



Capital Planning Committee

Meeting Minutes

August 3, 2017

In attendance: Jason Porth, Tom Lollini, Jill Anthes, Dominique Cano-Stocco, Gene Chelberg, John Elia, Alan Jung, Deborah Masters, Victoria Menzies, Robert Nava, Alejandro Rios, Nancy Robinson, Michael Scott, Elena Stoian, Shae Hancock, Elizabeth Smith, Nick Holmes

Absent: Wendy Bloom, Frank Fasano, Barry Jodatian, Andrew Harris, Guido Krickx, Ken Monteiro, Linda Oubre, Alison Sanders

Agenda Item – University Enterprises (Jason Porth)

- **JPorth:** We created “University Enterprises” (until a better name is confirmed). This new division will co-locate UCorp (which is the entrepreneurial wing and business partner of the university), Capital Planning Design & Construction (former Physical Planning & Development), as well as a real estate unit. With these three together, we’re hopeful it will position our campus to move forward with continuing to develop our infrastructure, delivering additional capital projects to the campus, and setting ourselves up in a way that is mindful of potential funding streams.

We think this will position us to consider master development on parts of campus where we might go out to the world and say “we have xx acres/make us an offer/we want these uses on it” and this is going to align us better to recognize that a lot of our funding is likely to come from the private sector in the future, or through different means of delivering projects. This new division will also be working more closely with the Downtown Campus, managing the property and delivering the same services that one would hope to find not only on a campus like ours, but also downtown. We’ve been in discussions with the Deans about some initial steps we want to take to make sure we’re delivering the facilities and services that are needed at the Downtown Campus.

In addition to the real estate projects we’ve already discussed, we feel there’s an opportunity being in San Francisco and recognizing the need for things like workforce housing. We’ll have a group that’s really focused on delivering additional opportunities, so if a house becomes available nearby, we can consider buying it so we can attract and retain faculty and staff in a different way than we have in the past, knowing workforce housing is a critical component of getting people to come to SF State.

This new unit will continue to grow, and we have some near-term issues we need to address. With Simon Lam's retirement, we have an opening for an AVP. Tom Lollini will stay on with us as a consultant and will lead us on projects into the Fall. As Ann Sherman announced, Tom's role will end in September, but he will stay on to help us with projects such as the Campus Master Plan, the Creative Arts Replacement building, the Holloway project and others. We'll consult with this group as we fill Simon's position and as we move forward with this new division.

Agenda Item – Capital Projects Update (Tom Lollini)

(See attachment "17-18 Capital Project Requests")

TLollini: This is my last meeting as co-chair, and since Dean Bowman has also left, Jason, Ann and Jennifer will determine how to proceed with this committee. In the last 2 years that I've been here, we've been trying to bring to light all the parts of the capital planning and programming for our major projects. With Jill's help in the last 18 months, we've tried to get them in front of you for dialogue.

This is a list of all the capital projects planned for 2017-2018. A number of them are carryforwards from last year that didn't have funding. We want to be sure all projects are reviewed, but they're only approved at the CO when there are a critical or life/safety issues.

I recommend that when annual budgets are being planned, funding is set aside for capital improvements, so that when we go to the CO, the ones they consider approving are the ones that come with some funding on the table from the interested party. Having matching funds would be ideal.

We hired a company called ISES Corp a few years ago to do a facility conditions assessment report, where they rated the condition of our buildings (including RTC) based on what's needed now to bring the building up to their original intended use (not modernization or improvement). They came up with about \$9M of replacement costs, and not necessarily based on San Francisco construction costs. It's one of the challenges in the master plan and making decisions in the future about what to keep and what to plan to replace, and it's why we need other ways to find sources of equity and investment, to bring value to campus rather than the traditional means of funding by the CSU. The CSU has a limited budget, but they have to divide it by all the campuses. We need a better strategy.

MScott: This committee is useful because it has a real impact, such as what happened at RTC this summer, if you don't keep on top of maintenance. The buildings got so bad and the inspectors red-tagged it on a Friday, so we had to plan to shut it down within 24 hours. Without power, we can't keep animals alive. There's a lot of upset people at RTC because of this issue, so it's important that we plan for these things, because it has a real impact on our students and faculty.

TLollini: At RTC we tried to work that through the CO's office and ask to reallocate some surplus funds from our labs, and we secured extra funding to address some of the higher-risk seismic conditions in some of those buildings, but more is needed. We asked for additional funds to assist in the relocation of the research that was in that building.

JAnthes: We know there's a donor gift in play for a structure at RTC, but there's never been an environmental assessment done on that site, which requires an EIR, and that takes time.

Agenda Item – Capital Call for unfunded projects (Tom Lollini)

(See attachment "Capital Call FY 2018/19 Minor Cap/Small Major Cap Projects - Unfunded")

TLollini: Allocations are coming in for this year's projects system wide, but the purpose of this capital call was to put our items on a priority list so we can review as funding becomes available. We need to come back and talk about the sequencing of the capital call process so everyone knows what to expect.

JAnthes: I want to thank all the Deans and their staff who put these lists of projects together, as we know that takes time. We were able to capture all the requests and we continue to add them, as they are included in the conversations in the upcoming years.

Agenda Item – Capital Call for Unfunded Projects (Tom Lollini)

(See attachment "Five Year Facilities Renewal and Capital Improvement Plan")

TLollini: See Final Submittal to CO for unfunded projects. These are items that were on prior year's lists but did not get funding. You'll see on this list the request for campuswide fire hydrant improvements. We did receive some funding but it could not reach all the hydrants across campus. That seemed pretty high on the list for general risk mitigation. For RTC, we asked for add'l funding because the amount this year will only stabilize Bldgs 49 & 50 and demolish a few others, except for Building 54, where we might only have enough to consider stabilizing it.

DCano-Stocco: Are any of the buildings at RTC on the historic registry?

TLollini: Not sure. We can't plan to tear down anything without doing at least a historical assessment. The master plan will do the assessment and will define steps we need to take. Our intention is leaving Building 54 in place until the master plan process is confirmed. We also recognize the neighborhood is watching for increased use of the site, but that's needed to keep the program functioning. That might be opportunity for a possible public/private or even a public/public partnership, such as with Marin Open Space Trust, and they might pay us the land value for some of that project. We need to look at creative projects all around. Other projects focus on fire and life safety first. Also the new Science Bldg which includes campus funding; campus needs to decide how to activate that money over the next few years. The HSS building is on the list for potential replacement also.

Agenda Item - Campus Master Plan Update (Jill Anthes)

- (Showed slide presentation from recent FutureState workshops)
- We'll have an online open house end of August to show drawings to date
- Took recent plans into consideration: SSGI, College Student Success and Strategic Plan
- We need to add Academic Plan to priority list
- We made some planning assumptions; 15-year planning horizon, maximize enrollment to current ceiling, adding student beds is the primary driver of the plan
- Met with President's Cabinet recently and asked us to review plan to increase FTE's to 30,000 and how to best accommodate via transportation, etc. Will come back with recommendations to Cabinet.
- We completed the July workshops, and we're working with consultants to pull together everything we're hearing, and reactions to our plans and ideas, then consolidating for a September/Fall open house.
- This open house will have a public presentation while we begin the EIR process, which will take a while.
- We will then develop RFPs, and as Jason and Tom discussed, perhaps there are particular projects that we may want to go out to the private sector, and how best to define them.
- In Spring will see a public *draft* master plan, to take to the BOT for approval

- At our last committee meeting, we discussed going to the colleges and talking with the Deans and their departments about what each college needed/wanted.
- We posed some very specific questions in order to get everyone thinking what we already know about our facilities (they need repair, maintenance) but also stepping back to see where we are going as an institution and what can we provide to our students that we can't do now.
- Compiling these ideas, we saw some very prominent patterns that everyone mentioned, without a doubt: student collaboration spaces, lounges, gatherings, seating – any way that we can get students together and give them places they can get together informally outside the classroom. Indoor or outdoor didn't matter.
- Also on that list was housing faculty, students and staff, as this is a huge issue for retention.
- We also agreed that adaptable, various-sized classrooms vs. fixed spaces are in need, branching out and creating maker spaces, more flexible labs, interdisciplinary research space and more places to meet.
- They also wanted a better handle on how faculty offices looked like, vs lecturer or tenure-track.
- Several colleges talked about opportunities to partner with other regional higher institutions or business and industry to enhance their academic program.
- Other ideas we heard were the need for central place where people can come when they visit campus, whether it be a visitor or welcome center, or even as staff arrive onto campus every day. How is the campus welcoming and are we seeing the work students and faculty are doing, is it on display, can we highlights some of our programs and art, show science that's happening, do we have a multicultural center reflects the history of social justice of this organization, is that on display anywhere and visible, can that be incorporated with the student success center or the technology center.
- We are looking at how these things can work together to highlight that entrance to campus we need, and also to be more visible to ourselves and our greater community.
- We pulled it all together onto the two concept plans and three themes. The program for each of these plans are identical, every though the buildings are organized separately.
- This map shows where there's quite a bit of infrastructure on campus that limits where we can put things, such as easements, piping, utilities, liquefaction zones, etc.
- Map also showed the building condition assessment (Student Health Center was not evaluated by ISES). It outlined what was in critical conditions, which buildings are obsolete, and which are located in places that aren't serving the campus well, such as when we become a residential campus, having health and safety nearby, etc.

JAnthes: We're also looking at various transit scenarios, how to move people through campus and what parking we need, do we need drop off locations, what our current parking supply is and what our future demand might be. The trends are looking at replacing one-to-one, but we may do that temporarily if the demand for parking drops.

TLollini: We are currently not maximizing our parking. We provide 2,700 spaces on campus, but at our peak demand, our survey shows we only use about 2,000. The off-campus supply is about 2,800 and those either walk/bike/bus to campus from where they park.

JAnthes: Parkmerced is looking into more of a parking permit program, which may eliminate many of those spaces, but there may be possibilities to partner with Stonestown as well.

TLollini: We may be at a time where the use of shared services in our society increases, with the success of Uber/Lyft changes how we access campus.

GChelberg: Looking at the Uber and Lyft impact on parking, we have to recognize that many of our students are also those drivers.

JAnthes: Housing is still the largest concern, whether it be workforce housing or student housing. If our students are traveling two hours each way, then they don't have time to form the bonds on campus with each other. For staff and faculty, they may not have the work/family balance.

TLollini: It would be interesting for colleges to do an informal survey, as we did with our students, to find where their faculty and staff are living or how far they travel to get here. Will be helpful in telling our story, and if the city were to question why we need this much housing, having those stories would be helpful.

MScott: We still need green space – West Campus green is often used, and intermural space is very popular now and allows students to bond.

TLollini: The softball field is not used as much and doesn't need as much space, and the tennis courts can be relocated.

JAnthes: We're hoping to also be the most resilient and sustainable campus within the CSU, with zero-waste, zero-water, zero-energy, so we're asking a lot of questions around that too, and our consultants are looking at how we might combine those, or might create a microgrid so we can be more resilient to the city in the event of an emergency.

TLollini: This could also be an academic program; a living laboratory for modern infrastructure.

GChelberg: What is the horizon of this master plan?

TLollini: Hopefully it's approved 2018-2019, and the horizon is about 2025, but we're planning for 2020 – 2035, and looking at it with 5-year increments so we keep on top of it.

Meeting Adjourned. Next meeting September 14, 2017

Attachments:

- 17-18 Capital Project Requests (with funding)
- Minor/Small Cap Projects requests (unfunded)
- 5-year Capital Plan – unfunded, but mostly life and safety issues