

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 19, 2013
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of January 22, 2013

Discussion Items

1. Status Report on the 2013-2014 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
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
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

January 22, 2013

Members Present

Peter Mehas, Chair
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair
Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor
Kenneth Fong
Bob Linscheid, Chair of the Board
Lou Monville
Gavin Newsom, Lieutenant Governor
J. Lawrence Norton
Jillian Ruddell
Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the November 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

Status Report on the 2013-2014 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget

Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra F. San Juan presented a report on the 2013-2014 State Funded Capital Outlay Program. The governor's budget for capital outlay supports equipment funding of \$3.6 million from old general obligation bond funds for four projects compared to the trustees' request of \$520 million. Ms. San Juan highlighted the funding need for infrastructure improvement projects. The utilities infrastructure project at CSU Fresno, the highest ranked campus infrastructure improvement project in the CSU capital program, had an electrical infrastructure failure over the holiday break closing the campus for three days.

Trustee Monville asked whether these infrastructure improvement projects, if not funded, may result in campus closures. Ms. San Juan responded in the affirmative. Trustee Monville suggested that the deferred maintenance projects be categorized and reported as such to the board to distinguish those that are health and safety; threaten campus closure; etc.

Ms. San Juan reported that the governor's budget proposed a significant change in that the CSU (as well as University of California) be responsible for paying its annual debt service on general obligation bonds and lease revenue bonds from its support budget appropriation. Specific

changes in the proposed budget bill would give the CSU authority to use support appropriations to design and construct capital projects. The proposal, allowing the CSU to address capital needs based on support budget funds would be a major departure from current practice. The governor's proposal would have the CSU submit projects to the Department of Finance for approval and would proceed with no further approvals.

Trustee Monville asked if reform of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was included in the governor's proposal. Ms. San Juan answered that a follow up with general counsel is needed on the interpretation of the language which is very broad. Trustee Monville noted having a comparison of the cost of the broad interpretation versus strict could be useful in discussions with Sacramento agencies.

Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom inquired if the CSU has prepared a program to seek funding via Prop 39 for energy efficiency opportunities as they relate to capital dollars. Ms. San Juan responded that the CSU prepared a \$160 million project proposal that went to the Department of Finance late 2012. Chancellor's Office staff met with Assembly Member Das Williams to further discuss how the CSU would use the funds for its energy efficiency program. However, it appears from the governor's budget that the Prop 39 funds went to K-14.

Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom noted the University of California is aggressively seeking Prop 39 funds and thinks CSU should as well. He asked Ms. San Juan to follow up with an email regarding this opportunity for energy efficiency funds.

Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision and Amendment of the 2012-2013 Non-State Funded Capital Outlay Program for the Motel Real Property Acquisition for the California Maritime Academy

Ms. San Juan presented the action item to approve the campus master plan revision and amendment of the 2012-2013 non-state funded capital outlay program for the motel real property acquisition for the California Maritime Academy.

Thomas A. Cropper, President, Cal Maritime, explained the importance of the property acquisition. First, it would provide greater access to on campus residential living which has proved to accelerate graduation rates and release the *Golden Bear* from service as a residence hall and return it to the institution for teaching and research. Second, the campus can complete the property purchase with cash from housing reserves the cost of anticipated renovation would be afforded by new campus residents at current housing. Third, the motel, located at the entrance to the campus, is an eyesore and the target of numerous calls to the police for various criminal activities. The acquisition would eliminate the eyesore which affects the surrounding community as well as Cal Maritime.

Trustee Monville encouraged the board to approve the acquisition.

Trustee Ruddell urged the board to vote in favor for the project as well.

Chair Linscheid asked about the anticipated CEQA process and associated cost. Ms. San Juan responded that a mitigated negative declaration is planned and that it would cost in the neighborhood of \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Lieutenant Governor Newsom asked the approximate cost of the property. President Cropper responded that the seller asserts that the property appraises at \$3.1 million. Lieutenant Governor Newsom questioned using \$3.1 million in housing reserves for the acquisition versus deferred maintenance or some other pressing priority. President Cropper stated that the campus has built up its reserves and is prepared to make this investment which will help students graduate faster and provide them with a quality campus residential life while in school.

Trustee Achtenberg expressed her support for the acquisition having visited the campus on numerous occasions. She sees the acquisition as an important investment in both the sustainability and reputation of the campus in addition to providing an appropriate living environment for the students.

Trustee Monville asked if the cost of residential housing is less than shipboard housing and whether the current use of the ship for housing has limited the educational uses of the ship. President Cropper agreed that the cost per student in residential housing is less (than onboard the ship). He also concurred that the campus has been limited in its ability to use the *Golden Bear* for educational purposes for the cadets as well as a research platform.

Chair Linscheid commented on justifying the demand for more student beds. In addition to the previously stated need with students living on the *Golden Bear* and others in off-campus housing, he recently met with the Veterans Administration where the number of veterans being discharged from service into California over the next five years should bear a significant impact on applications to Cal Maritime and other CSU campuses.

Governor Brown reflected back to when he served as the governor of California the first time, 30 years ago during the Reagan administration, and there were serious considerations to close the Maritime Academy; he sees the proposed acquisition as a positive investment for the campus which is so unique and important to California.

Lieutenant Governor Newsom further asked would the proposed housing be for existing students or new students; is the property definitely for sale or could it be subject to improvements; and, is the quoted appraised value the real number or is it much higher reflecting costs to upgrade and renovate the property.

President Cropper responded that the new property would only accommodate 100 students and thus there would still be a shortage of on campus housing for existing students. He is doubtful that an entity would make improvements to the motel property President Cropper went on to state that the investment for the acquisition would have multiple paybacks: much needed land, improved campus entrance, increased number of on campus student beds; all within Cal

Maritime's capacity based on student fees at current rates.

Chancellor White stated that the proposed acquisition successfully measures up to three areas of evaluation: first, the campus is financially able to afford the acquisition without state funds; second, it has been proven that students living on campus are more likely to succeed in both graduation and entering the workforce; and third, on an environmental level, this acquisition will change for the positive the current 'first look' for students and the community as they approach Cal Maritime.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-13-01).

Approval of Schematic Plans

With an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan presented the approval of schematic plans for California State University, East Bay—Warren Hall Replacement Building. All CEQA requirements for the project have been completed and staff recommends approval.

Leroy Morishita, President, CSU East Bay, noted the iconic structure has been essentially vacant since January 2012. The replacement building will consolidate critical services and add 113 faculty offices. The building completion will also enable the removal of 15 temporary buildings.

Trustee Monville asked how will the vacated site (following demolition of the existing Warren Hall) be used. President Morishita responded that perhaps in the long term another structure funded from private funds would be constructed; in the short term, the site will be landscaped and a plaque for the Warren family installed.

Chair Linscheid asked Ms. San Juan to explain construction management at risk, the delivery method for the project. Ms. San Juan explained construction management at risk, commonly referred to as CM@Risk, is a collaborative delivery approach which brings in the contractor early in the project, ideally before schematic design, to provide input on the architect's design. The use of CM@Risk delivery method (versus design-bid-build) has resulted in the participation of quality contractors who previously would not bid on a CSU project and fewer claims and litigation.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-13-02).

Trustee Mehas adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2013-2014 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

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

Summary

This item presents an update on the current status of the CSU's 2013-2014 state funded capital outlay program request, summarizes comments from the Legislative Analyst's Office on the governor's budget proposal, and includes an analysis on the funding for capital outlay.

Trustees' Request

The California State University's proposed state funded 2013-2014 capital outlay program was presented at the September 2012 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved the entire state funded priority list (38 projects) of \$520 million for the 2013-2014 capital outlay program. Of the \$520 million amount, program documentation for 21 projects totaling \$390.3 million, including seismic safety, renovation, new capacity and equipment programs, has been submitted to the Department of Finance.

The trustees were asked to approve the program even though program funding is uncertain and relies upon the governor's and legislature's approval of lease revenue bond financing, lease asset transfer financing, and the use of remaining general obligation bond funds.

Governor's Budget

The governor's budget released on January 10 proposed the use of \$3.6 million of remaining general obligation bond authority to fund the equipment (E) phase for four projects included in the CSU Capital Outlay Program, thus completing the funding needs for those projects:

Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Bakersfield	Art Center and Satellite Plant	E	\$ 533,000
Fresno	Faculty Office/Lab Building	E	\$ 383,000
Maritime	Physical Education Replacement	E	\$1,295,000
San José	Spartan Complex Renovation (Seismic)	E	\$1,428,000
Total			\$3,639,000

The construction funding for these projects was approved by the legislature in 2008-09 (Bakersfield and Maritime) and 2011-12 (Fresno and San José) and will be funded from Public Works Board lease revenue bonds. The two projects approved in 2008-09 were delayed due to the state's suspension of capital projects in December 2008.

As discussed at the January 2013 Board of Trustees' meeting, the governor has also proposed a change to the CSU support budget whereby the current practice of the state to separately budget and annually adjust the debt service for general obligation and lease revenue bond financing for CSU capital improvement projects would change and no longer be budgeted separately. The governor proposes to fold these appropriations into CSU's base budget to provide a fiscal incentive to factor these costs into the CSU's fiscal outlook and decision-making process.

Legislative Analyst's Office's Position Regarding the Governor's Budget Proposal

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) has taken no position on the four projects included in the governor's proposed capital outlay program for the CSU. However, the LAO report, *The 2013-14 Budget: Analysis of the Higher Education Budget*, recommends rejecting the governor's proposal to combine universities' capital and support budgets based on the following findings:

- ***Proposed Rationale to Change Capital Outlay Budget Process.*** The proposal suggests the incentive to combine the capital and support budgets is to provide greater flexibility to universities given limited state funding. However, as the proposal fails to identify any specific problems with the current capital outlay policy, and falls short in showing how it would improve the existing capital outlay program, the LAO could not support the proposed change.
- ***Proposed Shift of Capital Program Control from the Legislature.*** A result of the proposal would remove the legislature from its current role in approving state capital programs for each segment. The CSU would still submit programs to the Department of Finance, but there would no longer be oversight and approval by the legislature ensuring the priorities of the state as a whole are being met versus the singular goals of the institution. This could result in less funding allocated to university capital programs in deference to other perceived needs.
- ***Ongoing Bond Debt Service Amount Determination Based Upon One Fiscal Year.*** The proposal uses the presumed debt service funding for one fiscal year (2013-14) as the amount of debt service funding to be added to the annual base budget. The state's total debt service for general obligation bonds and lease-revenue bonds for the University of California, Hastings, and the CSU has increased 64 percent over the

past decade¹, yet no substantive evidence is provided to suggest that the selected amount (\$198 million for the CSU) is appropriate to meet the future needs of the university, nor has any methodology been offered on how to evaluate and adjust that number moving forward.

Legislative Questions Regarding Governor's Budget Proposal

The governor's proposal would provide increased authority for the CSU to address support and capital budget priorities; however, during the Senate and Assembly budget overview hearings for the CSU, legislative members asked questions like the following:

- 1) What is the governor's proposal trying to fix?
- 2) Why is the proposal removing approval by the legislature for capital budgets?
- 3) Is the level of presumed debt service adequate for CSU's long term needs?

From a CSU perspective, on-going discussions with the executive leadership will further formulate the university's formal response to such questions. In framing the CSU's response to question one, the following issues were identified:

- a. Based on the age of university buildings, there is a need to re-invest funds to replace building and infrastructure systems that have passed their useful life. The CSU estimates renewal and reinvestment needs at \$1.7 billion.
- b. The last statewide general obligation bond was approved by the voters in 2006.
- c. The legislature has approved limited use of Public Works Board lease revenue bonds for critical projects absent general obligation bond funds.
- d. While the state is emerging from its fiscal crises, the governor remains concerned about the "wall of debt" and capital outlay funding will continue to be limited.
- e. The state has to balance and weigh its capital priorities which include not only higher education, but K-12 education, transportation, and water infrastructure, to name a few.
- f. The CSU does not have access to local bonds like the California Community Colleges – it is estimated that over \$13 billion in capital bonds have been approved by the voters for local community college districts.

The increased authority proposed by the governor could help the CSU address the lack of re-investment into the CSU physical plant by expanding our authority to issue debt. The Department of Finance recently released draft Trailer Bill language to implement the governor's proposal, and staff will continue to monitor and report on this as more information and analysis becomes available.

¹ Legislative Analyst's Office, *The 2013-14 Budget: Analysis of the Higher Education Budget*, p. 19, figure 10, Debt Service costs for Universities Have Increased Significantly

As to the second question on the proposed removal of legislative approval, the Department of Finance has clarified the proposal:

- a. If general funds are proposed for a project, the CSU will submit a written report of project scope and the proposed funding, due July 1.
- b. Department of Finance would review and approve.
- c. The role of the legislature was silent; however, it could be modified to include the review and/or approval by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.
- d. In the following April, the CSU would provide to Department of Finance a status report.

The CSU would modify the current process of submitting Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals to Department of Finance and aim to simplify the amount of detail provided per project. This should be relatively easy to accomplish.

To answer the third question regarding the adequacy of proposed funding, a graph is provided (below) to summarize the information on current and planned debt.

The Department of Finance is proposing to increase the CSU's support budget by \$198 million to fund the annual general obligation bond debt service for state facilities. This amount has not previously been in the CSU budget, but is paid by the state based on the bonds that have been approved by the voters in statewide ballot measures. The general obligation bond debt will remain an obligation of the state.

In addition to general obligation bond debt, lease revenue bond financing has been issued by the state Public Works Board to fund capital projects. The legislature is able to approve Public Works Board bond financing for CSU capital projects. The annual debt service amount (due to the financing structure is also called a "rental payment") is estimated at \$90 million for 2013-14 and is typically funded by the state as part of the CSU Support Budget appropriation.

The combined general obligation and Public Works Board lease revenue bond debt service amount of \$288.6 million will increase to \$324.7 million by 2016-17 based on bonds sold to date. The proposed block grant funding approach by the governor will need to cover this cost increase in addition to planned general obligation bond and Public Works Board bond debt service increases, which include:

No.	Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
1	Channel Islands	West Hall	C	\$38,021,000
2	Chico	Taylor II Replacement Building	C	\$52,891,000
3	Fresno	Faculty Office/Lab Building	C	\$ 9,819,000
4	Monterey Bay	Academic Building II	C	\$41,291,000
5	Various	2013-14 Equipment	E	\$ 3,639,000
6	Systemwide	Infrastructure Improvements (May Revise request for 2013-14)	PWC	\$22,800,000
7	Various	2014-15 Equipment (planned)	E	\$ 7,925,000
	Total			\$176,386,000

The debt service is estimated to increase by another \$14 million for the above noted projects. The projects numbered one through four were previously approved by the legislature for \$142,022,000 of Public Works Board lease revenue bond financing and are currently headed for a spring 2013 bond sale. Items five through seven are projects proposed to utilize remaining general obligation bond funds including the proposed 2013-14 equipment requests of \$3,639,000 million (noted earlier in this agenda item).



The graph of the existing and planned debt service as it changes over time shows the governor’s proposal to provide \$288.6 million annually to fund the CSU capital outlay program is not sufficient. It is not sufficient to cover the existing debt service for prior bond sales and is not sufficient to pay for projects approved by the legislature that have not been included in a bond sale. The estimated shortfall is at its greatest in 2016-17 at \$50.1 million.

Lastly, this level of funding does not take into account the need to re-invest in our facilities and to renovate buildings to accommodate the academic program. The trustees will need to consider this expected capital debt obligation and funding need in addition to other support budget priorities such as enrollment and compensation in the budget deliberations.

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

The trustees previously approved these projects to be included in the capital outlay program. This item seeks approval of the schematic plans for three projects:

1. California State University, Northridge—Student Housing, Phase II
Design/Build Team: CW Driver/AC Martin Partners

Background and Scope

California State University, Northridge proposes to construct a new 396-bed student housing project located in the northeast quadrant of the campus adjacent to the existing University Park Apartments complex (#180-182). The first phase, a 400-bed 'Freshman Suites' project, opened in fall 2009 with the specific intention of improving student success through a residential model that encourages student interaction and fosters a sense of community. Follow-up studies with residents of the first phase have demonstrated the project's success in promoting student engagement and improving academic success and student retention.

Phase II has been designed to meet the goals established by the 2006 master plan to develop student housing designed for first-time freshmen and continue the campus's progress in improving student outcomes. In addition, the project will provide growth and diversity in the campus student housing stock, both of which are important goals of the campus master plan. The project consists of two four-story buildings connected with common walls and one five-story building (#158), together comprising 92,700 GSF and a remodeled 1,000 GSF section of a single-story community center constructed in Phase I.

There will be 192 double-occupancy rooms with 384 beds distributed among the three "houses" with one single-occupancy resident advisor room per floor providing a total of 396 beds. Each house will have its own entry, study lounge, social/community room, and laundry. The five-story building includes multi-purpose rooms, community kitchen and a security counter on the ground floor. The first floor of the five-story building serves as a podium for one house and is constructed in concrete while the four residential floors of the three houses will be of wood

framed construction. The single-story community center (#182) will be remodeled to serve as a coffee shop with terrace seating. Exterior building finishes will be cement-plaster with accent areas of cement board siding and metal sunshades. Existing campus parking will provide for the parking needs of the new housing residents.

The buildings' orientation and massing will limit the impact of wind and create a sheltered central courtyard area, an outdoor projection wall, shade trees with seating, power outlets for student laptops and a water feature that serves as a bioswale.

Energy conservation is addressed through shading via overhangs on the commons building, day-lighting in rooms and common areas, and the use of high-efficiency light fixtures and energy saving controls. The project's mechanical systems are energy efficient and optimized by the use of energy management control systems located in each room. Additional energy efficiency measures include maximum insulation values for walls and roofs and enhanced window performance from double-glazed windows with low emission coatings. The design also specifies low-flow showerheads and automatic faucet shut-offs. Storm water run-off is mitigated through natural filtration and diffusion to landscaped areas. This building will be designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	April 2013
Working Drawings Completed	July 2013
Construction Start	November 2013
Occupancy	April 2015

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	93,689 square feet
Assignable Building Area	62,000 square feet
Efficiency	65.81 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost (\$239 per GSF)	\$ 22,412,000
-------------------------------	---------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	(\$ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 9.05
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 71.14
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 56.54

d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 67.79
e. Special Construction	\$.42
f. General Conditions	\$ 34.28

Site Development (includes Landscape)	<u>2,871,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$ 25,283,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>7,633,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$351 per GSF)	\$32,916,000
Group II Equipment	<u>1,500,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$34,416,000</u>

Cost Comparison

The Student Housing, Phase II building cost of \$239 per GSF is greater than the \$206 per GSF building cost for the CSU Bakersfield Student Housing project, approved in November 2012 at CCCI 5950, primarily due to the smaller ratio of students to bathrooms and the additional cost of the concrete podium level in the five-story house.

Funding Data

The proposed project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program and from housing program reserves (\$12,705,950). Housing revenue will repay the bond financing.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

This project was included in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the California State University, Northridge master plan revision which was certified by the trustees in March 2006. The university has completed an addendum to the master plan FEIR in June 2012. The addendum determined that implementation of the Student Housing, Phase II project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than those identified in the 2006 master plan FEIR. An additional environmental analysis is not required because any additional effects of the project not previously identified or analyzed in the FEIR were fully analyzed in the addendum to the 2006 FEIR. This project is consistent with all required mitigation measures in the 2006 FEIR. Although CEQA does not require circulation of an addendum to a certified EIR, the university has circulated the document to the local neighborhood council and city council office in order to inform the community of campus development. A copy of the FEIR and the addendum will be available at the meeting.

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 March 2006 California State University, Northridge Master Plan Final EIR and the Addendum completed in June 2012 for the California State University, Northridge, Student Housing, Phase II project, have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The project before this board is consistent with the project description as analyzed in the Addendum to the previously certified Final EIR and does not propose substantial changes to the original project description, which would require major revision to the Final EIR or Findings adopted by this board in certifying said Final EIR.
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 not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
4. The mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge Student Housing, Phase II are approved at a project cost of \$34,416,000 at CCCI 5950.

2. San Francisco State University—Recreation and Wellness Center

Project Architect: WRNS
CM @ Risk: CW Driver

Background and Scope

San Francisco State University proposes to construct a Recreation and Wellness Center (#98) on the northern edge of campus, on a sloping site along Winston Drive. The new facility is located on the combined sites of the former Sutro Library building, which will be demolished as part of this project's scope, and Lot 25, a surface parking lot.

The three-story, 118,618 GSF facility includes a two-court gymnasium, one multi-activity court, a climbing wall, weight and fitness space, an elevated jogging track, indoor recreation and lap

pools, and related support space. The project includes rough-grading for future softball and recreation fields. As part of this project, a new 20-foot-wide pedestrian tunnel will be constructed to connect the site to the main campus by traversing under Winston Drive.

The site gradient is accommodated by retaining walls and an engineered foundation that steps down the slope resulting in a building that ranges from one to three stories in elevation. The exterior cladding consists of glazed window wall systems, glass fiber reinforced concrete panels, terra cotta rain screen system and exposed architectural concrete walls. The primary structural system consists of steel framing with concrete decks.

Sustainability features include the reduction of the existing storm water flow rate by 25 percent, net zero water use goal for landscape, high-performance glazing, certified wood products and low-emitting materials. Other conservation measures include displacement ventilation to maximize cooling without air conditioning, cogeneration for heating hot water, demand-based control ventilation, low-flow plumbing fixtures, building and site plumbing for recycled water use, occupancy sensors and dimming daylighting controls, and LED underwater lighting for the pools. This building will be designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	July 2013
Working Drawings Completed	March 2014
Construction Start	July 2014
Occupancy	January 2017

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	118,618 square feet
Assignable Building Area	87,302 square feet
Efficiency	73.64 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost (\$409 per GSF)	\$ 48,572,000
-------------------------------	---------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	(\$ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 55.89
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 108.61
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 57.71
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 92.83
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 16.66

f. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 30.10
g. General Conditions	\$ 47.69
Site Development (includes Landscape)	<u>10,504,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$ 59,076,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>18,410,000</u>
Total Project cost (\$653 per GSF)	\$ 77,486,000
Group II Equipment	<u>3,000,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$ 80,486,000</u>

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$409 per GSF is comparable to the CSU Northridge Student Recreation Center at \$395 per GSF, approved September 2008 and the CSU East Bay Recreation Wellness Center at \$423 per GSF, approved November 2008, both adjusted to CCCI 5950. This project's higher cost (than the Student Recreation Center at CSU Northridge) is primarily due to the drilled caisson foundation and retaining wall system required to accommodate the sloping site.

Funding Data

This project will be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program and student union program reserves of \$25,128,000. The bond financing will be repaid from student body center fee revenue which the university has been collecting since fall 2010. The fee increase was approved through the alternative consultative process in 2010. Student body center fees are being gradually increased commencing 2010-11 with an initial increase of \$70 per year to \$320 per year once the facility opens in 2017.

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 October 2, 2012 and closed on October 31, 2012. One comment letter was received from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission relating to storm water, sewer, recycled water, and irrigation. A letter from San Francisco State University was prepared in response which conveyed that the project will result in a decrease in total storm water volume as compared to

existing conditions, and will not significantly impact the sewer system. The project will utilize recycled and non-potable water as feasible and incorporate water efficient landscaping and irrigation. 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 Francisco State University Recreation Wellness Center, 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, that the project will be constructed with the recommended mitigation measures as identified in the mitigation monitoring program, and that the project will benefit the California State University. The Board of Trustees makes such findings with regard to this project.
 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 Francisco State University Recreation Wellness Center are approved at a project cost of \$80,486,000 at CCCI 5950.
- 3. Sonoma State University—Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons/MasterCard Pavilion**
Project Architect: Mark Cavagnero Associates
CM @ Risk Contractor: Rudolph & Sletten, Inc.

Background and Scope

Sonoma State University proposes to construct the MasterCard Pavilion Structure (#52A) located within the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons at the Green Music Center (#52). The MasterCard Pavilion amphitheater will be located at the northeast corner of the main campus

within the nine-acre commons area bordered by the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Hall on the west, Rohnert Park Expressway on the north, Petaluma Hill Road on the east and Copeland Creek to the south. The project will complete the hardscape, landscape and supporting infrastructure master planned for the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons for the arts at the Green Music Center. The project as presented herein reflects a reduced scope in both size and cost from the item for same project (amend non-state) approved by the board in November 2012.

The project will construct a 42,000 GSF outdoor performance venue, including a 6,000 GSF performance shell and stage, acoustical banners, theatrical lighting on stage, stage rigging, and an amphitheater audio-visual package. The project scope includes table seating on a 20,900 GSF terraced amphitheater for 4,000 patrons for informal seating, with a surrounding lawn area accommodating an additional 6,000 attendees, for a total audience capacity of 10,000 patrons.

Improvements within the commons area will include concession pads, accessible pathways and fire lane, way-finding signage, site lighting on egress pathways and step lighting on the terraced lawn seating area, landscaping, and dedicated loading and tour bus support areas. Supporting infrastructure will provide required electrical, data, plumbing, irrigation, sanitary sewer, fire protection, domestic water, and storm drains.

The design of the performance shell will complement the Weill Hall and blend with the surrounding foot hills. The pavilion will consist of a concrete base with a steel structural frame supporting roof trusses with a stretched fabric roof covering in a color scheme that complements the campus architectural palette. The pavilion base and the performance shell wing walls will be concrete with a rustic form board finish. Sustainable features include high efficiency lighting and the use of reclaimed water for all landscaping and fire hydrants.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	July 2013
Working Drawings Completed	October 2013
Construction Start	April 2014
Occupancy	April 2015

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	42,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	42,000 square feet
Efficiency	100 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 5950

Building Cost (\$107 per GSF)	\$ 4,478,000
<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	
	(\$ per GSF)
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 10.02
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 35.52
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 4.31
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$ 18.12
e. Equipment and Furnishings	\$ 28.57
f. General Conditions	\$ 10.07
Site Development (includes Landscape)	<u>5,414,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$ 9,892,000
Fees, Contingency, Services	<u>3,429,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$317 per GSF)	\$13,321,000
Group II Equipment	<u>2,379,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$15,700,000</u>

Cost Comparison

The building cost of \$107 per GSF is less than the CSU cost guide for typical theater arts buildings as the proposed project is less complex. No comparable CSU structures have been built recently and the CSU construction cost guide does not include comparative systemwide costs for open air amphitheater structures.

Funding Data

The project will be funded through a corporate sponsorship negotiated with MasterCard Worldwide, fundraising, and ticket fee revenue generated by the venue. Use of bond financing or commercial paper is anticipated and will be repaid from future payments received from the MasterCard corporate sponsorship and ticket fee revenue.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

Facilities for a music center were addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Sonoma State University Master Plan revision which was certified by the trustees in May 2000. The university completed an Addendum to the FEIR in February 2013 for the Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision and Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons/MasterCard Pavilion project. It identified minor changes and determined that implementation of this project

would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts as outlined in Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. The project is consistent with required mitigation measures as previously certified.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The May 2000 Master Plan Final EIR and the February 2013 Addendum to the EIR, prepared for the Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision and Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons/MasterCard Pavilion, has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The project before this board is consistent with the previously certified May 2000 Master Plan Final EIR as well as with the February 2013 Addendum to the EIR prepared for the Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision and Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons/MasterCard Pavilion.
3. With implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the master plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment beyond those described in the May 2000 Master Plan Final EIR, and the project will benefit the California State University.
4. The schematic plans for the Sonoma State University, Joan and Sanford I. Weill Commons/MasterCard Pavilion project are approved at a project cost of \$15,700,000 at CCCI 5950.