

# AGENDA

## ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON EDUCATION FINANCE

**Assemblymember Joseph S. Simitian, Chair**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2002  
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 126  
4:00 P.M.**

### REGULAR BUSINESS

ITEM                      DESCRIPTION  
  
                                    OUTSTANDING COMMITMENTS (HANDOUT)

### ITEMS TO BE HEARD

<b>6440</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>	<b>2</b>
Issue 1	K-12 Minority Outreach Programs	2
Issue 2	Update on Comprehensive Admissions	6
<b>6440</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6610</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	
<b>6870</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CROSS CUTTING ISSUES</b>	
Issue 1	Higher Education Capital Outlay Issues (Information Only)	7
<b>6440</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>	<b>10</b>
Issue 1	Capital Outlay Projects Consent Calendar	10
Issue 2	UC Irvine Computer Science Unit 3	12
Issue 3	UC Los Angeles Engineering 1 Seismic Mitigation	14
Issue 4	UC Santa Cruz Humanities and Social Sciences	15
<b>6610</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	<b>16</b>
Issue 1	Capital Outlay Projects Consent Calendar	16
Issue 2	CSU San Luis Obispo Engineering & Architecture Renovation & Replacement, Phase II	18
Issue 3	CSU Stanislaus Science II Seismic	19
<b>6870</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES</b>	<b>20</b>
Issue 1	Capital Outlay Projects Consent Calendar	20

## ITEMS TO BE HEARD

### 6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### ISSUE 1: K-12 MINORITY OUTREACH PROGRAMS

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposed \$4.2 million reduction to K-12 minority outreach programs and a progress report by UC on its outreach strategy.

#### BACKGROUND:

In response to the precipitous decline in underrepresented student admissions to the University resulting from the elimination of affirmative action, the State has invested over \$80.8 million (after the Governor's \$2 million veto in 2001) in outreach programs to assist the UC in its efforts to increase diversity. In addition, the University has been spending \$3.1 million of its own funds for this effort. When combined with an estimated \$66.1 million from other segments, private and federal resources, the University has a total of approximately \$150 million available for this effort.

**Types of Outreach Programs.** UC runs several different types of outreach programs, including the following:

- **Student Academic Development Programs.** These programs work to increase the academic preparation of students directly through activities such as tutoring, academic advising, skills development and test preparation. These activities are typically one-on-one and have demonstrated success in preparing students for college. Two student academic development programs run out of UC, MESA and PUENTE, recently received national recognition for their efforts. These programs, complemented by the efforts of the Early Academic Outreach Program and the student-initiated outreach efforts, have been viewed as part of an effective short-term strategy to increase the number of historically underrepresented students being admitted and attending UC.
- **School University Partnerships.** These programs are new programs established by the University to improve student performance indirectly by systemically reforming and improving K-12 education. These programs are usually longer-term efforts lasting more than two years. Because these programs are designed as long-term, several classes of students will not benefit because of the time it takes to reform schools. It is in this area where UC has had the most trouble demonstrating results.
- **Informational Outreach and Recruitment.** These efforts help students plan and prepare for college through informational outreach and recruitment programs. Informational outreach and recruitment combine long-term and short-term strategies. This type of outreach increases student awareness about the accessibility and benefits of a college education and provides assistance with information on financial aid.

**Subcommittee Reviews UC Admissions and Outreach Last Year.** On April 4, 2001, the Subcommittee joined with the Assembly Higher Education Committee and the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee No. 1 on Education to hold a hearing on UC admissions, access and outreach. The impetus for the joint hearing centered on continued concerns regarding the negative impact of UC Regent's Resolution SP-1 and how current outreach efforts had or had not been successful at addressing the severe decline and continued underrepresentation of students of color at UC.

During the course of the April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2001 hearing, members expressed several concerns related to the University's admission policies and related outreach programs. The concerns expressed during the hearing included the following: the increasing racial and ethnic stratification of the university, the problems inherent in a two-tiered admissions process and the cost effectiveness of long-term outreach programs. At the time, while UC could demonstrate the success of its short-term efforts, UC was not able to present data that demonstrated that their long-term efforts were in fact working or meeting goals and expectations. This was particularly troubling given that UC had been receiving about \$1.5 million annually to evaluate their efforts. UC assured the Subcommittee that in one more year they would have information to demonstrate that their long-term efforts were working and urged patience from the Legislature.

Based on the deliberations and the concerns expressed by members about the lack of sufficient short-term outcomes and the substantial expenditures on longer-term outreach programs, the University agreed to a partial redirection of funds. This redistribution plan redirected \$5 million from UC long-term partnership programs to shorter-term "yield" efforts with the objective that this redirection would help the recruitment and admissions efforts of students to UC. A slightly modified version of the Subcommittee's actions was adopted by the Legislature and sent to the Governor.

**The Governor's Veto.** In signing the Budget Act of 2001, the Governor vetoed \$2 million from UC outreach programs without specifying which programs should have their funding reduced. In addition, as part of the veto message, the Governor inserted the words "up to" before dollar amounts provided in the UC budget item, under Provision 10 that was established by the Legislature for various outreach programs. By doing so, the Governor created unprecedented discretion for the University of California to fund outreach programs at whatever level they determined, or even to not fund certain programs at all. Moreover, the Governor's actions essentially abrogated the Legislature's ability to determine funding priorities and undercut the Legislature's redirection of outreach funds to short-term efforts or the Legislature's authority to appropriate funding in the manner in which it sees fit.

Given concerns over the constitutionality of the Governor's actions and the importance of K-12 outreach to the Legislature, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 1287 (Chapter 564) deleting the objectionable language and setting appropriation levels for outreach programs consistent with the Legislature's desire for short-term results. In acting on this measure, the Legislature in no way sanctioned the Governor's use of his line item veto authority to add language to appropriation legislation or abrogate the Legislature's appropriation authority. Nonetheless, AB 1287 did sustain the Governor's original veto of \$2 million in outreach funds.

**Governor's Proposed Reductions.** This year, the Governor proposes to reduce funding for UC K-12 outreach by \$4.2 million. This is in addition to his \$2 million reduction to these programs last year. These reductions affect eight UC outreach programs, one of which was strongly supported by the Legislature last year as part of the shift of funding from long-term efforts to short-term efforts.

**COMMENTS:**

**Complete Evaluation of Long-term Efforts Still Unavailable.** UC has been provided about \$1.5 million annually for the last four years (approximately \$6 million since 1998-99) for the purpose of evaluating its outreach efforts. While UC had told the Subcommittee it would be able to provide data demonstrating the effectiveness of its long-term efforts this year, UC now indicates that its studies of programmatic outcomes and cost-effectiveness will not be complete until the end of the 2003-04 academic year. Consequently, little is known about the effectiveness of UC long-term K-12 outreach programs. Without reliable data on program effectiveness, it is difficult for the Legislature or the University to determine which outreach programs are most successful in achieving the important objectives of increased awareness, preparation, and access to higher education—particularly with respect to the Legislature's immediate goal of increasing the number of underrepresented students who are admitted and enrolled at UC.

**Legislative Analyst's Recommendations.** The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature approve the Governor's proposed reductions for K-12 outreach because it is their view that the majority of these programs do not provide direct services or increase preparedness of students. In addition, the Legislative Analyst has raised several far-reaching recommendations in this year's analysis of the Governor's proposed budget. These recommendations include the consolidation of existing programs to reduce inefficiencies and administrative overlap and redirecting funding for student academic development to schools and districts.

While some of the Legislative Analyst's observations and recommendations are worthy of further consideration, the Analyst does not appear to view UC outreach efforts in the same context as the Legislature. For example, while the Analyst believes the University's focus on yield is misplaced, the Legislature has requested the University to place more emphasis on these efforts as part of a larger short-term strategy to increase the number of underrepresented students becoming eligible, admitted and enrolling at UC. Moreover, this emphasis on yield and short-term objectives is a direct response by the Legislature to the precipitous decline in underrepresented students being admitted and enrolling at UC after the Regent's adoption of SP-1 and the eventual passage of Proposition 209.

In addition, the Analyst's recommendation to shift funding for student academic development programs to schools and districts negates the fact that the most successful programs run by the University are the student academic development programs, two of which have won national recognition for their efforts. These programs are virtually the only programs in which UC can fully demonstrate actual impact on students served through the admission of underrepresented students to the University. The student academic development programs have been and continue to be at the heart of the University's short-term strategy and are consistent with the Legislature's desire for short-term results.

The Legislative Analyst plans to give an oral report of her recommendations to the Subcommittee during the hearing. In addition, UC plans to give the Subcommittee a progress report of their outreach efforts. The Subcommittee may wish to specifically request that UC provide additional information on its long-term outreach efforts and provide an accounting of expenditures related to funding provided for evaluation. Given the budget situation and the high priority placed on K-12 outreach programs by the

Legislature, Budget staff has been working with the University to re-evaluate the Governor's proposed reductions to K-12 outreach programs.

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

---

**ISSUE 2: UPDATE ON COMPREHENSIVE ADMISSIONS**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the University of California's implementation of comprehensive admissions.

**BACKGROUND:**

At the urging of the Legislature, in November 2001 the University of California Board of Regents approved a modified selection process for freshman admissions expected to lead to a more thorough and complete review of the qualifications a student presents when applying to one of UC's eight undergraduate campuses. Called "comprehensive review" or "comprehensive admissions," this new process replaced the previous "two-tiered" process embedded in Regent's Resolution SP-1 in which each campus was required to admit 50-75 percent of its freshman students solely on the basis of certain academic factors (i.e. GPA and test scores).

The 2001 Budget Act appropriated \$750,000 to support UC campus efforts to move toward comprehensive assessment of freshman applications. Budget bill language further stipulated that "funding shall be provided to campuses contingent on the elimination of the two-tiered admissions system and the establishment of a unitary admissions review process."

**COMMENTS:**

In an effort to monitor the University of California's progress in achieving educational equity, Assembly Budget Committee Chairwoman Jenny Oropeza requested that UC provide the Legislature with information about their implementation of comprehensive admissions, including an accounting of expenditures. As part of her information request, Assemblywoman Oropeza further requested that UC address the following elements for each campus individually:

- 1) The factors to be used in admissions selection and the differential weights assigned to each factor, if any.
- 2) Definitions of academic achievement, as compared to the list of system-wide criteria.
- 3) Additional information, if any, used to augment the application review process, other than information obtained through the standard University of California application.
- 4) Expected impact on the diversity and demographics of the student populations.

The Subcommittee will hear an oral presentation by UC regarding their implementation of comprehensive admissions as part of their response to Assemblywoman Oropeza's request.

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**6610 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**6870 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CROSS CUTTING ISSUES**

---

---

**ISSUE 1: HIGHER EDUCATION CAPITAL OUTLAY ISSUES**

The issues for the Subcommittee to consider are higher education capital outlay issues raised by the Legislative Analyst.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

In their analysis of the Governor's proposed 2002-03 budget, the Legislative Analyst recommends deleting or reducing funding for three University of California facility projects and five California State University projects due primarily to the following four reasons: (1) campus assumptions regarding summer enrollment; (2) the utilization of existing facilities; (3) cost guidelines for construction; and (4) the potential use of Garamendi lease-revenue bonds at the UC to finance research facilities. The following provides a summary of the issues raised by the Legislative Analyst:

- **Assumption of Full Summer Enrollment For Capital Outlay Planning.** Currently the UC, CSU and Community Colleges each incorporate assumptions about student enrollment during the summer term into their future year capital outlay plans; however, the university systems do not assume "full" year round operations. For the purpose of capital outlay planning "full year round operations" would be defined as enrollment levels at or near campus capacity and/or summer enrollment levels equal to or near student enrollment during the fall and spring terms. The Analyst argues that "if full use of instructional facilities in the summer is not the basis for developing capital outlay plans, the plans may indicate a need to construct new instructional facilities to accommodate enrollment growth, when there is actually capacity to increase enrollment in summer and avoid the need to build new instructional facilities."
- **Staff Comments.** While the LAO recommends Supplemental Report Language requiring the UC, CSU and Community Colleges to assume full summer enrollment when planning for capital outlay, staff notes that "full" summer enrollment is an unrealistic expectation. No college in the nation exceeds summer enrollment that is 40% of fall and/or spring term enrollment. Staff is working with the segments to draft supplemental report language for the Subcommittee's future consideration that would request the segments assume at least 40% of enrollment in capital outlay planning as a goal and adjust these goals upward when and if they are exceeded.
- **Utilization of Existing Facilities.** The Legislative Analyst raises concerns regarding the standards by which UC, CSU, and the Community Colleges utilize existing facilities. Specifically, the Analyst notes that while UC has utilization standards, neither CSU nor the Community Colleges have such standards. The Analyst defines "utilization" as the amount of time rooms and seats in classrooms or laboratories are used for instruction.

**Staff Comments.** In order to better understand how CSU and Community College space is currently utilized and to help move towards the better utilization of existing space, the LAO and Assembly Budget Committee staff recommend that the committee adopt the following supplemental report language:

*1. California Community Colleges are directed to report by November 1, 2002 and at least biennially thereafter, the utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories for each district and campus. Such report shall include for each campus the total number of rooms, number of stations, weekly student contact hours, and weekly station hours. The report shall also include the average weekly room hours, average percent station occupancy and actual utilization.*

*2. The California State University is directed to report by November 1, 2002 and at least biennially thereafter, its utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories. Such report shall include for each campus the total number of rooms, number of stations, weekly student contact hours, and weekly station hours. The report shall also include the average weekly room hours, average percent station occupancy, average weekly hours of station use, and actual utilization as a percent of the utilization standard.*

- **Construction Cost Guidelines.** The Legislative Analyst recommends reducing the appropriation levels for various UC and CSU projects due to construction costs, which the Analyst believes are too high. Specifically, the Analyst raises concerns with the guidelines used by UC and CSU to determine the cost of the specified projects. The Analyst concludes that the UC does not use cost construction guidelines and that CSU's cost guidelines have been inflated this year at a rate which exceeds the annual California Construction Cost Index, as calculated by the Department of Finance.

**Staff Comments.** In response to the Legislative Analyst, both UC and CSU believe that their building construction costs are reasonable and in line with similar types of facilities. Further, CSU notes that it budgeted for increased construction costs (above the California Construction Cost Index) in order build higher-quality facilities which will likely decrease deferred maintenance and replacement costs in future years. Given that every year the topic of construction cost guidelines is brought before the Subcommittee with no conclusive end in sight, the Subcommittee may wish to revisit the issue in further detail in the coming year.

- **Use of Garamendi Lease-Revenue Bonds by UC to fund research space.** Existing law authorizes the UC and the Public Works Board to finance the construction, renovation, and equipping of research facilities at UC campuses through the issuance of revenue bonds (known as Garamendi bonds), which pledge future increases in research-related revenue. The Legislative Analyst recommends the reduction of state General Obligation Bond funding for two UC projects (UC Irvine Computer Science facility and the UC Los Angeles Engineering Seismic Replacement) based on the assumption that the UC should use lease revenue bonds instead.

**Staff Comments.** Staff notes that UC already utilizes Garamendi lease-revenue bonds and is currently financing approximately \$1.5 billion worth of facility projects using this mechanism. In order to use Garamendi bond financing (like all lease revenue bonds), the UC must identify a funding stream for repayment of the bonds. In particular, the funding



stream for Garamendi bonds must come from an increase in the amount of research money available to the campus, due to the construction of the newly built facility. Since the primary source of research dollars to the UC is the federal government, it is important to note that, in most disciplines, federal research budgets have declined in recent years, with the exception of the health sciences (through the National Institutes for Health).

Staff notes that the two projects identified by the Analyst for Garamendi bond support do not appear to lend themselves to this type of financing mechanism. Specifically, the UC Los Angeles Engineering Seismic Replacement Project is simply a replacement of an existing facility and will not include any new research space, and as such, does not have the potential to generate new or additional research dollars. While the Computer Science Unit 3 project at UC Irvine contains new research space, and as such may have the capacity to generate additional research dollars, it is unlikely given the trends in the federal research budgets that new research funding would flow to the University as a result of this project. Furthermore, the UC Office of the President notes that UC Irvine has incurred a substantial amount of lease-revenue debt and is at or near its debt capacity ceiling.

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA****ISSUE 1: CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS (RECOMMENDED CONSENT)**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the University of California's (UC) capital outlay program.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Governor's budget proposes \$699 million from General Obligation (GO) and lease-revenue bonds for 32 projects under the UC capital outlay program. 23 projects, at a cost of \$85 million are funded in the budget bill from GO bonds and \$279 million for seven projects from lease-revenue bonds are proposed under separate legislation. The budget also includes \$356,000 in General Fund for one project. In addition, the Governor proposed and the Legislature approved a shift \$335 million of funding from the General Fund to lease-revenue bonds for the Institutes of Science and Innovation (\$308 million) and the Merced campus (\$27 million).

The following is a list of most of UC's capital outlay projects:

Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Davis	Watershed Science Research Center	PWC	\$3,000,000
Davis	Seismic Corrections, Thurman Laboratory	PWC	\$356,000
Davis	Veterinary Medicine 3A	C	\$66,126
Davis	Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science	P	\$900,000
Berkeley	Seismic Safety Corrections, Hertz Hall	PWC	\$4,830,000
Berkeley	Stanley Hall Seismic Mitigation	C	\$16,737,000
Irvine	Natural Sciences Unit 2	CE	\$55,319,000
Merced	Site Development & Infrastructure, Phase 2	WC	\$16,449,000
Merced	Classroom & Office Building	PWCE	\$26,739,000
Merced	Site Development & Infrastructure, Phase 3	W	\$566,000
Riverside	Engineering Building, Unit 2	C	\$35,675,000
Riverside	Biological Sciences	WC	\$18,707,000
San Diego	Engineering Building, Unit 3B	CE	\$37,369,000
San Diego	Pharmaceutical Sciences	W	\$1,658,000
San Diego	Biomedical Library Renovation & Addition	PW	\$1,800,000

Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
San Diego	West Campus Utilities Improvements	PW	\$360,000
San Diego	Student Academic Services Facility	P	\$959,000
San Diego	Campus Emergency Services Facility	PW	\$443,000
Santa Barbara	Life Sciences Building	CE	\$26,904,000
Santa Barbara	Engineering-Science Building	E	\$1,454,000
Santa Barbara	Psychology Building Addition and Renewal	W	\$476,000
Santa Barbara	Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement	PW	\$1,178,000
Santa Cruz	Engineering Building	CE	\$41,183,000
Santa Cruz	Emergency Response Center	P	\$517,000
San Francisco	Health Sciences West Improvements, Phase 1	W	\$618,000

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

---

**ISSUE 2: UC IRVINE COMPUTER SCIENCE UNIT 3**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposed \$2.7 million (preliminary plans and working drawings) for the UC Irvine Computer Science Unit 3 capital outlay project.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature reduce \$1,770,000 from this item and recognize future costs of \$10,685,000 for construction and \$3,000,000 for equipment because the cost of the project is high. The Analyst also recommends research space in the project be funded by Garamendi bonds. These are the same issues discussed earlier in the agenda.

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

---

**ISSUE 3: UC LOS ANGELES ENGINEERING 1 SEISMIC MITIGATION**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposed \$26.3 million (working drawings and construction) for the UC Los Angeles Engineering 1 Seismic Mitigation capital outlay project.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature reduce \$17,573,000 from this project because the Analyst believes the construction cost is high and research space in the building can be funded by Garamendi bonds. These are the same issues discussed earlier in the agenda.

**6440 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

---

**ISSUE 4: UC SANTA CRUZ HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES FACILITY**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposed \$1.5 million (preliminary plans) for the UC Santa Cruz Humanities and Social Sciences facility.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature reduce \$462,000 from this item and recognize future costs of \$19,760,000, because the construction cost is high. These are the same issues discussed earlier in the agenda.

**6610 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY****ISSUE 1: CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS (RECOMMENDED CONSENT)**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the California State University's (CSU) capital outlay program.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Governor's budget proposes \$450 million from GO and lease-revenue bonds for the CSU's capital outlay program. Specifically, \$259 million is appropriated in the budget bill from the proposed 2002 GO bond for 31 projects and \$191 million is appropriated in legislation from lease-revenue bonds for three projects. Of that amount, \$6 million is proposed for expenditure in the current year and \$185 million is in the budget year.

The following is a list of most of CSU's capital outlay projects:

Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay	PWC	\$20,000,000
Bakersfield	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$5,336,000
Channel Islands	Science Lab Building	E	\$1,262,000
Chico	Education Classroom/Faculty Office Addition, Phase I	E	\$678,000
Chico	Student Services Center	P	\$811,000
Dominguez Hills	Technology Center, Health & Administration Services Building	E	\$3,802,000
Dominguez Hills	Renovate and Upgrade Electrical Infrastructure	PWC	\$2,855,000
Fresno	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$18,149,000
Fullerton	Life Safety Modifications Campuswide	PWC	\$9,649,000
Fullerton	Physical Education Addition/Renovation	E	\$987,000
Fullerton	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$6,724,000
Hayward	Business & Technology Building	PWC	\$11,500,000
Los Angeles	Remodel Music Building	E	\$795,000
Long Beach	Peterson Hall Addition	E	\$3,780,000
Long Beach	Library Addition and Renovation	PWC	\$19,083,000
Maritime Academy	Engineering Building Renovation/Addition	E	\$1,037,000
Monterey Bay	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$10,988,000

Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Northridge	Engineering Renovation, Phase II	PWC	\$14,739,000
Pomona	Library Addition and Renovation	PWC	\$33,209,000
San Diego	Chem/Geo/Business Admin./Math Building Renovation	E	\$3,805,000
San Diego	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$11,248,000
San Francisco	Renovate Hensill Hall Seismic	E	\$225,000
San Francisco	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$14,593,000
San Jose	Joint Library	E	\$8,095,000
San Jose	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$7,008,000
San Luis Obispo	Engineering/Architecture Renovation & Replacement Phase I	E	\$2,430,000
San Marcos	Library Information Center	E	\$7,431,000
San Marcos	Telecommunications Infrastructure	C	\$1,986,000
Stanislaus	Drama Ceiling, Seismic Upgrade	PWC	\$675,000



**6610 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

---

**ISSUE 2: CSU SAN LUIS OBISPO ENGINEERING & ARCHITECTURE  
RENOVATION & REPLACEMENT, PHASE II**

The issue for the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposed \$35 million (preliminary plans, working drawings and construction) for the CSU, San Luis Obispo Engineering & Architecture Renovation and Replacement, Phase II capital outlay project.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature delete the proposed \$35 million for this project because the Analyst asserts that the project is not justified under year-round operation and the alternative of accommodating instructional needs by renovating existing facilities would meet the same programmatic needs at lower cost.

**6610 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

---

**ISSUE 3: CSU STANISLAUS SCIENCE II SEISMIC**

The issue for the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposed \$922,000 (preliminary plans) for the CSU, Stanislaus Science II Seismic capital outlay project.

**BACKGROUND/COMMENTS:**

The Legislative Analyst recommends the Legislature reduce \$180,000 for this project and recognize future costs of \$45,341,000 because the Analyst asserts that the proposed cost of the project is high.

**6870 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES****ISSUE 1: CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS (RECOMMENDED CONSENT)**

The issue for the Subcommittee to consider is the California Community Colleges' (CCC) capital outlay program.

**BACKGROUND:**

The proposed capital outlay program for the community colleges totals \$340 million, and is funded in both the Budget Bill and separate legislation. Specifically, legislation proposes to fund \$109 million in the current year and \$62 million in the budget year from lease-revenue bonds, while the Budget proposes to fund \$169.4 million from GO bonds (\$7.6 million from 1998 bond funds and \$161.8 million from the proposed 2002 GO bond measure).

The following is a list of CCC capital outlay projects:

District/Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Allan Hancock/ Allan Hancock College	Library/Media Tech Center	W	\$315,000
Butte-Glenn/Butte College	Learning Resource Center	W	\$608,000
Cabrillo/ Watsonville Center	Watsonville Center Phase 2	E	\$1,005,000
Cerritos/Cerritos College	Seismic Retrofit-Metals	C	\$1,148,000
Cerritos/Cerritos College	Seismic Retrofit-Electronics	C	\$750,000
Cerritos/Cerritos College	Science and Math Complex - Life Safety	C	\$14,646,000
Chabot-Las Positas/Las Positas College	PE Gym - Phase I	W	\$466,000
Chaffey/Chaffey College	Science Bldg.	C	\$9,489,000
Citrus/Citrus College	Math/Science Bldg. Replacement	CE	\$8,438,000
Contra Costa/ Diablo Valley College	Life Sciences Reconstruction	E	\$713,000
Contra Costa/ Diablo Valley College	Life Science Remodel for Laboratories	W	\$141,000
Contra Costa/ Diablo Valley College	Seismic Retrofit- Technical Education Building	PWC	\$1,153,000
Contra Costa/Los Medanos College	Learning Resource Center	W	\$284,000
Contra Costa/San Ramon Valley Center	Phase I Bldg.	W	\$1,085,000
Desert/College of the Desert	Seismic Retrofit-Dining Hall	C	\$989,000
Fremont-Newark/ Ohlone College	Child Development Center	C	\$4,635,000
Glendale/Glendale College	Allied Health /Aviation Lab	W	\$332,000

District/Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Grossmont-Cuyamaca/Cuyamaca College	Science & Technology Mall	W	\$562,000
Grossmont-Cuyamaca/Grossmont College	New Science Bldg.	W	\$439,000
Hartnell/Hartnell College	Library/Learning Resource Center Complex	W	\$690,000
Lake Tahoe/Lake Tahoe College	Learning Resource Center	W	\$214,000
Long Beach/Long Beach City College-PCC	Replacement of Technology Buildings	CE	\$8,146,000
Long Beach/Long Beach City College-PCC	Child Development Center	E	\$197,000
Los Angeles/East Los Angeles College	Technology Building	E	\$1,945,000
Los Angeles/Los Angeles City College	Child Development Center	C	\$4,580,000
Los Angeles/Los Angeles Mission College	Child Development Center	W	\$470,000
Los Angeles/Los Angeles Southwest College	Child Development Center	W	\$162,000
Los Angeles/Los Angeles Trade Tech College	Child Development Center	W	\$117,000
Los Angeles/Los Angeles Valley College	Health Sciences Building	W	\$435,000
Los Rios/American River College	Learning Resource Center Expansion	W	\$310,000
Los Rios/Folsom Lake Center	Instruct Facilities Phase 1B	CE	\$35,770,000
Mendocino/ Mendocino College	Science Building	CE	\$7,023,000
Merced/Merced College	Interdisciplinary Academic Center	CE	\$9,028,000
Monterey Peninsula/Monterey Peninsula College	Plant Service Complex (Health & Safety)	E	\$70,000
Mt. San Antonio/Mt. San Antonio College	Seismic Retrofit - Four Buildings	C	\$1,880,000
Mt. San Antonio/Mt. San Antonio College	Science Bldg. Replacement	C	\$18,879,000
Mt. San Jacinto/Menifee Valley Center	Learning Resource Center	CE	\$10,548,000
North Orange County/Cypress College	Library/Learning Resource Center	W	\$499,000
North Orange County/Fullerton College	Library/Learning Resource Center	C	\$15,926,000
Palo Verde/Palo Verde College	Technology Bldg. Phase II	W	\$246,000
Palomar/Palomar College	High Technology Building	CE	\$29,358,000
Rancho Santiago/Santiago Canyon College	Library/Learning Resource Center	CE	\$8,975,000
Rancho Santiago/Santa Ana College	PE Seismic Replacement/Expansion	W	\$223,000

District/Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Riverside/Riverside College	Learning Resource Center	E	\$2,534,000
Riverside/Moreno Valley Center	Child Development Center	W	\$65,000
Riverside/Norco Valley Center	Child Development Center	W	\$70,000
San Bernardino/San Bernardino Valley College	Child Development Center	E	\$125,000
San Bernardino/San Bernardino Valley College	Seismic Retrofit - Art/Art Gallery	C	\$1,457,000
San Bernardino/San Bernardino Valley College	Seismic Retrofit - Campus Center	C	\$1,653,000
San Bernardino/San Bernardino Valley College	Seismic Retrofit - Administration	C	\$2,450,000
San Francisco/Mission Center	Mission Center Building	C	\$26,429,000
San Francisco/Chinatown Campus	Campus Building	W	\$1,185,000
San Joaquin Delta/San Joaquin Delta College	Electrical System	C	\$2,766,000
San Jose-Evergreen/San Jose City College	Science Building	PW	\$844,000
San Luis Obispo/Cuesta College	Theater Arts Bldg.	W	\$397,000
San Luis Obispo County/Cuesta College	Library Expansion & Reconstruction	CE	\$12,555,000
San Luis Obispo County/North County Center	Initial Bldg.. - Science Cluster	C	\$8,107,000
San Mateo County/Districtwide	Fire Alarm Replacement, Phase 2	C	\$1,998,000
San Mateo County/College of San Mateo	Seismic Retrofit-Student Svs. Bldg. #6	C	\$3,745,000
San Mateo County/Skyline College	Seismic Retrofit-Gym Bldg. #3	C	\$1,431,000
San Mateo County/Skyline College	Seismic Retrofit - Bldg. 7 & 8	C	\$3,923,000
Santa Barbara/Santa Barbara City College	Gymnasium Remodel	W	\$164,000
Sequoias/College of the Sequoias	Multi-Media Learning Center	CE	\$13,910,000
Sequoias/Sequoias College	Science Center	W	\$390,000
Shasta Tehama Trinity Jt/Shasta College	Library Addition	W	\$243,000
Sonoma County/Santa Rosa Jr. College	Learning Resource Center	W	\$1,028,000
Southwestern/Southwestern College	Child Development Center	W	\$193,000
State Center/Madera Co. Education Center	Facilities, Phase 1B	CE	\$17,343,000
State Center/Reedley College	Learning Resource Center Addition	W	\$195,000

District/Campus	Project	Phase	Amount
Ventura County/ Moorpark College	Learning Resource and Technology Center	E	\$2,708,000
Ventura County/ Moorpark College	Child Development Center	W	\$103,000
Ventura County/ Ventura College	Learning Resource Center	E	\$2,848,000
Victor Valley/Victor Valley College	Advanced Technology Complex	CE	\$17,520,000
Victor Valley/Victor Valley College	Seismic Retrofit-Auxiliary Gym	C	\$1,000,000
West Hill/Kings County Center	Phase 2B Classrooms/Laboratories	W	\$372,000
West Valley- Mission/Mission College	Main Building 3rd Floor Reconstruction	W	\$167,000
Yuba/Yuba College	Adaptive Physical Therapy	C	\$1,218,000
Yuba/Woodland Center	Science Building	C	\$5,844,000