprenticeship Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

This information item reports on progress to date on the development of the CSU Troops to Trades Apprenticeship Program. The program is a joint endeavor with the State Employees Trades Council United (SETC) to educate and employ returning veterans into our Apprenticeship program in one of 10 skilled trades. The program has been developed in partnership with the California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

Apprenticeship Program

The CSU/SETC Joint Apprenticeship Training program is certified by the State of California in 10 skilled trades. The ten skilled trades include:

Electrician	Carpenter
Building Service Engineer (HVAC)	Painter
Refrigeration Mechanic	Auto Mechanic
Operating Engineer	Sheet Metal Mechanic
Locksmith	Plumber

Of the 971 skilled trade workers in the CSU, given the demographics of the bargaining unit, there is a potential for over 50 percent of the workforce to retire over the next five to seven years. Departures in these numbers will create a serious deficiency of institutional knowledge for the campuses' infrastructure maintenance and operational needs.

The CSU/SETC Joint Apprenticeship Program was developed to utilize existing journeyman trades personnel experience and instructional knowledge to train and mentor apprentices to backfill the expected vacancies, and provide a professional development pathway for prospective apprentices interested in careers in the skilled trades. The CSU Troops to Trades initiative builds upon the existing program and was recently approved by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs as an acceptable educational development program that can be funded from the veterans'

G.I. Bill benefits. This approval should enable the veteran to learn employable skills while working as an apprentice and reduce the cost to the CSU for the veterans' wages and benefits. California State University, San Bernardino has agreed to fill one of its vacant building service engineer positions using the new program. This first enrollee will pave the path for others to participate by helping the CSU and its partners work through administrative specifics of the military and utilize the campus support structure, typically reserved for veterans enrolled as students, to also assist veterans hired as employees.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

Presentation By

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

Summary

Pursuant to the Board of Trustees' policy, this information item provides the annual report on the CSU's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) certification actions for Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) and related documentation. The report identifies the compliance actions that have been acted upon by the board for the period from July 2011 through June 2012, consistent with its responsibility as the "Lead Agency" under CEQA. The report also provides information on recent changes to CEQA administrative rules and procedures, and current court actions.

Background

As the Lead Agency, the board has a responsibility to ensure that draft EIRs and other CEQA documents circulated for required public review provide all relevant information on potential environmental impacts of a project. Under CEQA, a "project" can be either a specific building or facility planned for construction, or it can be a programmatic action such as approval of an updated campus master plan that is prepared to guide long-range campus development. The chancellor is delegated responsibility for ensuring compliance with CEQA broadly, and the assistant vice chancellor for capital planning, design and construction (CPDC) is delegated responsibility to ensure all procedural requirements are met. The assistant vice chancellor for CPDC has authority to approve schematic plans for capital projects deemed architecturally insignificant and/or utility/infrastructure projects and their related environmental compliance documents. Small capital projects, such as facility renovations, may be exempt from CEQA compliance under a Categorical Exemption.

CSU Compliance Actions from July 2011 through June 2012

Attachment A lists CEQA actions from July 2011 through June 2012. Significant CEQA approval actions as noted on the attachment include:

- The Dining Center Replacement project at the California Maritime Academy and the Aztec Walk project at San Diego State University met CEQA compliance requirements through the preparation of addendums to existing approved Final EIRs for the campus master plans.

- The Academic Building II project at California State University, Monterey Bay and the School of the Arts (SOTA) Demolition project at San Francisco State University met CEQA compliance requirements as the projects are consistent with previously approved EIRs for their respective campus master plans.

- Negative Declarations and Mitigated Negative Declarations were certified for three capital projects for California State University, Chico, California Maritime Academy, and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. These projects either have no significant environmental impacts or include mitigation measures which reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- Categorical Exemptions were submitted for six major capital outlay projects at California State University, East Bay California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (2), California State University, San Marcos, and San José State University (2).

These actions provided for a reduced period of time to review and approve CEQA documentation.

Judicial Action Updates

Ten major master plan revisions have been approved by the trustees since the *Marina* decision in 2006. For these long-range development plans, the CSU made off-site fair share mitigation determinations consistent with that court decision. In three cases, litigation was initiated to overturn the board's approval action (further discussion below), and one case (California State University, Monterey Bay) was settled. The CSU acknowledges the following principles when proceeding with negotiations associated with fair share, off-site mitigation:

1. CSU determines the basis for fair share mitigation responsibility.
2. CSU negotiates in good faith with local agencies.
3. CSU requests off-site mitigation funding from the governor and legislature.
4. Caltrans (California Department of Transportation) is responsible for state highway mitigation improvements.
5. Public/private partnerships are responsible to pay full fair share mitigation costs.

The CSU has requested funding for off-site mitigation as part of a systemwide state capital outlay request with no resulting favorable inclusion in a governor's budget. The CSU has sought and received approval from the Department of Finance to use contingency or project bid savings from previously approved state funded projects to help mitigate campus impacts. This includes the CSU Channel Islands Entrance Road and the CSU Monterey Bay Academic II projects. The CSU will continue efforts to seek funding for fair share mitigation costs in future systemwide budget requests and state project budget requests as appropriate.

In 2010, the CSU prevailed in a Superior Court decision in a lawsuit filed by the City of San Diego and other agencies over the 2007 San Diego State University Master Plan and EIR approved by the board. The trial court found that the CSU had complied with the *Marina* decision in its analysis and determination of San Diego State's fair share for off-site mitigation costs. The city appealed the decision. In December 2011, the Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's decision and ordered that the master plan be vacated. The California Supreme Court has granted CSU's petition to review the case. The appeal is in the briefing stage.

The City of Hayward and two homeowner associations filed CEQA challenges to the 2009 California State University, East Bay Master Plan and EIR approved by the board. In September 2010, the trial court ruled in favor of the petitioners on nearly every issue and enjoined the university from proceeding with construction of a planned parking structure. The university subsequently filed an appeal. In June 2012, the Court of Appeal ruled that the CSU East Bay Master Plan and EIR were adequate, except for the omission of analyzing impacts on recreational facilities. The Court of Appeal also held that the obligation to provide adequate fire and emergency services was not an environmental impact the CSU is required to mitigate. The City of Hayward petitioned the California Supreme Court for review. The California Supreme Court has granted review but deferred briefing pending disposition of the San Diego State University case.

Land-Value 77, a private business entity in Fresno, filed a CEQA challenge to the California State University, Fresno's Campus Pointe project. The court ultimately determined that the EIR for Campus Pointe complied with CEQA, except for additional analysis required on overflow parking and traffic as well as certain water and air quality issues. A revised EIR addressing the court's concerns was circulated for public review and comment in August 2011, and approved by the board in November 2011. In February 2012, the trial court found the CSU had addressed all CEQA issues. No further CEQA challenges have been filed.

CEQA Guidelines Update

CEQA Guidelines were amended to address AB 209, signed into law in 2011, which requires that public notices indicate the manner in which a Draft Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration is provided electronically for public review.

CEQA Legislation Update

During the 2011-2012 legislative session, a number of proposed changes were introduced to streamline and improve the environmental review process. While no significant changes were enacted that impact the CSU, it is anticipated that reform will continue to be a priority for the upcoming 2012-2013 legislative session.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ANNUAL REPORT
July 2011 through June 2012

CAMPUS/Project	CEQA Action Prepared					
	Exempt	MIT. N.D.	N.D.	E I R	BOT Action	NOD Filed
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO						
Taylor Hall II Replacement Building Schematic Plan Approval		√			5/9/2012	5/10/2012
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY						
Fuel Cell Facility	√				(1)	8/17/2011
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO						
Certify the Revised EIR and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision and Amendment to the Non-State Capital Outlay Program for the Campus Pointe Project				√	11/16/2011	11/17/2011
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY						
Dining Center Replacement Schematic Plan Approval				√	7/13/2011	7/14/2011
Physical Education and Pool Facility Schematic Plan Approval		√			11/16/2011	11/17/2011
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, MONTEREY BAY						
Academic Building II, Schematic Plan Approval				√	11/16/2011	11/23/2011
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA						
CLA Replacement Building-Minor Master Plan Revision	√				(1)	12/16/2011
Collins College Expansion Phase III-Minor Master Plan Revision	√				(1)	12/12/2011
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY						
Aztec Walk Campus Minor Master Plan Revison				√	(1)	5/15/2012
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY						
School of the Arts (SOTA) Building Demolition and Interim Use				√	(1)	6/22/2012
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS						
Fuel Cell-Minor Master Plan Revision	√				(1)	6/8/2012
SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY						
Spartan Complex Renovation (Seismic)--Minor Master Plan Revision	√				(1)	2/3/2012
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories Aquaculture Facility Replacement	√				(1)	4/12/2012
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO						
Nelson Reservoir Improvement		√			(1)	4/27/2012

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

This report now includes CEQA actions on minor master plan revisions for projects that were presented for the trustees' approval of schematic design.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University Seismic Safety Program Annual Report

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents the CSU Seismic Safety Program Annual Report for the July 2011 to June 2012 period.

Seismic Policy and History

The trustees initiated an 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 was established to provide advice on the ongoing seismic condition of the CSU building stock and technical counsel in how to effectively implement a seismic oversight program. Since the original trustee resolution, the CSU Seismic

Policy and its Seismic Review Board has evolved to become a respected standard and has periodically been asked to provide opinions and reports on seismic matters for other state agencies and institutions.

CSU's seismic approach is to actively seek out and identify potential seismic hazards within the existing building stock and subsequently pursue its mitigation. It is better to identify potential concerns that can help inform and prioritize future capital program planning efforts even though this can at times require some public education on seismic risks and mitigation. Where immediate structural threats are identified prompt action is taken. Crandall Gymnasium at San Luis Obispo is an example of this. There, due to seismically weak post connections, building occupancy restrictions have been put into place pending renovation repairs.

The CSU Seismic Review Board Membership

The following individuals have been appointed by the assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction (CPDC) to serve as members of the CSU Seismic Review Board:

- Charles Thiel Jr., PhD, President, Telesis Engineers (Chairman)
- Gregg Brandow, PhD, SE, Consulting Structural Engineer, Adjunct Professor, University of Southern California
- John Egan, GE, Principle Engineer, AMEC Geomatrix
- John A. Martin, Jr., SE, President, John A. Martin and Associates, Inc.
- Richard Niewiarowski, SE, Consulting Structural Engineer
- Thomas Sabol, PhD, SE, Principal, Englekirk and Sabol
- Theodore C. Zsutty, PhD, SE, Consulting Structural Engineer (Vice Chair)

CSU Seismic Mitigation and Oversight

The California State University maintains an ongoing seismic mitigation and oversight effort comprised of six elements:

1. Mitigate urgent falling hazard concerns. Mitigate significant life-safety threats posed by falling hazards as a priority. The initial falling hazard concerns identified at the 23 campuses and off-campus centers have been mitigated. There are no present falling hazard concerns outstanding.

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 published listings; *Seismic Priority List 1,* which are buildings that should be retrofitted as soon as practical, and *Seismic Priority List 2,* which triggers the project's seismic retrofit when any construction work other than maintenance is performed

notwithstanding code allowances. Of the more than 200 buildings priority-listed since inception, the current published listing (revised July 9, 2012) contains 32 Priority List 1 entries and 44 Priority List 2 entries. To accurately reflect existing conditions, projects are removed from the priority lists only when completed.

The following projects merit special note:

CSU East Bay, Warren Hall. We are pleased to report that Warren Hall, long our most pressing seismic concern, has been funded for demolition and replacement as a part of the 2011-2012 state funded capital outlay program. Additional details on the schematics for the new replacement facility are anticipated to be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval in January 2013 with the demolition scheduled for July 2013.

Warren Hall is presently vacated except for a small cadre of essential campus functions that remains operational pending relocation. These functions are: the main campus telephone switch gear in the basement, campus IT servers on the third floor, and various telecom antennas on the roof. Although most operational maintenance can be performed remotely, support staff will periodically continue to visit these three areas on an as-needed basis. While not presently occupied, library fixtures and equipment still remain in the two-level bridge over the campus loop road (the bridge is structurally part of Warren Hall). The Seismic Review Board, in written correspondence, recommends a complete vacation of all Warren Hall spaces and observes that, until demolition, a building fall line hazard remains.

Cal Poly Pomona CLA building. The CLA tower facility remains a priority List 1 concern. State capital outlay funds have been requested, since 2011-12, but have not been included in a governor's budget.

2012-2013 Capital Outlay Budget. Using remaining general obligation bond funds, the legislature approved funding for (1) Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Crandall Gymnasium (Seismic), (2) CSU Los Angeles Seismic Upgrade, Administration, and (3) Humboldt State Seismic Upgrade, Van Duzer Theatre. FEMA grant matching funds were sought but were not awarded to the CSU.

3. Perform periodic re-evaluation of existing facilities. The last comprehensive systemwide seismic assessment was completed in 2008. Since then buildings have been reviewed and evaluated on an individual basis when there has been a basis for reconsideration either in new knowledge or observed building performance. The results of these individual evaluations are reflected in the periodically updated Seismic Priority Lists. A future systemwide comprehensive seismic review is anticipated after the publication of the upcoming triennial

California Building Code update (2013-2014), contingent upon the availability of state capital outlay funding.

4. Provide peer review for all major construction. Each major capital and minor capital project constructed under CSU authority is both code reviewed and separately, and independently, seismically peer reviewed. The California Building Code includes separate provisions for new construction and for renovation work on state building projects. The code contains triggering criteria that have the practical effect over time of systematically raising the level of seismic safety for our existing building stock whenever significant modifications, alterations or additions are undertaken. The Seismic Review Board closely monitors this compliance as a part of its peer reviews.

5. Have in place a Seismic Event Response Plan. When a significant seismic event occurs, predefined CSU and Seismic Review Board actions are triggered. Initial damage assessments by campus first responders are promptly relayed to Chancellor's Office senior management and the CSU building official/chief of architecture & engineering. The Seismic Review Board chairman confers with potentially affected campuses to determine if an on-site presence by the Seismic Review Board is warranted. If so, the chair of the Seismic Review Board is pre-designated and empowered to act as a special deputy building official to make campus police-enforceable building occupancy posting assessments in the immediate post-earthquake period regarding the safety of buildings where structural damage has occurred. Once initial life-safety assessments are made, follow-up structural repair strategies can be developed.

6. Conduct seismic related staff training. CSU facilities planning, design and construction staff are afforded training on project management, building code, building official responsibilities and seismic emergency response and assessment procedures. Systemwide building official training was last conducted in September 2010.

   This November, CPDC hosted a systemwide facilities management conference that included training/management sessions on comparative structural systems.

Summary of 2011-2012 Seismic Review Board Activities

1. The Seismic Review Board met four times during this period. Consistent with past practice, two meetings were held at campus locations to maintain familiarity with potential concerns, planned projects and projects in progress:

   San José State University (June 2011)
   Office of the Chancellor (September 2011)
   Moss Landing (San José State University) (April 2012)
   Office of the Chancellor (July 2012)

2. Reflective of the reduced capital program the CSU is confronting, a reduction from the past practice of six meetings to three meetings for the upcoming year is currently budgeted. Upon consideration of this meeting schedule the Seismic Review Board agreed to hold an additional meeting at no cost to the CSU, absorbing these costs in the members' stipends. They will be proceeding in this same manner for the 2012-2013 fiscal year.

3. With the Seismic Review Board's 20th anniversary approaching the issue of succession planning was raised at its April meeting. All members unreservedly anticipate being willing and able to offer several years of additional service. Given the member's exemplary service, we expect to continue renewing existing appointments. Since its inception, board membership has been remarkably stable with withdraws limited to three members who elected to retire. In the future, should a member elect to withdraw, or board activity merit expansion, the board will identify several prospective candidates for consideration by the assistant vice chancellor.

4. The Seismic Review Board remains available and continues to provide seismic and structural engineering technical support to the Chancellor's Office and campuses. This was in part evidenced by their assistance in reviewing CSU applications for FEMA seismic mitigation grant proposals during the period.

5. The Seismic Review Board peer review system remains in place. Peer reviews continued and were completed for construction projects in accordance with trustee policy. This includes all new construction and all renovation projects that modify the structural characteristics of existing structures, regardless of their extent.

6. The Seismic Review Board was active and participated in voting capacity on the technical structural review committees that are charged to create the structural appendices (ASCE-41) that will be adopted as a part of California's future building codes. The Seismic Review Board continues to take a proactive role in this regard and provides significant technical input to the development of state building code requirements.

7. Modest technical updates during the 2011-2012 reporting period were made to improve the trustees' *CSU Seismic Requirements*.

8. The CSU seismic retrofit priority list is regularly evaluated and periodically updated. The current edition is dated July 9, 2012. Projects are removed as renovations/demolitions occur and new listings are added as conditions warrant. Several of these listings are seen as correctable at a cost below the minor capital project threshold ($610,000). Current budget constraints continue to severely limit available funds for such renovations.

The current trustees' *CSU Seismic Requirements* and *Seismic Priority Lists* are available online at: http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/ae/review/seismic_peer.shtml

9. During this reporting period there were no significant seismic events that impacted CSU campuses.

10. The Seismic Review Board continues to provide technical and review support to other state institutions and departments. Historically this has included interaction at a systemwide level with the president's office of the University of California and directly with select UC campuses, the Department of General Services, the Division of State Architect, and the California Community Colleges.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2014-2015 through 2018-2019

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 2014-2015 through 2018-2019 categories and criteria, which is consistent with those approved by the board last year.

For 2014-2015, campus presidents concur with the staff recommendation to focus the CSU request on the systemwide programs to fund minor capital outlay and infrastructure improvements. Seeking these funds aims to address the aging infrastructure by reinvesting in existing buildings and distribution systems.

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 2014-2015 through 2018-2019 in Attachment A of Agenda Item 6 of the November 13, 2012 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
2014-2015 through 2018-2019 State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

General Criteria

A campus may submit a maximum of one major capital project for the 2014-2015 budget year, and one project for the 2015-2016 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 2016-2017 through 2018-2019 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 based on 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 the systemwide minor capital outlay and infrastructure improvement programs.

B. Modernization/Renovation

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

II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

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

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

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

Summary

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

1. **California State University, Bakersfield—Student Housing**
   Project Architect: Steinberg Architects
   Design-Build Contractor: Bernards

Background and Scope

California State University, Bakersfield proposes to award a design-build agreement for a new 500-bed Student Housing, Phase I complex located in the northeast quadrant of the campus on a 7.5-acre site bordering the north side of Kroll Way and the eastern perimeter of the campus. The project consists of three four-story residential buildings (#54) totaling 133,008 GSF, and one 11,998 GSF single-story support facility.

The residential units will provide 89 suites with 356 beds in two double-occupancy bedrooms and 24 suites with 144 beds in two triple-occupancy bedrooms. The housing complex will accommodate 12 resident adviser suites and a two-bedroom apartment for the resident director. Administrative offices and residential common spaces including public restrooms, lounges, classrooms, study rooms, a multi-purpose room, a game room, and a laundry facility will also be incorporated. The central courtyard will create opportunities for independent and group study, while providing residents with active outdoor areas for recreational activities.

The buildings will be wood-frame construction with concrete slab foundations. The exterior skin of the residence halls will consist of brick veneer and prefinished corrugated metal panels to minimize the maintenance cost and life cycle cost of the buildings. The exterior materials and architectural features of the complex have been designed to complement the campus palette and climatic conditions.

The project incorporates several features that promote energy conservation and sustainable building practices. The building is designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold equivalency. It will incorporate operable windows that maximize natural light and ventilation. High performance glazing, along with sun shades, will help reduce solar heat gain. The bathrooms will utilize water-saving plumbing fixtures including low-flush toilets and solar hot water panels on the roofs will reduce the domestic hot water annual energy costs.

Other significant features will include energy efficient light fixtures and controls to reduce energy costs for lighting. The building energy model is designed to outperform Title 24 requirements by at least 20 percent. Drought tolerant native planting will be incorporated as well as smart controllers to automatically determine the irrigation schedules based on climatic conditions.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	March 2013
Working Drawings Completed	October 2013
Construction Start	November 2013
Occupancy	February 2015

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	145,006 square feet
Assignable Building Area	98,208 square feet
Efficiency	68 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost ($206 per GSF)		$ 29,912,000
Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)	($ per GSF)	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 5.59	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$ 59.61	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$ 39.94	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$ 69.19	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 2.84	
f. Special Construction	$ 2.18	
g. General Conditions	$ 26.93	
Site Development		1,907,000

Construction Cost	$ 31,819,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	7,414,000
Total Project Cost ($268 per GSF)	$ 39,233,000
Group II Equipment	2,078,000
Grand Total	$ 41,311,000

Cost Comparison

The Student Housing, Phase I building cost of $206 per GSF is less than the CSU construction cost guidelines for residence halls of $222 per GSF (including Group I). It is also less than comparable projects such as the CSU Northridge Student Housing, Phase I project approved in September 2007 at $292 per GSF and the Humboldt State University Housing, Replacement and Addition, Phase I project approved in April 2008 at $215 per GSF, both adjusted to CCCI 5950. The lower costs of this project are due to the simplified design of suites (no kitchens) and the absence of food service facilities.

Funding Data

The proposed project will be funded through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program, housing program reserve contributions of $500,000, and an $8 million internal loan from the Affordable Student Housing Revolving Fund (ASHRF) loan program. The total project cost of $41,311,000 reflects the project budget as approved at the March 2012 Board of Trustees meeting. Housing revenue will repay the loan and the bond financing.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared in conjunction with the campus master plan for California State University, Bakersfield and approved by the Board of Trustees in September 2007. No new environmental analysis is required because the effects of the project were fully analyzed in the 2007 FEIR. Copies of the FEIR, the Initial Study, and the Finding of Consistency are available for review online at CSU Bakersfield Master Plan CEQA Documents and at the California State University, Bakersfield, Facilities Planning, Development and Operations office.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The California State University, Bakersfield Student Housing project was evaluated pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The Finding of Consistency analysis has determined that no further environmental documentation is required since all potential significant effects have been analyzed adequately in the Master Plan Program Final EIR, no new or increased, previously undisclosed, potential significant impacts have been found, and therefore no new mitigation measures are required to mitigate impacts disclosed in the previously certified Master Plan Final EIR.

3. Mitigation measures set forth in the previously approved Master Plan Program Final EIR by the Board of Trustees shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act.

4. A Finding of Consistency has been prepared for the California State University, Bakersfield, Student Housing project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

5. The project will benefit the California State University.

6. The schematic plans for the California State University, Bakersfield, Student Housing are approved at a project cost of $41,311,000 at CCCI 5950.

2. California State University, Fresno—Faculty Office/Lab Building
Project Architect: Paul Halajian Architects

Background and Scope

California State University, Fresno proposes to construct a new two-story Faculty Office/Lab Building (22,183 GSF) on the northwest side of campus adjacent to the Aquatics Center (#13F) and the North Gym (#13). The first floor of this building (#13G) will provide lecture space for the department of kinesiology and research laboratories and faculty offices for the physical therapy department. The Department of Finance has been asked to approve a modification to add six additional faculty offices and administrative space to the first floor to support the new doctoral program in physical therapy.

The second floor will house faculty offices for the Colleges of Health and Human Services and Physical Education. The scope also includes a self-instruction computer lab, locker rooms and 23 academic/athletic faculty offices. This will provide gender equitable space and logical adjacencies to accommodate men's and women's sports programs in compliance with Title IX.

The building will be constructed using a steel moment frame on spread footings and grade beams. Exterior materials, including an insulated metal panel rain screen system and cement board panels, were selected based on thermal performance, cost effectiveness and long term maintenance factors. The design will feature the use of daylight in interior spaces using clerestory windows, high performance glazing and a standing seam metal roof.

The building is designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver equivalency by using a combination of sustainable features including HVAC efficiency, energy efficient light fixtures, and recycled content materials. Site improvements include hardscape and landscaping around the project site including an accessible path of travel.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	January 2013
Working Drawings Completed	May 2013
Construction Start	June 2013
Occupancy	August 2014

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	22,183 square feet
Assignable Building Area	15,443 square feet
Efficiency	70 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5732

Building Cost – State Funded ($340 per GSF)	$ 7,542,000

Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)	($ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 11.50
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$ 136.41
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$ 29.62
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$ 109.99
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 16.00
f. Special Construction	$ 2.52
g. General Conditions	$ 33.95

Site Development	639,000
Construction Cost	$ 8,181,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	2,484,000
Total Project Cost ($481 per GSF)	$ 10,665,000
Group II Equipment	405,000
Grand Total	$ 11,070,000

Cost Comparison

The Faculty Office/Lab Building project's building cost of $340 per GSF at CCCI 5732 is comparable to the CSU construction cost guidelines of $339 per GSF (includes Group I) for faculty office buildings even though the building includes a wet lab, locker rooms, and computer lab spaces.

Funding Data

The project is funded from General Obligation Bonds approved in 2010 for preliminary plans and working drawings, and from Lease Revenue Bonds approved in 2011-2012 for construction. Funding for Group II equipment ($383,000) has been requested from the state for 2013-2014. The requested scope modification for an additional 2,058 ASF will be funded from donor funds on deposit with the Fresno State Foundation.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

The project is categorically exempt and a Notice of Exemption has been recorded with the State Clearinghouse.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment and the project will benefit the California State University.

2. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fresno, Faculty Office/Lab Building are approved at a project cost of $11,070,000 at CCCI 5732.

3. California State University, Fresno—Jordan Research Building
Project Architect: ZGF Architects

Background and Scope

California State University, Fresno proposes to construct the Jordan Research Building (#210) which will provide 29,846 GSF of dedicated research space on a five-acre site. The project site is located at the southeast corner of Barstow and Willow Avenues, adjacent to other university agriculture research related facilities. Currently, the project site houses the non-operational feed mill and hay storage facilities which will be demolished as a part of the project scope.

This three-story building will support collaborative research initiatives in the disciplines of agricultural sciences and technology, engineering, science and mathematics. The first floor will have dry labs and project space for graduate students and researchers in addition to a training room. The second and third floors will contain wet labs along with required support equipment and storage areas. The floor plans are designed for flexibility to accommodate a number of different research projects.

The primary structural design will be a steel braced frame system with concrete spread footings and slab on-grade for the first floor. Floors two and three will consist of concrete over composite deck to provide the required damping. The building will utilize a rain screen exterior wall assembly for optimal thermal and moisture performance. The primary cladding includes both smooth and articulated pre-cast concrete panels punctuated by two-story openings framed by metal panel fascia and infilled with curtain wall.

The building has targeted aggressive energy reducing strategies through envelope performance and high-efficiency HVAC systems and lighting. Glazing will be insulated with a low-emission coating for optimal solar control and high insulation value. Ultra low-flow plumbing fixtures will reduce water consumption and the building will be dual-piped to facilitate a future connection to a planned campuswide reclaimed water system. Additionally, the structural frame and interior finishes will utilize high recycled content materials. Site improvements include hardscape and xeriscopic landscaping surrounding the project site, including a small parking lot and pedestrian accommodations to ensure an accessible path of travel.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	February 2013
Working Drawings Completed	September 2013
Construction Start	February 2014
Occupancy	June 2015

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	29,846 square feet
Assignable Building Area	17,773 square feet
Efficiency	60 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost ($484 per GSF)		$ 14,454,000
Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)	($ per GSF)	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 10.39	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$ 150.10	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$ 52.64	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$ 157.41	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 47.34	
f. Special Construction and Demolition	$ .23	
g. General Conditions	$ 66.16	
Site Development		2,783,000
Construction Cost		$ 17,237,000
Fees, Contingency, Services		5,130,000
Total Project Cost ($749 per GSF)		$ 22,367,000
Group II Equipment		1,499,000
Grand Total		$ 23,866,000

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of $484 per GSF is comparable to the CSU construction cost guidelines for engineering lab buildings of $479 per GSF at CCCI 5950 (including Group I). The project's exterior shell is slightly higher due to the combined use of pre-cast concrete panels, metal fascia, rain screens and curtain walls.

Funding Data

The project will be funded entirely from donor funds from the estate of Lowell and Hannibal Jordan.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. The public review period closed on May 19, 2011. Written comment letters were received at the close of the public review period and responses were prepared as part of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The concerns raised in these comment letters were found to have a less than significant impact. The final documents for the Jordan Research Building can be reviewed online at the following links:
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared to address any potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the California State University, Fresno, Jordan Research Building, and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified in the Final Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and state CEQA guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which requires that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project that the mitigated project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment and the project will be constructed with the recommended mitigation measures as identified in the mitigation monitoring program, 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, Fresno, Jordan Research Building are approved at a project cost of $23,866,000 at CCCI 5950.

4. San José State University—Student Health and Counseling Facility
Project Architect: Ratcliff Architects
Design-Build Contractor: Blach Construction

Background and Scope

San José State University proposes to construct a new facility (#116) to house the Student Health Center and Counseling Services. The project site is a vacant lot located at the northwest corner of Paseo de San Carlos and 7th Street, adjacent to Spartan Complex East (#46).

The existing Student Health Center provides basic outpatient and primary care services to students and employs 45 practitioners and administrators. The current center occupies 14,627 GSF of the Health Building (#38), which also serves as the home for the nursing program. Counseling Services provides mental health services with a staff of 20 and occupies 5,500 GSF of the Administration Building (#30). The new facility will join the Student Health Center and Counseling Services in a shared site for an overall student health services program.

The proposed facility (52,700 GSF) will house pharmacy, wellness center, physical therapy, counseling services, and administrative offices, plus three clinical areas. The three-story building will be fully sprinklered with a prefabricated steel moment frame structure designed to support flexibility and efficiency in the space layout. The project will feature glass walls along the east façade, providing open vistas to the main public corridor on all three levels. Each floor will have receptionist control and internal corridors to maintain privacy for counseling and clinical services.

The building design is contemporary yet incorporates elements such as brick and precast concrete that are compatible with the historical palate of adjacent buildings. The project will include extensive landscaping with tree-lined malls and sequestered gardens and will meet design standards equivalent to a U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold rating by incorporating high efficiency HVAC, windows and lighting controls, bio swales, and high recycled content materials.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	January 2013
Working Drawings Completed	May 2013
Construction Start	June 2013
Occupancy	December 2014

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	52,700 square feet
Assignable Building Area	31,053 square feet
Efficiency	59 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost ($401 per GSF)		$ 21,111,000
Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)	($ per GSF)	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 19.03	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$ 96.62	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$ 78.82	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$ 119.79	
e. General Conditions	$ 86.32	
Site Development		2,816,000
Construction Cost		$ 23,927,000
Fees, Contingency, Services		8,316,000
Total Project cost ($612 per GSF)		$ 32,243,000
Group II Equipment		2,000,000
Grand Total		$ 34,243,000

Cost Comparison

The project building cost of $401 per GSF is less than the CSU construction cost guideline of $419 per GSF for health clinic buildings at CCCI 5950 and higher than the $350 per GSF at CCCI 5950 for the CSU San Marcos Student Health and Counseling Services Building, presented for board approval at this same meeting. The higher building cost is due in part to the cost of the drilled pier foundation substructure and the more costly exterior enclosure including rated glass window walls, brick and precast concrete. The building interiors with a multi-story atrium and skylights also contribute to the higher building cost.

Funding Data

This project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program and a health center program reserve contribution of $9,389,000.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. The public review period began on June 14, 2012, and closed on July 13, 2012. No comments were received on the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The final documents are available online at:
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared to address any potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures and comments associated with approval of the San José State University, Student Health and Counseling Facility, and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified in the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and state CEQA Guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines which requires that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project that the mitigated project as approved will not have a significant impact on the environment and that the project will be constructed with the recommended mitigation measures as identified in the mitigation monitoring program, 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 San José State University, Student Health and Counseling Facility are approved at a project cost of $34,243,000 at CCCI 5950.

5. California State University San Marcos—Student Health and Counseling Services Building
Project Architect: HMC Architects
Design-Build Contractor: CW Driver

Background and Scope

California State University San Marcos proposes to construct the Student Health and Counseling Services Building (#21). Student health services were originally located on campus in the first floor of the main administration building, Craven Hall (#1). These services moved off campus in January 1997 due to space constraints and are now located in leased space on the corner of Twin Oaks Valley Road and Craven Drive. Rather than extend a lease that will expire in 2015, the campus proposes to build a facility in a location on campus near the hub of student activity.

The proposed two-story 19,000 GSF building will be located in the north central area of campus adjacent to the new parking structure (#103) and the University Student Union (#25) under construction, and across the street from University Village Apartments (#38). The project site will act as a conduit for students traveling between the parking structure and the student union. The project scope includes examination rooms, medical offices, counseling and administrative spaces arrayed between north and south wings, with a central pedestrian bridge. This building design will allow for future expansion.

The structural system will be a steel-braced framed building system, with concrete block and masonry exterior wall systems used for building sheer walls and site supporting retaining walls. Foundations will use concrete slab on grade with spread footings.

The building is designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification. Sustainable features will include a cool roof, natural and energy efficient lighting, and recycled content materials. Well water will irrigate the water efficient landscaping.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	March 2013
Working Drawings Completed	May 2013
Construction Start	June 2013
Occupancy	October 2014

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	19,188 square feet
Assignable Building Area	12,581 square feet
Efficiency	66 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost ($350 per GSF)		$ 6,712,000
Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)	($ per GSF)	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 6.41	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$ 78.02	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$ 29.50	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$ 122.63	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 11.15	
f. General Conditions	$ 102.10	
Site Development (including landscape)		788,000
Construction Cost		$ 7,500,000
Fees, Contingency, Services		1,952,000
Total Project Cost ($493 per GSF)		$ 9,452,000
Group II Equipment		484,000
Grand Total		$ 9,936,000

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost at $350 per GSF is less than the CSU construction cost guidelines for health clinic buildings ($419 per GSF, including Group I) and less than the San José Student Health and Counseling Facility at $401 per GSF at CCCI 5950, presented for board approval at this same meeting. The lower building cost is due in part to the cost effective building skin and interiors.

Funding Data

This project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program and a health center program reserve contribution of $4,484,000. The related debt service will be repaid

by an increase in health center facility fees. Health center fees were increased by $44 per year in 2004-2005 by student referendum to fund the project.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. The public review period began July 25, 2012, and closed August 23, 2012. Written comment letters were received at the close of the public review period and responses were prepared as part of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Comment letters were received relating to cultural resources. The Mitigated Negative Declaration indicates that a Cultural Resource Study was previously prepared for the campus which determined that there are no known undisturbed archaeological or historic sites. All concerns raised in these comment letters were found to have a less than significant impact. The final documents are available online at:
Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared to address any potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the California State University San Marcos, Student Health and Counseling Services Building, and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified in the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. The Final Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and state CEQA Guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which requires that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project that the mitigated project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment and the project will be constructed with the recommended mitigation measures as identified in the mitigation monitoring program, 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 Marcos, Student Health and Counseling Services Building are approved at a project cost of $9,936,000 at CCCI 5950.