AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 10, 2001
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Daniel N. Cartwright
Frederick W. Pierce, IV
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of May 16, 2001
Approval of Minutes of June 4, 2001

1. Amend the 2001/2002 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded *Action*
2. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, *Information*

Discussion Items

3. Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
4. Progress Report on California State University Capital Outlay Projects, *Information*
5. Revised California State University Policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management and Energy Consumption Reduction Goal for 2004/2005 Compared to 1999/2000, *Action*
6. Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2003/04-2007/08, *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
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

May 16, 2001

Members Present

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chairman of the Board
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Members Absent

William D. Campbell

Other Trustees Present

Roberta Achtenberg
Martha C. Fallgatter
Debra S. Farar
Robert Foster
William Hauck
Neel I. Murarka
Dee Dee Myers

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction
Freda Hinsche Otto, Administrative Officer in Charge, University Advancement

Chair Wang greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 9:55 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 21, 2001, were approved as submitted.

Status Report on the CSU Energy Management Program and the California Energy Crisis

At the request of Chair Wang, Assistant Vice Chancellor Patrick Drohan reminded the committee members that the purpose of this item was to brief them on how the California State University (CSU) is responding to the California energy crisis. He introduced Mr. Mark Gutheinz, chief of plant, energy and utilities, capital planning, design and construction, to present the item.

Mr. Gutheinz stated that over the past 20 years, the CSU has earnestly pursued energy conservation and management. As early as 1979, the CSU has saved 123 million kWh beyond the Title 24 standard requirements through conservation efforts and projects. Typically, these projects were lighting retrofits, variable speed drives, thermal energy storage, cogeneration, and the implementation of energy management systems.

Mr. Gutheinz noted that even as the campuses have grown, the energy use per gross square foot has been more and more efficient. Staff has seen some increases over the past two years, and after studying the situation, attributes it to (1) additional evening classes requiring additional lighting, heating and cooling loads; (2) increased technology infrastructure, additional cooling load related to that infrastructure, and technology in general; and (3) the fact that added space has been put on line as a result of the capital improvement program focusing on science facilities.

Currently, the CSU's primary focus is on the electrical energy market. Mr. Gutheinz stated that the CSU currently has a contract with Enron Energy Services that covers 19 campuses plus the Office of the Chancellor. The CSU is in litigation with Enron to retain its direct access status, which we feel is a primary goal to keep future low-priced power for the university system. Mr. Gutheinz continued to say that there are a number of contract provisions that are being retained that will help us maintain our contract pricing advantage, strategic energy plan development, energy data analysis programs, and the ability to use Enron as an energy service company contractor to provide contracting services for our projects. The Enron contract expires March 31, 2002, at which time the CSU hopes to have a direct access contract that will incorporate both electricity and gas.

Mr. Gutheinz stated that the current CSU conservation efforts include compliance with the governor's executive order that asks for a 10 percent reduction in energy consumption; the directives of the Department of General Services in Management Memos 99-13, 00-06, 00-13, and 01-01; campus strategies on adjusting operational days; and involvement in a number of summer initiatives for demand reduction. The demand reduction program will reduce campus demands across the system up to 10 megawatts and will bring funding to the campuses. Another program that campuses may enter into is the optional binding mandatory curtailment program. Mr. Gutheinz said that this program allows a campus to commit to a certain amount of reduction, and if performed, they will not be exposed to rolling black outs.

Just as important as the electrical market, the CSU is also studying the gas market and making strategic moves to protect the university system. Mr. Gutheinz informed the committee members that the CSU has entered into a one-year portfolio contract with the Department of General Services that provides gas for 18 campuses. The portfolio is comprised of 16 percent of a fixed gas price, 40 percent of a capped gas price, 24 percent of a floating gas price, and a 20 percent option to convert to a known price. This portfolio is designed for the CSU to hedge the increases and decreases that are taking place within the market. In addition, the CSU is developing an RFP for a long-term gas contract that will hopefully be coupled with the electrical direct access contract.

Mr. Gutheinz indicated that the CSU campuses are looking at their existing emergency plans and adding procedures to those plans in the case of rolling blackouts this summer. Current calculations estimate as high as 55 days of rolling blackouts will occur this summer. In the event of an extended electrical grid failure and even the possibility of a natural gas curtailment, there is a notification process in place that allows the ISO, utility companies, and the Chancellor's Office to provide information to the campuses on a timely basis alerting them to a stage 1, 2 or 3 event. The campuses will report back to the Chancellor's Office and staff will summarize on a monthly basis all of the events that have occurred during the summer months.

The CSU's overall action plan consists of a number of components—the securing of long-term electrical and gas contracts; participation in demand reduction programs, including the optional binding mandatory curtailment program; exploration of emerging and existing technologies in the areas of micro turbines, next generation solar cells, load shifting, and cost-effective cogeneration and distributive generation processes; and continuing campus conservation efforts.

Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Mr. Drohan briefly reviewed this item's handout report noting that the Senate has approved all of the CSU proposed capital outlay projects and the Assembly has approved all but two projects. Staff will continue to work toward the approval of all projects. He brought to the committee member's attention some of the budget adjustments that occurred in the May Revise.

Approval of an Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the International Polytechnic High School at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan presented the item as printed in the agenda.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 05-01-09).

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amend Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the National Training Center/Sports Complex at California State University, Dominguez Hills

With the use of a slide presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. In conclusion, he indicated that the extensive CEQA process had been completed and complied with, thus allowing staff to recommend approval of the project.

Due to the large number of people wishing to speak to this item, Chair Wang stated that unless he heard any objections from the committee members, the speakers would abide by the proposed rules. One hour will be allocated for those wishing to speak against the project and one hour for those wishing to speak in favor of the project. Each speaker who submitted a timely request pursuant to the trustees' rules will be given three minutes, all others will be permitted two minutes, and the sound of the bell will indicate when their time had expired. A speaker could not give his or her time to another speaker. The speakers were called in the order that the secretariat received their letters of request. Anyone not able or desiring to speak could submit a statement to the secretariat reflecting his/her position. There would not be a public hearing at the plenary session.

Chair Gould stated that he would continue to abstain from making any comments on this project since they might be perceived as a conflict of interest.

There being no objections, the proposed rules were adopted and the committee proceeded to hear twenty-four (24) people in opposition to the project: Robert Leslie, Rita Boggs, H. R. Norwood, Mike Rasberry, Mike Mitoma, Gil Smith, Daryl Little, Steve Bivens, Stuart Pardau, Richard Close, Cindy Grager, Herb Johnson, Marguerite Carter, Louise Campbell, Harry Barron, Shirley Conley, Judy Brantley, Doris Reed, Margaret Hudson, Chris Bradley, Linda Wyatt, Mary Blassingame, Nicole Hinston, and Philip Kone; and seventeen (17) people in support of the project: Jerome Groomes, Bill Brown, Rudy Vanterpool, Ricardo Pulido, Isaac Canales, Brian Raber, Nadine Gills-Ward, Clifford Cannon, Ledgis Williams, Rova Williams, Sybil Lewis-Brown, Linda Pickle, Tommie Williams, Doris Wilson, Carl Robinson, John Goolsby, and James Gaines.

President Lyons commented that he resides in Carson, supports this project and in the long run, if approved, we will look back and realize that this project was very important for the CSU Dominguez Hills community. At the same time, he realizes that he was hired to head up CSU Dominguez Hills, not a sports complex, and that the university and its teaching and learning process is of foremost importance. President Lyons takes the expressed issues very seriously and does not intend to do anything that would put the students' lives in jeopardy or be destructive to the campus. He was comforted by the fact that the majority of the citizens of Carson support the project.

Due to the complexity of the issues raised and the tremendous amount of public comment, Trustee Galinson proposed the following resolution:

> **RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the consideration of this agenda item is continued to a meeting to be noticed in the next 10-21 days. No further public comment will be taken at this meeting.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
Continued from May 16, 2001

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

June 4, 2001

Members Present

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Ralph R. Pesqueira, Vice Chair
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of the Board
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Members Absent

William D. Campbell
Frederick W. Pierce IV

Other Trustees Present

Roberta Achtenberg
Martha C. Fallgatter
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Dee Dee Myers
Anthony M. Vitti

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction
Freda Hinsche Otto, Administrative Officer in Charge, University Advancement

Chair Wang greeted the audience and called the continued meeting to order at 10:50 a.m.

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amend the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the National Training Center/Sports Complex at California State University, Dominguez Hills

Assistant Vice Chancellor Patrick Drohan, capital planning, design and construction, introduced Mr. George Pardon, vice president for administration and finance, CSU Dominguez Hills, to give a visual presentation focusing on three areas—land uses, master plan related project benefits, and a summary of the environmental issues that have been addressed for this project.

Mr. Pardon stated that in addition to the three areas to which Mr. Drohan referred, the presentation would include a review of the economic benefit not only for CSU Dominguez Hills but also to the city of Carson and the surrounding communities.

This project is envisioned to: create a world class sports complex in a campus setting for national athletic programs as well as for university and community use; build excellent facilities for both amateur and professional athletes in tennis, soccer, track and field, cycling, basketball, and volleyball; provide a permanent home for national sports federations; create national prestige for the city and university; and enhance participation in sports and greater awareness of health, fitness and wellness from athletic competition at local, regional, national and international levels.

As a result of the campus's land use review, Mr. Pardon informed the committee members that the university's ability to achieve its master plan capacity of 20,000 FTE is not compromised by this project. CSU Dominguez Hills has 346 acres of land that includes a significant amount of undeveloped land.

Mr. Pardon reviewed the major elements of the project and the acreage utilized for each element. They are 1) soccer stadium–12 acres, 2) tennis stadium–4 acres, 3) velodrome–3 acres totalling 19 acres of the development, and 5) 66 acres in surface-level improvements including practice fields (basketball, baseball, softball, and in-line skating), tennis courts, and parking.

The extensive use of proposed landscaping and park-like settings provided at the entrance to and around the proposed venues was noted.

Mr. Pardon indicated that the significant community benefits that will be derived from the project include employment opportunities during construction and operation, facilities for community and university use, new tax dollars, national prestige for the city and the university, the encouragement of additional retail development (restaurants and new housing demand), and new hotel demand.

He continued by saying that the Economic Research Associates provided an estimate of the potential economic activity that includes $112 million in private investment (no public funds requested), the creation of over 2,300 new jobs and $250 million in economic activity during construction, $375,000 in new taxes paid directly to the city of Carson annually, over $63 million in economic activities per year once operational, and the development will also be a catalyst to stimulate other new economic growth including hotels and restaurants.

In addition to the community benefits, Mr. Pardon noted that the economic benefits to the university include a minimum annual rent of $200,000, $1 million donation by the developer over the first four years to the university foundation, new and upgraded campus athletic facilities valued at over $5 million, 3,900 additional new parking spaces valued at $4 million that will be available to the campus when not required for events, and an annual savings to the university of approximately $100,000 in costs by using the soccer stadium for graduation ceremonies.

The ability to attract new students, use of the facilities by student athletic programs, contributions to student life on campus, and the possible expansion of the university's curriculum were other benefits to the university cited by Mr. Pardon.

With respect to the number of events held per year, Mr. Pardon informed the committee members that when initially constructed, the soccer stadium will have a 20,000-seat capacity and the tennis stadium will have an 8,000-seat capacity. Since the larger events create the significant environmental impacts, the developer has agreed to limit the number of events with over 5,000 attendees in the soccer stadium to 50 events per year.

Mr. Pardon noted that the environmental impacts have raised a lot of concerns and it is the university's position that the concerns have been properly addressed. The community outreach efforts for this project have been significant with over 100 meetings held with campus organizations, homeowners' associations, community-based organizations, and public agencies and departments. He said that meetings have been held with public officials, commissions and committees in the city of Carson, business organizations and stakeholders. The university and the developer are committed to a community outreach program on an ongoing basis.

Fire and policy protection reviews have led to mitigation measures that the fire and safety agencies believe will protect the community from risk. Mr. Pardon is in receipt of a copy of a letter addressed to the City Council, Carson City, from Los Angeles County Sheriff Lee Baca endorsing the project and stating that he is confident that an appropriate public safety plan has been developed for the venue.

The California Environmental Quality Act requires the EIR to examine a worst-case scenario. Air quality impacts were attributable almost entirely to automobile traffic. Of the 31 intersections analysed, the EIR cites two intersections with significant impacts. Mr. Pardon indicated that further expert analysis shows that, using typical wind direction and wind speed conditions, ambient air quality conditions resulting from the project are unlikely to exceed California Ambient Air Quality Standards.

In analysing the traffic and parking impacts, several project conditions were included—event and non-event days, AM-PM peak hour traffic periods, direction of approach, vehicle occupancy, accessibility of parking areas, cumulative effects pertaining to new and proposed adjacent developments, and university activities and growth. Mitigation measures include the addition of 3,900 new parking spaces, and when added to the 4,000 existing campus parking spaces, there will be 7,900 spaces available for major events. Also, there is a requirement to maintain an open emergency access route and fire lane. Mr. Pardon stated that an off-site traffic and parking management plan will be created by the developer, CSU Dominguez Hills' Office of Public Safety, city of Carson, and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department.

Mitigation measures addressing light, glare and noise concerns include below grade design of the stadium bowls, limitations on maximum decibel levels from speaker systems as well as limits on the size of speakers, limiting increases in noise levels in adjacent areas, using narrow beam and hooded field and stadium lights to reduce light and glare, and significant use of venue landscaping to screen light and glare.

Mr. Pardon stated that additional measures have been taken to address neighborhood concerns. In particular, the university has asked for and the developer has agreed to provide traffic, parking and other neighborhood improvement measures even where the EIR concluded there would not be significant impacts requiring mitigation. The following improvements have been offered to these three neighborhoods: **University Heights—**temporary or permanent gating at the two neighborhood entrances, dedicated security staff during major events, landscaping approved by the homeowners for the 50 foot setback areas, pressure washing all homes during construction and creation of a scholarship fund; **Carson Harbor Village—**two new access driveways (Victoria and Albertoni) and creation of an on-street permit parking program; and **Colony Cove Mobile Home Park—**new driveway access to Albertoni and additional landscaping along Victoria Street.

President Lyons thanked the trustees for agreeing to come to the continued meeting. It was his belief that the day would be one of the most significant days in the history of CSU Dominguez Hills. He noted that there were concerns raised at the May 16th meeting of Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds and the university has attempted to respond to them. Discussions continue between the developer, Anschutz Southern California Sports Complex, LLC (ASC), and the neighborhood associations. President Lyons said that he is in receipt of a June 1, 2001, letter addressed to Chancellor Reed from the president of ASC that commits the organization to continued discussions with the community. The university has stressed the fact that ASC needs to remember and respect the concerns of the citizens of Carson who live in the neighboring community.

President Lyons intends to submit requests to the Anschutz Foundation for funding support in areas of similar interest in both the academic and library areas.

Trustee Goldwhite thanked staff for the additional material sent to the trustees prior to the continued meeting that answered their concerns for this project. He pointed out that this sports center is a controversial project in that it will impact the lives of those living near the university. After reading the material and listening to the presentation, it was his decision that the benefits out weigh the concerns and he would be voting in the affirmative for this project.

Trustee Galinson stated that this is a very important project for the university and the community. It was his intent to vote for the project but he intends to hold the developer to their word to continue working with the neighboring community to mitigate any problems that still exist or may arise.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 06-01-10.)

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2001/02 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2001/02 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. California State University, Long Beach
University Office Building **PWC** **$992,000**

CSU Long Beach wishes to proceed with the design and construction of an office building to be located within the existing corporation yard. It is sited as Building No. 80 on the master plan map. The proposed facility will be one-story containing 6,000 gross square feet. The building is steel framed with brick veneer to match the established campus architecture. The structural system will be purchased through the "California Multiple Awards Schedule" contract. The proposed project will initially provide space for approximately 25-30 individuals engaged in the implementation of the student administration module of the Collaborative Management System (CMS) over the next three years. Upon completion of that effort, the building's interior will be modified to house the University Police Department. The campus investigated leasing space for the CMS implementation at nearby commercial sites. The costs for leased space for the projected thirty months were nearly half the cost of the proposed permanent facility. The university believes that the permanent building is a better use of resources. Funding for the project will be provided through university trust and foundation funds.

2. California State University, Northridge
Parking Structure I **PWC** **$14,000,000**

CSU Northridge needs additional parking for the growing campus population. A parking feasibility study by Kaku Associates recommends construction of two new parking structures to meet current and future needs. The first parking structure (Parking Structure I) will contain approximately 1,500

spaces providing a net increase of 1,000 spaces. It will be constructed on the western edge of the campus on the existing surface lots and will serve major classroom buildings in the Business and Education Complex. A request for the second parking structure will be presented to the trustees at a future date. The proposed project will be funded by tax-exempt revenue bonds with the debt service funded from the fees collected from the Parking Program revenue. The Board of Trustees will be requested to approve the bond financing for the project at a subsequent meeting.

3. San Diego State University
Renovate Cox Arena and Aztec Recreation Center **PWCE** **$1,700,000**

San Diego State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a renovation to the Cox Arena and the Aztec Recreation Center (ARC), which are operated by the Associated Students. The current recreation center opened on July 9, 1997 and was designed for a forecasted 8,000 members. It currently has over 14,000 members. This growth has caused a demand for additional laundry facilities**,** a solution to long lines at the service counters, and more office facilities. The ARC renovation project will meet the goals of increasing the service counter space, relieving space congestion, modifying office space to house added staff, and improving the laundry and towel service areas. Improvements to ADA access will be made with automatic doors to allow for independent and rapid access to the facility. Several internal functions will be combined to make the entire space function more efficiently. Cox Arena was also completed in 1997 and needs additional restrooms and concessions at the ground level. All of the concessions and restrooms are currently at the top level of the arena requiring lower level patrons to climb numerous stairs to these facilities. With the completion of the Aztec Athletic Center, the offices occupied by the Department of Athletics in Cox Arena will no longer be necessary. These offices will be turned over to the Cox Arena facilities and operations staff to be renovated to provide restrooms and concessions at the ground level of the arena. Funding for this renovation project will come from the San Diego State University Associated Students' Student Union Net Revenue Account.

4. Sonoma State University
Recreation Center Building **PWCE** **$14,114,000**

Sonoma State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new recreation center building as requested by the students in a referendum that was passed during Fall 2000. Bonds will be issued through the CSU Board of Trustees to finance construction of the proposed project to be located in the south-central area of the campus. This project will be the first phase of a building complex master planned as The University Center (#35). It will contain three gymnasium courts, a fitness area, multi-purpose areas, lockers, common areas, offices and support areas. The building will have approximately 45,050 assignable square feet and 52,063 gross square feet. The project will

comply with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act and will be designed to incorporate energy efficient and environmentally sustainable architectural features.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

> **RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2001/02 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: $992,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Long Beach, University Office Building; and $14,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Northridge, Parking Structure I; and $1,700,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the San Diego State University, Renovate Cox Arena and Aztec Recreation Center; and $14,114,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the Sonoma State University, Recreation Center Building.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Pursuant to Board of Trustees' policy, this information item provides the annual report on CSU's compliance actions required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Background

The Board of Trustees must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in assessing the potential environmental impacts of CSU development projects. The board is the "Lead Agency" for all CEQA approval actions, and the chancellor is delegated responsibility for implementing actions to ensure compliance for campus development projects. The assistant vice chancellor of Capital Planning, Design and Construction has delegated authority to approve certain capital projects and their related environmental compliance documents (primarily Negative Declarations).

Attachment A lists CSU compliance actions during 2000. In summary:

- One Mitigated Negative Declaration and five Negative Declarations were certified.

- Three new Environmental Impact Reports were certified for significant master plan revisions at Pomona, San Luis Obispo and Sonoma. Previously certified EIRs covered major capital outlay projects at Channel Islands, Fresno, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, and San Marcos.

- Three Categorical Exemptions were filed. There were other exemptions filed by campus staff for minor capital outlay projects that are not included on Attachment A.

No substantial amendments to the basic statutes were enacted during the 2000 legislative session.

During this reporting period, Channel Islands, Pomona, and San Diego participated in public/private and public/public joint-venture projects. EIR documentation for public/private projects continues to be subject to added scrutiny from the local community.

Capital Planning, Design and Construction is overseeing an update to the CSU Environmental Impact Review Procedures Guidelines and Handbook collectively referred to as "CSU CEQA". The *Guidelines* require board approval and are being updated pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title14, Division 6, Sections 15000 et seq. and are applied to proposed CSU capital outlay projects and leases. The updated *Handbook* does not require board action, but will serve as the "CSU CEQA" instructional and application tool for the campus staff and consultants.

This update is the first comprehensive review of "CSU CEQA" since September 1990 and is being prepared by Cotton/Bridges/Associates, Inc., Urban and Environmental Planning Consultants. The review process has included extensive consultation between staff at the 23 campuses and the chancellor's office. A committee comprised of staff from the campuses and chancellor's office is also conducting peer reviews of the developing "CSU CEQA" documents. The primary goal of the update in addition to incorporating the latest changes to the California Administrative Guidelines is to make the *Handbook* a more user friendly and streamlined guide to campus facilities administrators.

The updated "CSU CEQA" will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the November 2001 meeting.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ANNUAL REPORT

January 2000 through December 2000

	CEQA Action Prepared					
	EXEMPT	MIT. N.D.	N.D.	E I R	BOT ACTION	NOD FILED
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHANNEL ISLANDS						
Master Plan				v	7/19/2000	7/20/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO						
Department of Justice Crime Lab Schematic Plans			v		1/26/2000	1/28/2000
Event Center Schematic Plans				v	1/26/2000	1/28/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON						
Student Housing Expansion Schematic Plans			v		5/10/2000	5/11/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD						
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES						
Bookstore/Dining Services Building Schematic Plans	v				5/10/2000	5/11/2000
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY						
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MONTEREY BAY						
Science Academic Center Schematic Plans	v				3/15/2000	3/16/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE						
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA						
Master Plan Revision				v	7/19/2000	7/20/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO						
Regional & Continuing Education Building Schematic Plans			v		9/20/2000	9/21/2000
Capital Public Radio Building Schematic Plans			v		11/9/2000	11/10/2000
Parking Structure II Schematic Plans			v		11/9/2000	11/10/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO						
Coachella Valley Off Campus Center Initial Campus Master Plan						
and Phase I Schematic Plans				v	5/10/2000	5/11/2000
Student Housing Expansion Schematic Plans				v	7/19/2000	7/20/2000
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY						
Chem, Geology, Bus Admin. and Math Bldgs. Reno Schematics	v				3/14/2000	3/15/2000
Athletics Administration Bldg/Hall of Fame Schematic Plans				v	5/10/2000	5/11/2000
Parking Structure 6 Schematic Plans				v	5/10/2000	5/11/2000
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY						
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY						
CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO						
Master Plan Revision/Student Housing				v	1/26/2000	1/28/2000
Student Housing Schematic Plans				v	7/19/2000	7/20/2000
Eng. & Arch. Renovation/Replacement Phase I Schematic Plans		v			9/20/2000	9/21/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS						
Field House/Student Union Offices Schematic Plans				v	3/15/2000	3/16/2000
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY						
Master Plan Revision and Schematics for Center of Musical Arts				v	5/10/2000	5/11/2000
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS						

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

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

A handout covering the Board of Trustees' 2001/02 state funded capital outlay program will be provided. A final report will be presented if the 2001/02 Budget Act has been enacted.

Status of actions at the time this item was prepared:

Trustees' Request	***Governor's May Revision***	***Legislative Analyst***	***Senate***	***Assembly***
$207 Million	$225 Million	$86 Million	$225 Million	$186 Million

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Progress Report on California State University Capital Outlay Projects

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item presents a summary of active CSU capital outlay projects.

Background

As requested by the Board of Trustees, a handout of all active state and nonstate projects will be provided. The information will illustrate each project's budgetary and schedule performance to-date.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Revised California State University Policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management and Energy Consumption Reduction Goal for 2004/2005 Compared to 1999/2000

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests Board of Trustees' approval of a revised CSU Policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management.

Background

In 1978, the Board of Trustees approved a policy statement on energy conservation that established a program plan for systemwide energy conservation. This initial plan established 1973/74 as the base year of recorded energy consumption and limited energy consumption measurement to electricity, natural gas and fuel oil. The total of the three energy sources was expressed in British Thermal Units (Btu). The initial goal was to reduce British Thermal Units per Gross Square Foot of building area per year (Btu/GSF-YR) by 40% by 1983/84 as compared to the 1973/74 base year. In November 1988, the trustees adjusted the comparison baseline year and established a new reduction goal of 15% to be implemented by fiscal year 1992/93 compared to 1986/87. Implementation of the policy was delegated to the campuses through CSU Executive Order No. 538.

In the 27 years since the program's implementation, the CSU has achieved an overall reduction of 33% compared to the 1973/74 base year. This achievement is particularly significant when: 1) enrollment has increased from 224,152 full-time equivalent students in 1973/74 to 281,782 full-time equivalent students in 1999/2000, a growth of 25.7%, and 2) the gross area of buildings and facilities increased from 24.98 million square feet to 52.40 million square feet, an increase of 109%. The overall cost avoidance estimated by the energy program for this period is $350 million.

Proposal

As was reported at the May 2001 Board of Trustees' meeting, energy conservation is of paramount importance considering the current energy crisis in California. As a leading public higher education institution in the state, the CSU has an obligation and a responsibility to lead the way in California's energy conservation effort. The CSU must continue to identify methodologies to render more efficient physical plant utilities operations for the years to come.

Based on a thorough analysis of the achievements of the energy program to date and the opportunities for additional gains in the future, the chancellor's office is recommending that a 15% reduction in energy consumption be established as a systemwide goal to be achieved by 2004/2005 using the adjusted comparison baseline year of 1999/2000. This reaffirmed goal is in keeping with the spirit of Governor Gray Davis' Executive Order D-15-00 directing state agencies to institute energy conservation measures that will reduce energy consumption to help avert severe electrical emergencies.

The CSU is actively participating in state sponsored demand reduction programs that will assist the state in maintaining the stability of the electrical transmission grid throughout California. These programs help avert rolling blackouts that would significantly affect the delivery of the educational programs at the CSU campuses.

With the Board of Trustees' approval of the reaffirmed 15% goal, the chancellor's office staff will develop a systemwide energy conservation database that will measure the reductions in energy consumption and provide valuable information to campus energy managers and chancellor's office staff as existing strategic energy plans are implemented. These plans would detail tactical recommendations in the areas of new construction, deferred maintenance, facility renewal, and energy projects, and contain a structured energy management plan. The success of these strategic energy plans will depend upon the identification of multiple funding sources in the public (federal and/or state) and private sector for financing the projects and programs.

Any elements associated with this policy and the subsequent action plans, which affect terms and conditions of employees, will be negotiated as necessary with the appropriate employee organizations.

Revised Policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management

The proposed CSU policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management follows (changes to the previous policy shown in italics):

General Provisions

1. All CSU buildings and facilities, regardless of the source of funding for their operations, will be operated in the most energy efficient manner without endangering public health and safety and without diminishing the quality of education.

2. All CSU campuses will continue to identify energy efficiency improvement measures to the greatest extent possible, undertake all necessary steps to seek funding for their implementation and, upon securing availability of funds, expeditiously implement the measures.

3. All future CSU new construction, remodeling, renovation and repair projects will be designed for optimum energy utilization, lowest life-cycle operating costs, and in compliance with all applicable energy codes (Enhanced Title 24 Energy Codes) and regulations. In instances where a project's current funding does not include energy features consistent with lowest life cycle costing, augmentations will be sought, when warranted. In the areas of specialized construction that are not regulated through the current energy codes, such as historical buildings, museums, and auditoriums, the CSU will apply prudent standards to ensure that these facilities are designed for optimum energy efficiency. Incorporation of energy efficient design features in the project plans and specifications will receive a high priority next only to meeting health, life-safety code elements and the academic program needs of the project within the available project budget.

4. The CSU will promote the use of cost-effective renewable and non-depleting energy sources, wherever possible, both in new construction projects and in existing buildings and facilities. *The campuses will consider implementation of load shifting technologies such as thermal energy storage.*

5. The CSU will take the necessary steps to provide adequate, reliable and cost-effective utilities infrastructure at all campuses for meeting the needs of the present and planned future buildings and facilities.

6. The CSU will actively seek all available sources of funding for implementing energy efficiency improvement and utilities infrastructure renewal projects. Funding sources will include federal and state budget appropriations, federal, state and private sector grants opportunities, and other unique public/private sector financing arrangements, which have been made available through legislative actions in California and the United States Congress. In the event these funding sources are unable to meet the requirements for an approved energy program, priorities within the existing support appropriations will be examined to determine if funds could be made available for project development purposes.

7. The CSU will cooperate with federal, state and local governments and other appropriate organizations in accomplishing energy conservation and utilities management objectives throughout the state; and inform students, faculty, staff and the general public of the need for and methods of energy conservation and utilities management.

8. Each CSU campus will designate an Energy/Utilities Manager with the responsibility and the authority for carrying out Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Programs. The Chancellor's Office will have the responsibility to coordinate the individual campus programs into a system-wide program.

9. The CSU will monitor energy usage on all campuses and the chancellor's office monthly, and prepare a system-wide annual report on energy utilization. The chancellor's office will maintain a systemwide energy database in which monthly campus data will be compiled to produce system-wide energy reporting. Campuses will provide the chancellor's office the necessary energy and utility data for the system-wide database in a timely manner.

10. *Each CSU campus will develop and maintain a campuswide strategic energy plan, which will include tactical recommendations in the areas of new construction, deferred maintenance, facility renewal, energy projects, and a structured energy management plan. This plan will drive the overall energy program at the given campus and should be renewed at 5-year intervals.*

11. To monitor the effects of energy conservation efforts on instructional programs and environment, the campus energy/utilities managers shall solicit and evaluate feedback from faculty, staff, and students. *Training on new energy management concepts and programs will be provided as necessary.*

12. *Campuses will maintain a portion of their emergency plan that takes into consideration short-term electrical outages, large-scale grid failures, and natural gas curtailments.*

Operations and Maintenance Provisions

1. Purchased energy resources on CSU facilities will not be used to heat above 68°F or cool below 78° F. Domestic hot water temperatures will not be set above 115° F. These limits will not apply in areas where other temperature settings are required by law or by specialized needs of equipment or scientific experimentation.

2. *Each campus shall operate and maintain a computerized energy management system that will provide centralized reporting and control of the campus energy related activities.*

3. Campus energy/utilities managers will make the necessary arrangements to achieve optimum efficiency in the use of natural gas, electricity, or any other purchased energy resources to meet the heating, cooling, and lighting needs of the buildings and/or facilities. Except for areas requiring special operating conditions, such as electronic data processing facilities, or other scientifically critical areas, where rigid temperature controls are required, buildings and/or facilities temperatures will be allowed to fluctuate between the limits stated above. Simultaneous heating and cooling operations to maintain a specific temperature in work areas will not be allowed unless special operating conditions dictate such a scheme to be implemented.

4. Scheduling of buildings and/or facilities (building) usage will be optimized consistent with the approved academic and non-academic programs to reduce the number of buildings operating at partial or low occupancy. To the extent possible, academic and non-academic programs will be consolidated in a manner to achieve the highest building utilization. Further, the scheduling of buildings will be implemented in a manner to promote central plant and individual building air conditioning system shutdown to the greatest extent possible during the weekend and other holiday periods. Campus energy/utilities managers will make all attempts to change or update building operating schedules to match the changes in the academic programs on a continuing basis.

5. All air conditioning equipment, including supply and return air fans, are to be shut off on weekends, holidays and for varying periods each night, except where it would adversely affect instruction, electronic data processing installations and other scientifically critical or 24-hour operations.

6. *Campuses will participate in State sponsored demand reduction programs, where practical, during periods of CAISO Stage Alerts. Reductions in non-critical loads will be made in an effort to aid in the state electrical grid integrity*.

7. Outdoor air ventilation will be set at *10 CFM/person* or such other higher limits as prescribed by State law or regulations. This restriction does not apply to situations where 100% outside air is called for by properly installed and tuned economizer cycles and in designated smoking areas where the rate may be as high as 15 CFM/person.

8. All windows in buildings and/or facilities that are air-conditioned will be kept closed and as secure as possible to prevent loss of conditioned air.

9. Portable electric heaters and fans are not to be used in CSU facilities unless specifically required by occupants because of medical conditions, failure of the building heating, ventilating or air conditioning systems, or when building heating, ventilating or air conditioning systems cannot be adjusted to achieve minimum comfort levels within the provisions established under Item No. 1. Campus energy/utilities managers will grant such exemptions on a case-by-case basis. Use of refrigerators for non-instructional purposes should be consistent with good energy management practices. Each campus will prepare their own guidelines on this area to discourage proliferation of personal refrigerators.

10. All lighting, except what is required for security purposes, will be turned off when buildings and facilities are unoccupied, such as at the end of the workday. Custodial personnel will turn lights back on only for the time actually required for custodial work.

11. All CSU campuses will, to the greatest extent possible, change custodial hours from evening/night shifts to day shifts to reduce custodial energy usage. Any revisions to the custodial shift schedule will be made in consultation with the energy/utilities manager. Building ventilation and lighting systems will not be operated any more or longer than what is required under health and safety codes during the low load custodial occupancy periods.

12. Indoor lighting will be reduced in number and/or wattage, wherever possible, to provide for the minimum but adequate lighting levels consistent with the needs of instructional programs and State mandated standards for the efficient and effective use of the spaces. Existing incandescent lamps for general-purpose lighting will be phased out and future incandescent lamps will not be allowed unless exempted for very limited and specialized tasks by the Campus energy/utilities managers. *New lighting systems will be in the form of the latest energy saving technology.*

13. Outside lighting on building exteriors and campus grounds will be maintained at levels necessary to provide security and safety to promote confidence within the campus community. Good energy management practices shall be observed within this guideline.

14. Purely decorative lighting on CSU campuses beyond reasonable display lighting, inside or outside, will not be added. Existing decorative lighting beyond reasonable display lighting will be eliminated on a continuing basis. In general, decorative lighting will not be used for commercial or holiday purposes unless specifically exempted by the campus president.

15. All natural gas fired boilers on the campuses will be tuned at least twice annually, and brought up to maximum efficiency unless automated combustion controls are installed. In the case of automatic controls, verification of combustion efficiency shall be conducted routinely or at least once monthly for central plant and quarterly for decentralized boilers. A permanent record of these readings will be maintained on each campus.

16. All CSU campuses will maintain their energy plant and utilities infrastructure improvements in good working order and will undertake preventive maintenance schedules to maintain highest possible system efficiencies and, hence, lowest operating costs.

17. When replacing energy consuming and/or utilities infrastructure equipment, the most cost-effective models will be selected. Life cycle costing procedures, instead of first capital cost only, will be utilized as the basis for all future equipment selection. All possible efforts will be made to secure additional funding if required to effect lowest life-cycle procurement.

18. All CSU campuses will implement a utilities charge back system to recover costs of utilities provided to self-support and external organizations.

19. All CSU campuses will take every necessary step to conserve water resources, including such steps as installing controls to optimize irrigation water, reducing water usage in restrooms and showers and promoting the use of reclaimed water. The use of decorative fountains should be minimized. In the event of a declaration of drought, the CSU will cooperate with the State, city and county governments to the greatest extent possible to effect additional water conservation.

20. The CSU will encourage continuing energy conservation and lowest utilities operating costs on its campuses by instituting appropriate fiscally responsible incentive plans designed to recognize and reward meritorious achievements by campus staff, faculty, and students beyond normal expectation. These incentive plans will be designed in such a fashion that they are adaptable to changing budget constraints from year to year.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees of The California State University has historically supported an aggressive CSU energy conservation and utilities management policy and program; and

WHEREAS, CSU campuses have performed admirably in conserving energy resources by reducing their energy consumption by 33% by 1999/2000 compared to base year consumption recorded in 1973/74, thereby avoiding an estimated utilities expenditures of $350 million; and

WHEREAS, Energy costs in California are projected to increase significantly in the next decade and such increases are estimated to take a greater percentage of the CSU's operating budget, reducing available funds for other essential academic needs and services; and

WHEREAS, Proven opportunities and measures for additional energy conservation and utilities management are available to significantly reduce these costs by instituting and reaffirming sound energy management practices; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that a goal of 15% reduction in energy consumption is hereby established for 2004/2005 compared to 1999/2000 measured in British Thermal Units per Gross Square Foot of building space per year; and be in further

RESOLVED, That the revised CSU Policy on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management in Agenda Item 5 of the July 10-11, 2001 meeting of the Trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds is adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor or his designee is authorized to take the necessary steps to implement the intent of this policy.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2003/04-2007/08

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests approval of the proposed categories and criteria to be used for the CSU state funded five-year capital improvement program.

Background

The Board of Trustees annually adopts categories and criteria that are used in setting priorities for the state funded capital outlay program. This proposal recommends minimal changes to the categories and criteria approved by the Board of Trustees last year. The proposed CSU 2003/04-2007/08 categories and criteria are included in Attachment A and have been reviewed by campus administrative staff.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

> **RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:
>
> The Categories and Criteria for the 2003/04-2007/08 State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program in Attachment A of Agenda Item 6 of the July 10-11, 2001 meeting of the trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds be approved; and
>
> The chancellor is directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the CSU State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. If this results in an "action year" (2003/04) request beyond reasonable expectation of available funding, the chancellor is delegated authority to adjust the number of campus projects submitted.

**Categories and Criteria to Set Priorities for
the 2003/04 to 2007/08 State Funded Capital Improvement Program**

General Criteria

A campus may submit a maximum of one renovation project and one growth project, including health and safety projects, for the 2003/04 budget year, and one project for the 2004/05 planning year. Exceptions to this limit will be considered on an individual project basis. Equipment, seismic strengthening and telecommunication infrastructure projects are excluded from this limit. Seismic strengthening projects will be prioritized according to recommendations from the Seismic Review Board.

A campus may submit a maximum of three projects per year, including health and safety projects, for the 2005/06 through 2007/8 planning years.

Campuses are to prepare their project requests for the five-year program using PWC lump sum funding for all new project starts. Campus requests for preliminary plan (P) phase funding separate from the working drawing and construction (WC) phases will be considered on an individual project basis. Phased projects must be completely funded (PWC) within the expected bond cycle. Requests for remaining projects in the five-year program that received an initial phase of funding should use the lump sum method for the balance of funds required to complete the projects with the exception of equipment funds.

Current trustee-approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus 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.

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 minor capital outlay projects.

B. Modernization/Renovation
These funds make facilities operable by providing capital renewal, providing group II equipment, and replacing utility services to make buildings and the campus infrastructure operable. These funds also meet campus needs by modernizing facilities or constructing new replacement buildings in response to the academic and support program.

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

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

Schematic plans for seven CSU projects will be presented for approval.

1. CSU Channel Islands, John Spoor Broome Library (Information Resources Center) Project Architect: Leo A. Daly and the Design Architecture Foster and Partners

Background and Scope

CSU Channel Islands is the 23rd campus of the CSU system. The university will officially open in Fall 2002, and will accept the first freshman class in the Fall 2003. The current library is located in a small building that provides approximately 6,500-gross square feet (GSF) of library space. This limited space will need to be replaced by a facility adequate to accommodate projected student enrollments for ten years after occupancy of the facility. This is consistent with the CSU Library Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees in November 1987 as the policy framework for the future development of library design capacity throughout the CSU as noted below:

> "When a campus library facility or addition is proposed in the capital outlay program, the size and scope of the project shall address, for a period of ten years, the amount of space needed to adequately house the library's collections and public service areas for the approved FTES."

The proposed Information Resource Center (library), phase I project is the first of a multi-phase plan to renovate the "receiving and treatment building" (R&T building) for use as a library. The existing R&T building is a two story poured in-place reinforced concrete building with a basement, and has a red tile roof of Spanish colonial style architecture. Within the R&T building are eight fully enclosed open courtyards creating a very large 230,000 GSF building footprint. The demolition removes the center portion of the R&T building (44,000 GSF) and completely

demolishes the existing administration building (26,000 GSF), located directly in front of the R&T building, for a total demolition of 70,000 GSF.

The center core of the R&T building will be removed as a part of this first phase of construction. A new two-story addition of steel and glass will be inserted into this space over a full basement and covered by a lightweight pergola intending to respect the existing architecture. In phase I, 50,118 GSF of the R&T building will be completely renovated and 77,223 GSF of new building will be constructed for a project total of 127,341 GSF. During the construction of phase I, additional work will be required in the R&T building that is not part of phase I. The additional work includes interior demolition, a build back of shell space in the basement, and seismic strengthening of the entire building. Site development costs exceed the normal 3 percent of building cost because of the substantial amount of demolition of existing facilities. These costs are over and above standard costs for new library building construction. Phase I construction will provide all of the campus library space requirement for the target year 2014, which represents the ten-year planning horizon (2004-2014). The exception is in the area of compact storage and the library stack space that will initially be less than the 40,000 ASF established guidelines for the target year FTE.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	January 2002
Completion of Working Drawings	December 2002
Construction Start	February 2003
Occupancy	December 2004

Basic Statistics

	Existing	New	Total
Gross Building Area	50,118	77,223	127,341 square feet
Assignable Building Area	30,000	50,790	80,790 square feet
Efficiency	60 percent	66 percent	63 percent

The first phase of construction includes 100% demolition of the existing building area, renovation of 50% of the remaining buildings, and 63% of the overall new construction.

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019

Building Cost ($184 per gross square foot)	$23,422,000

Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$17.68	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$49.54	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$37.46	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$69.11	
e. Other Building Construction	$10.14	
Site Development (Includes Landscaping)		2,969,000
Group I Equipment		733,000
Construction Cost		$27,124,000
Fees, Contingency and Services		12,868,000
Total Project Cost ($314 per gross square foot)		$39,992,000
Group II Equipment		2,720,000
Grand Total		$42,712,000

Cost Comparison

This building cost of $184 per GSF is 6% above the $173 per GSF CSU Cost Guide for library projects at CCCI 4019. The difference is primarily attributed to seismic strengthening and basement work performed in area that will be fully renovated in the phase II project.

Funding Data

Funding for the project includes $37,712,000 from non-state funds financed through revenue bonds sold by CSUCI Site Authority in FY 2003/04 and $5,000,000 of donor funds totaling $42,712,000.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

Development of the library was analyzed as part of the Initial Campus Master Plan, which was the subject of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) prepared in early 2000. The SEIR is supplemental to the Final EIR which was certified by the CSU Board of Trustees in September 1998 and which evaluated the long-term build-out of a university campus on the site and approved a concept Long Range Development Plan. The CSU Board of Trustees certified the FEIR because the Site Authority did not exist at the time, and the approval of a concept master plan was a critical milestone established by the trustees prior to their acceptance of the

hospital site as a future university campus. The SEIR was prepared to analyze the additional potential significant environmental effects found in an analysis of the master plan and the Specific Reuse Plan. This was required after the FEIR was certified because the level of detail regarding future physical development led to adjustments in the plan. Following the Board of Trustees' adoption of the FEIR, the Site Authority was created and legislatively mandated to develop a reuse plan. Consequently, the Site Authority is now the Lead Agency for CEQA compliance for the east campus residential development and was responsible for certification of the SEIR, which it did at the June 5, 2000, meeting. The authority took steps to ensure wide public dissemination and input on the SEIR. The SEIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse on March 23, 2000. The CSUCI Site Authority certified the Final SEIR at its regular meeting on June 5, 2000.

Action

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 Final Supplemental EIR (SEIR) for the California State University, Channel Islands, certified by the CSUCI Site Authority, was prepared to include the John Spoor Broome Library project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The project does not propose substantial changes in the original project, which would require revision of the Campus Master Plan SEIR.

3. The project will not be built under substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project Master Plan Program EIR was certified.

4. No new information of substantial importance shows that the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Master Plan Program EIR and SEIR.

5. The SEIR was prepared to specifically include the Master Plan for CSUCI development and has been considered as an important part of the planning process.

6. This board hereby concurs with the findings of fact in Attachment A and related mitigation measures in Attachment B of the June 5, 2000, action of the

Authority which certified the SEIR, that the proposed project will reduce most of the potential significant effects on the environment to less than significant.

7. The findings in Attachment A and the related mitigation measures in Attachment B of the June 5, 2000, action of the Authority which certified the SEIR are incorporated by reference and concurred with by this board, include findings of specific overriding considerations which outweigh the identified remaining significant impacts.

8. Air quality, agricultural, historical and biological resource impacts will remain significant and unavoidable for which the CSUCI Site Authority, as Lead Agency, has made the required findings of Overriding Considerations.

9. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

10. The project will benefit The California State University.

11. The previously approved mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan approved by the Site Authority as Attachment D, Agenda Item 6, of the June 5, 2000, meeting of the Channel Islands Site Authority, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).

12. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

13. The schematic plans for the California State University, Channel Islands, John Spoor Broome Library are approved at a project cost of $42,712,000 at CCCI 4019.

2. California State University, Los Angeles, Intimate Theater
Project Architect: Jeffrey M. Kalban and Associates Architecture, Inc.

Background and Scope

The Harriet and Charles Luckman Fine Arts Complex at CSU Los Angeles was completed in 1994. The Intimate Theatre is the final unfinished portion of the complex. The black box intimate theater is designed to accommodate the growth of the Luckman Center. It will provide a

blank canvas for the creative imagination of players, directors, and technicians encouraging experimentation and fostering educational opportunity. The proposed project includes new space totaling 6,900 gross square feet with seating for a maximum of 250 people, a lobby, public restrooms, dressing rooms, and support space. The project design also includes conduits and base components that will allow for future expansion to accommodate distance learning. The building exterior continues the banded brick motif of the Luckman Complex, with a glass curtain wall at the lobby entrance creating a continuous flow and transition from the Luckman Complex and the Avenue of the Arts. The facility is Type II construction of structural steel frame and metal stud incombustible construction.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	August 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	January 2002
Construction Starts	April 2002
Occupancy	December 2002

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	6,900 square feet
Assignable Building Area	4,111 square feet
Efficiency	60 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019

Building Cost including Group I Equipment ($251 per gross square foot)	$1,736,000

Systems Breakdown		*($ per GSF)*
a.	Substructure (Foundation)	$ 5.36
b.	Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$87.74
c.	Interiors (Partitions)	$47.90
d.	Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$63.13
e.	Equipment and Furnishings	$13.69
f.	General Conditions	$33.44

Site Development (Includes Landscaping)	155,000
Construction Cost	$1,891,000
Fees, Contingency and Services	538,000

Total Project Cost ($352 per gross square foot)	$2,429,000
Group II Equipment	71,000
Grand Total	$2,500,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $251 per GSF is consistent with the CSU Cost Guide for a theater arts building of $250 per GSF at CCCI 4019.

Funding Data

Funding for the project is provided from on-hand private donor funds.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the California State University, Los Angeles, Intimate Theater in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on June 12, 2001.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Los Angeles, Intimate Theatre project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit The California State University.

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Los Angeles, Intimate Theatre are approved at a project cost of $2,500,000 at CCCI 4019.

3. California State University, Northridge, Sierra Center
Project Architect: Froelich, Kow & Gong, Architects, Inc.

Background and Scope

The proposed CSU Northridge, Sierra Center project is a 30,446 gross square foot three-story facility that will serve as the replacement food service facility lost to the Sierra Hall Complex after the Northridge earthquake. The project creates an outdoor dining area around the base of the building and outdoor terrace dining on the second floor. Other components include central offices for the University Corporation, improved public and ADA access and circulation for the existing Jerome Richfield Hall, and enhanced landscape and hardscape to the western portion of the campus. This three-story addition to the existing Sierra Complex will be finished with an exterior plaster-and-insulation system. Exterior walls below the second floor line will be clad in ceramic tile to match Sierra Tower, which is part of the complex. Fenestration will complement existing window sizes, materials and layouts.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	August 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	November 2001
Construction Start	March 2002
Occupancy	July 2003

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area (New 30,446 sq. ft; Renovation 1,440 sq. ft.)	31,886 square feet
Assignable Building Area (New 22,689 sq. ft.; Renovation 1,440 sq. ft.)	24,129 square feet
Efficiency	75 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 3909

Building Cost ($169 per gross square foot including Group I equipment)		$5,378,000
Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 2.68	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$68.77	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$34.22	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$37.33	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$25.34	
f. Special Construction and Demolition	$ .31	
Site Development (Includes Landscaping)		438,000

Construction Cost	$5,816,000
Fees, Contingency and Services	1,642,000
Total Project Cost ($234 per gross square foot)	$7,458,000
Group II Equipment	400,000
Grand Total	$7,858,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $169 per GSF represents a mix of renovation and new construction costs. The composite cost is lower than the Pomona student union cost of $179 and the Long Beach student union cost of $261 at CCCI 3909.

Funding Data

Funding for the nonstate supported Sierra Center is from FEMA facility replacement funding as well as tax-exempt revenue bonds issued by the University Corporation.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the California State University, Northridge, Sierra Center in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on May 29, 2001.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Northridge, Sierra Center has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and the project will benefit The California State University.

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Sierra Center are approved at a project cost of $7,858,000 at CCCI 3909.

4. California State University, Northridge, University Student Union Renovation
Project Architect: Carter-Burgess Architects & Rebecca Binder FAIA, Design Architect

Background and Scope

The CSU Northridge, university student union renovation project will re-organize and remodel the existing 205,000 gross square foot facility to create a village along a new outdoor "main street". The project will add student computer labs, new and improved food options and expanded program space. The "main street" will bring student traffic from a large adjacent parking lot into the central campus promenade linking to other major campus buildings. The streetscape will be lined with trees, small park areas, dining patios and entertainment spaces. Coffee shops, a variety of fast food eateries, a copy center, and an electronic café will create a vibrant center of student activity for the campus. Renovations to the union will provide ADA compliance. The existing union consists of two distinct architectural styles from the 1970s and the 1990s. These will be interwoven with new construction to resemble a town street. Wayfinding in the facility will be improved, as all major uses in the union will enter directly from the new main street. The renovation will feature masonry and plaster to complement the existing structures and other campus buildings.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	August 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	January 2002
Construction Start	April 2002
Occupancy	July 2003

Basic Statistics

Existing Gross Building Area	205,000 square feet
Existing Assignable Building Area	145,000 square feet
Efficiency	71 percent
New Gross Building Area	70,900 square feet
New Assignable Building Area	60,000 square feet
Construction Area Efficiency	84 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 4019

Building Cost ($108 per gross square foot)	$7,668,000

Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 1.97
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$25.32
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$21.86
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$47.85
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 8.46
f. Special Construction and Demolition	$ 2.68

Site Development (Includes Landscaping)	2,160,000
Construction Cost	$9,828,000
Fees and Contingency	3,073,000
Total Project Cost ($182 per gross square foot)	$12,901,000
Group II Equipment	1,100,000
Grand Total	$14,001,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $108 per GSF represents a mix of renovation and new construction costs. The composite cost is lower than the Pomona student union cost of $179 and the Long Beach student union cost of $261 at CCCI 4019.

Funding Data

The project was overwhelmingly approved by a margin of 77% in a May 2000 student referendum. Fees will be assessed upon completion of the project. Design and construction will be funded by tax-exempt revenue bonds issued by the University Student Union.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the California State University, Northridge, University Student Union Renovation project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on May 29, 2001.

Action

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Northridge, University Student Union Renovation project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and the project will benefit The California State University.

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, University, Student Union Renovation project are approved at a project cost of $14,001,000 at CCCI 4019.

5. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Student Housing Phase I
Project Architect: Sasaki Associates, Inc.

Background and Scope

The proposed student-housing phase I project includes two residential buildings and one common building on approximately five acres and will accommodate approximately 440 students in housing suites. The 3 and 4 bedroom suites will house 4 students and the 2 bedroom suites will house 2 students. Each student will have a private sleeping room with the exception of one double occupancy bedroom in the 3 bedroom suite. Each suite will have shared areas comprised of a living area, kitchen center (with limited kitchen facilities), dining/group study area, and two compartmentalized bathroom facilities. The housing suites are equipped with data, telephone and cable TV in each bedroom. Three study classrooms are available for group and individual study as well as classroom and seminar use. The common facility accommodates the front desk and lobby, serves as the public entrance to the housing community and includes a multi-purpose academic space, computer lab, student mailboxes and offices for residence life and student organizations. The three and four story Type 5 buildings will have a stucco exterior over a wood frame. The project was presented to the California State University Housing Proposal Review Committee on May 16, 2001.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	July 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	November 2001
Construction Start	May 2002
Occupancy	August 2003

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	164,750 square feet
Assignable Building Area	132,830 square feet
Efficiency	81 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 3909

Building Cost ($114 per gross square foot)			$18,773,000
	Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*	
a.	Substructure (Foundation)	$10.98	
b.	Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$32.16	
c.	Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$19.99	
d.	Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	$38.80	
e.	Equipment and Furnishings	$ 4.85	
f.	General Conditions	$ 7.16	
Site Development (Includes Landscaping)			1,436,000
Construction Cost			$20,209,000
Fees, Contingency and Services			5,262,000
Total Project Cost ($155 per gross square foot)			$25,471,000
Group II Equipment			3,434,000
Grand Total			$28,905,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $114 per GSF is comparable to San Luis Obispo's student housing cost of $110 per GSF at CCCI 3909. The slight increase is primarily attributed to the foundation costs related to the site's soil conditions and an upgrade of the HVAC systems around life cycle cost benefits.

Funding Data

Project financing will be through the issuance of Dormitory Revenue Fund Housing Bonds. A request for approval of financing will be presented to the Board of Trustees at a future meeting.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study was prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on October 19, 1999. The 30-day public review period ended on November 17, 1999, and no adverse comments were received during the review period.

Action

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 Negative Declaration for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Student Housing Phase I project has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit The California State University.

3. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

4. The schematic plans for the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Student Housing Phase I project are approved at a project cost of $28,905,000 at CCCI 3909.

6. California State University, Sacramento, Modoc Hall
Project Architect: E. M. Kado Associates-AIA

Background and Scope

In September 2000, the trustees amended the 2001/02 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the CSU Sacramento, Regional and Continuing Education and Foundation Projects Building (#81). The facility has been renamed Modoc Hall and will provide 79,440 gross square feet of office, administrative support, laboratory, multipurpose and conference room space to house multiple continuing education and foundation functions. The project is a four story, steel moment frame structure. Lightweight concrete fill will be placed on metal decks with a single ply roofing system. The exterior cladding will consist of pre-cast concrete and a curtain wall system with integral sunshades. The building will have a dedicated boiler and chiller system with a variable air volume distribution system.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	October 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	February 2002
Construction Start	July 2002
Occupancy	September 2003

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	79,440 square feet
Assignable Building Area	61,027 square feet
Efficiency	77 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index CCCI 3909

Building ($176 per gross square feet)		$13,974,000
Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 7.14	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$57.07	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$35.62	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Pro.)	$71.33	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 4.68	
Site Development (includes landscaping and parking)		1,815,000
Construction Cost		$15,789,000
Fees and Contingency		3,154,000
Total Project Cost ($238 per gross square foot)		18,943,000

Group II Equipment	400,000
Grand Total	$19,343,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $176 (includes Group I equipment) per GSF is comparable to the Dominguez Hills' extended education project of $164 per GSF at CCCI 3909.

Funding Data

Funding will be provided by the sale of revenue bonds by the CSUS Foundation.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study was prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on January 25, 2001. The 30-day public review period ended on February 26, 2001, and no adverse public comments were received during the review period.

Action

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 Negative Declaration for the California State University, Sacramento, Modoc Hall has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and the project will benefit The California State University.

3. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Sacramento, Modoc Hall are approved at a project cost of $19,343,000 at CCCI 3909.

7. California State University, San Bernardino, Student Housing Expansion, Phase II
Project Architect: Fisher-Friedman Associates

Background and Scope

CSU San Bernardino, Serrano Village, currently has a design capacity of 406 beds. The university has a projected 2001/02 full-time equivalent student enrollment of almost 13,000 students. The university commissioned an independent market research firm to explore the demand for additional housing on campus. The study identified a market demand of 1,700 beds by 2001. The campus entered into a two-phase project of approximately 640 beds. Phase I of the project was approved by the board last year and is currently under construction and will be ready for occupancy in Fall 2001.

The Phase II student housing expansion project provides 314 beds in one bedroom/one bath, two-bedroom/two bath, and four bedroom/two bath apartment units. The fully furnished apartments also include areas for living and dining plus a complete kitchen. Each room will be equipped with data, telephone, and satellite TV. The project utilizes parking spaces conveniently located nearby. The design of the two- and three-story buildings will be compatible with existing campus architecture. The new buildings will be concrete slab on grade construction, wood frame, exterior stucco with a durable and attractive tile roof. Open plazas, aesthetically pleasing exterior designs, and generous landscaping will provide a welcoming and attractive village environment. Each of the buildings will have an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) elevator and accessible units will be distributed throughout all three floors. The project includes a coin-operated laundry facility and a 2,500 square foot multi-purpose room. The existing pool will be supplemented with a spacious courtyard. The project was presented to the California State University Housing Proposal Review Committee in May 2001.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Preliminary Plans	July 2001
Completion of Working Drawings	August 2001
Construction Start	October 2001
Occupancy	August 2002

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	112,785 square feet
Assignable Building Area (Housing)	98,867 square feet
Assignable Building Area (Laundry Room & Common Building)	2,000 square feet
Total Assignable Area	95,867 square feet
Efficiency	85 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4019

Building Cost ($101 per gross square feet)		$11,349,000
Systems Breakdown	*($ per GSF)*	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	$ 4.26	
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	$25.41	
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	$21.14	
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	$30.23	
e. Equipment and Furnishings	$ 5.67	
f. Special Construction and Demolition	$ 4.17	
g. General Conditions	$ 9.75	
Site Development (includes landscaping)		1,243,000
Construction Cost		$12,592,000
Fees and Contingency		3,160,000
Total Project Cost ($139 per gross square foot)		$15,752,000
Group II Equipment		980,000
Grand Total		$16,732,000

Cost Comparison

The building cost of $101 per GSF is less than San Luis Obispo's housing cost of $113 per GSF at CCCI 4019 primarily due to differences in the site and building mechanical design.

Funding Data

Funding will be provided from the issuance of Dormitory Revenue Fund–Housing Revenue Bonds. The Board of Trustees will be requested to approve bond financing at a future meeting.

Debt service will be provided from rental revenues. The pro forma financial analysis indicates sufficient revenues from the debt-free Serrano Village Phase I and Phase II to cover all expenses and bond payments.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Draft Environmental Impact Report was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and the public comment period ended on November 29, 1996. Comments were received and responded to in the Final EIR certified by the Board of Trustees on January 27, 1999. A January 2000 initial study and addendum to the previously certified Final EIR analyzed minor technical changes for the Phase II student housing project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164). No new adverse impacts or mitigation measures were identified.

Action

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 Final EIR for the California State University, San Bernardino Master Plan Revision certified on January 27, 1999, was prepared to include the Student Housing Expansion, Phase II project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. Based on the information contained in the approved Final EIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will reduce most noise impacts on the environment to a less-than-significant effect.

3. Air quality, noise, traffic, and circulation impacts identified in the Final EIR will remain significant and unavoidable for which the Board of Trustees has made the required findings of Overriding Considerations.

4. An addendum to the Final EIR confirmed that no new adverse impacts would result from the construction of the Student Housing Expansion, Phase II project.

5. No additional mitigation measures are necessary; and the project will benefit The California State University.

6. The previously approved mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan approved by the Board of Trustees as Attachment D, Agenda Item 3, of the January 26-27, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and

7. The chancellor is requested under the Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project, and

8. The schematic plans for the California State University, San Bernardino, Student Housing Expansion, Phase II project are approved at a project cost of $16,732,000 CCCI 4019.