

State Administrative Manual Narrative: Responses to Specific Requirements

The purpose of this document is to provide California Community Colleges facilities planning professionals with guidance for writing the State Administrative Manual (SAM) narrative when preparing Final Project Proposals (FPPs) for submission to the Chancellor’s Office Facilities Planning Unit. For additional guidance, please review the annual Chancellor’s Office Call for Capital Outlay Projects memorandum, the California Community Colleges Facilities Planning Manual, and the [California Community Colleges Vision for Success \(Vision for Success\) document](#). Also, please consult with your district’s assigned Chancellor’s Office Facilities Planning Specialist.

A. Purpose of the Project: (problem, program need, infrastructure deficiency)

PROBLEM STATEMENT

- Briefly summarize the problem and the proposed project scope.
- Tailor the Executive Summary to the proposed project category (e.g., growth or modernization).
- Remember that the audience you are writing to includes personnel at the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, the Legislature, and the Governor’s Office. Your audience is likely unfamiliar with your campus, its needs, and its facilities.
- *Briefly* summarize the problem and the proposed project scope, and include specific information concerning program need. Include the following:
 - A general statement about the college, the number of students that attend the college (e.g., enrollment). Include a sentence about the number of low-income students the college enrolls.
 - A statement about how the college’s program needs drive modifications to the existing facility or requires a new facility.
 - A statement that indicates if the college is located in a region of high-need as identified in the Vision for Success.
- What has been done to mitigate the problem?
- For projects that modify existing facilities, remain objective, specific, and fact-based when articulating your justification. Please use the following guidance:
 - Please avoid vague, non-fact-based descriptive words and phrases like “deplorable conditions”, “substandard”, “space does not work”, “falling apart”, “inadequate”, “old”, “overcrowded”, and “end-of life” since these issues are not sufficient justifications. Instead, include clear examples: refer to the building’s age, facilities condition index (MEPs), or use the campus’ capacity load ratios to demonstrate overcrowding.
 - Please avoid references to “contemporary modes of education”, because modes of instruction evolve quickly. Instead, discuss larger underlying issues with technological infrastructure, inadequate space for instruction, or other elements that clearly identify how instruction is negatively impacted by the current facility.

- Please avoid words or phrases like “facilities are scattered across campus” or are “decentralized”. If the proposed project centralizes programs in one location or area, please describe the *benefits* of centralizing the programs.
- Please identify all issues in the problem statement including if the proposed project responds to changes in state standards related to fire/life/safety issues, code violations, court-ordered projects, and/or new legislation (e.g., ADA accessibility standards, seismic vulnerabilities, or building code violations, if court ordered). Sometimes there is more than one problem that prompts the need for new facilities or to modify an existing facilities.
- Specify the assignable square feet (ASF) of the project and what those spaces will be composed of (lab, lecture, office) and whether the project will include space for Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses.
- Please do not introduce a proposed solution in this section, as the purpose of this section is only to identify the problem.
- If your district is applying for hardship, you will need to demonstrate the local effort to raise revenues and provide evidence of at least one of the following:
 - District passed a local General Obligation bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project.
 - Debt-level of at least 70 percent of bonding capacity (2.5 percent of AV).
 - Total district bonding capacity less than \$50 million.

Example:

California College has 13,425 students enrolled in its instructional programs, and 10,200 (76 percent) of California College’s students are low-income. California College has 983 full-time equivalent employees who provide administrative leadership, student services, and instruction. There are 42 full-time equivalent employees who directly serve the programs associated with the proposed project. The California College CCD and the California College campus are located in the Central Valley, which is identified by the California Community College Vision for Success as a region of high-need.

The California College Instructional Building Replacement project includes demolition of the eastern wing of Building E, the eastern wing of Building F, and the western wing of Building D. The project supports the academic areas of Biology, Social Sciences, Psychology, Speech Communication, English, Humanities, Spanish, and Vocational English as a Second Language (ESL). California CCD will demolish the old building and replace it with a new two-story building that has 20,160 assignable square feet (ASF) consisting primarily of lecture, laboratory, and office space. The existing instructional buildings (D, E, and F) were constructed in 1954 and currently house instructional programs. The 65-year-old buildings have not been renovated and contain the original building systems that do not support the current academic programs for several reasons, including: physical access and seismic issues.

The current facilities no longer meet building seismic codes. The district recently commissioned a third-party seismic study, which found that all three buildings are assessed at risk level IV. The college is located in City X, which is located approximately 50 miles from California’s San Andreas Fault. In a seismic event, these facilities may pose structural hazards.

Programmatic Issues

Although the structural problems with the buildings are a concern in terms of the safety of faculty, students, and staff, these buildings do not serve the instructional needs of the programs.

The buildings' design and the materials used to construct these concrete buildings make installing new technology very difficult. Faculty and students cannot access the Internet from some instructional spaces. The materials and design used to construct these concrete buildings has made installing technology very difficult. Both instructors and students are hindered by the lack of technology in using new teaching/learning methodologies. Student services cannot provide the full spectrum of programs due to the inability to access technology.

The electrical, heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems are original and cannot support increased loads generated by additional computers and other electronics. The lack of appropriate infrastructure results in power outages and failing mechanical systems. The buildings' insufficient technological infrastructure causes interruptions in instruction and failure to deliver consistent support to the instructional program.

Solution Criteria

The alternatives discussed in "C. Alternatives" must be analyzed against the solution criteria:

- Write solution criteria as positive statements to make the argument for the best-fit solution identified in section C.
- Ensure that the language used in establishing the criteria is the same as the language used to analyze project alternatives.
- Please do not discuss the proposed solution; instead, discuss what would happen if the problem was resolved.

The following standard criteria is used to analyze each solution alternative that would satisfy the problem.

- Cost
- Educational impacts
- Delivery timeline
- Campus integration or cohesiveness
- Security
- Energy efficiency and environmental sustainability

B. Relationship to the Strategic Plan: (relevance of problem/need to mission and goals)

- Discuss how the problem relates to the campus' master plan by analyzing the following:
 - Describe how the identified solution criteria fulfills the campus master plan/mission;
 - Please avoid vague statements like "the project supports the plan", "is in the master plan" or "meets the goals." Instead, briefly specify the master plan year that was approved by the district's local board. In addition, discuss the academic benefits of the proposed solution.

- Descriptions must be brief, yet they should include all of the information requested.
- Indicate why fixing the identified problems is important to the master plan.
- Include a statement affirming that the proposed project advances the state’s environmental sustainability goals, and describe the method used to achieve these goals.

Example:

California CCD’s Instructional Building Replacement project seeks to advance the goals of the California Community Colleges Vision for Success, an effort to improve student success, increase students’ transfer to four-year institutions, and build robust career technical education programs. This project is among the highest priority detailed in the master plan which California CCD’ board of trustees approved in 2019. While structural safety is the primary concern this project seeks to address with structural improvements, the 65 year-old buildings were not originally designed to accommodate technological infrastructure needed for instruction. Additionally, this project will integrate architectural elements that match the state’s environmental sustainability goals. The district has evaluated the campus’ energy and water usage to inform methods to implement sustainability measures for the proposed project, including energy efficient lighting and HVAC, installing photovoltaic systems, and integrating water conservation measures.

The college has experienced increased demand for degrees and certificates in the disciplines housed by the Instructional Building: Biology, Social Sciences, Psychology, Speech Communication, English, Humanities, Spanish, and Vocational ESL by XX.XX FTES and this facility will help meet that demand. In addition to meeting the demand, this facility will help achieve the set goals to increase awards in each of these disciplines by 20 percent in the next six-years.

C. Alternatives:

For each, describe the proposed alternative and provide a brief summary of scope, cost, educational impacts, delivery timeline, campus integration or cohesiveness, security, and energy efficiency and environmental sustainability.

- What options have been considered to address the problem identified above?
- Be objective in the discussion of alternatives. In this section of the SAM narrative, no solution has been chosen.
- What are the comparable ways to fix the problem?
- Discuss a minimum of three alternatives:
 - The first alternative should be the recommended solution.
 - The Department of Finance has requested that the alternatives include renovation of existing space, the installation of temporary buildings, and new construction.
- Remodeling existing space on campus should be one of the alternatives, particularly if there is excess space in any space category.
- Alternatives should be detailed per the format below, include:
 - Brief alternative scope.
 - Academic program impact and benefits to the instructional programs.
 - Facility management benefits/impact on support budget.

- Ensure that the language used in establishing the criteria is the same as the language used to analyze project alternatives.
- List pros and cons that reflect the language used in the solution criteria section of the document.

Example:

Three viable alternatives were analyzed to address the problems discussed above:

- *Alternative 1 – Demolish the western wing of Building D plus the eastern wings of buildings E and F and construct a replacement building*
- *Alternative 2 – Remodel the western wing of Building D and the eastern wings of buildings E and F*
- *Alternative 3 – Lease space off campus*

Alternative #1 Demolish the western wing of Building D and the eastern wings of buildings E and F and construct a new building with a total of 20,160 ASF. The estimated cost of this alternative @ CCI 7120 and EPI 3848 is \$XX.

Pros:

- *Educational Impacts – Provides the technology and configuration to support student services programs.*
- *Educational Impacts – Creates an on-campus environment where students can learn through the incorporation of current educational technologies*
- *Delivery Timeline – Project delivers a solution in the shortest amount of time*
- *Campus integration or cohesiveness – Project is included in the campus’ master plan*
- *Security - Improves campus security systems*
- *Energy efficiency and environmental sustainability – Improves energy efficiency*
- *Is the least cost solution.*

Cons:

- *None*

Alternative #2 – Modernize existing Building. Modernize Building D for a total of 20,160 ASF. The estimated cost of this alternative @ CCI 7120 and EPI 3848 is \$XX.

Pros:

- *Educational Impacts – Provides the technology and configuration to support student services programs*
- *Educational Impacts – Creates an on-campus environment where students can learn through the incorporation of current educational technologies*
- *Delivery Timeline – Project delivers a solution in the shortest amount of time*

Cons:

- *Cost – Is not the least cost solution.*
- *Campus integration or cohesiveness – Project is not included in the district’s master plan.*
- *Security – Improvement to campus security systems is limited*
- *Energy efficiency and environmental sustainability – Improvement to energy efficiency is limited*

Alternative #3 – Lease off campus space. Lease 20,160 ASF of off campus space. The estimated cost of this alternative @ CCI 7120 and EPI 3848 is \$XX.

Pros:

- *Educational Impacts – Provides the technology and configuration to support student services programs.*
- *Educational Impacts – Creates an on-campus environment where students can learn through the incorporation of current educational technologies.*
- *Delivery Timeline – Project delivers a solution in the shortest amount of time.*

Cons:

- *Cost – Is not the least cost solution.*
- *Educational Impacts – Does not provide the technology and configuration to support student services programs.*
- *Educational Impacts – Does not create an on-campus environment where students can learn through the incorporation of current educational technologies.*
- *Campus integration or cohesiveness – Project is not included in the district’s master plan*
- *Security – Does not improve campus security systems.*
- *Energy efficiency and environmental sustainability – Does not improve energy efficiency*

SOLUTION CRITERIA MATRIX

Please complete the table below by providing a brief assessment of these alternatives for each criterion:

Solution Criteria	#1 New Building	#2 Modernization	#3 Lease Space off campus
Least Cost Solution	Yes	No	No
Educational Impact	Yes	Yes	Yes
Delivery Timeline	Yes	Yes	Yes
Campus Integration or Cohesiveness	Yes	No	No

Solution Criteria	#1 New Building	#2 Modernization	#3 Lease Space off campus
Security	Yes	No	No
Energy Efficiency and Environmental Sustainability	Yes	No	No

D. Recommended Solution:

1. WHICH ALTERNATIVE AND WHY?

- Briefly discuss the merits of the chosen alternative and why it is the best choice of all the alternatives detailed above.
- The chosen alternative should meet all of the solution criteria.
- In this portion of the FPP, offer a synopsis of the pros and cons. The synopsis should not exceed a couple of paragraphs.
- If the chosen alternative provides additional space, and there is excess capacity on campus of any type, justify why the existing excess capacity cannot be renovated/remodeled to solve the identified problem. Ensure that the renovate/remodel alternative is discussed thoroughly.

Example:

Alternative #1 – Demolish the western wing of Building D and the eastern wings of buildings E and F and construct a new building is the chosen option because it meets all of the solution criteria. The new permanent building provides technologically advanced, appropriately configured learning spaces that support the academic and student services programs. The new building provides security features, and allows students to learn in a safe environment.

Alternative #1 is consistent with strategies defined in the district’s master plan, as it can be completed in a reasonable timeframe and aligns with college’s strategic plan to enhance campus integration. The new building will be efficient, it improves environmental and sustainability measures. This alternative does not adversely impact the campus’ operations budget, and is the least cost solution. The total estimated cost of this alternative @ CCCI 7120 and EPI 3848: \$XX.

2. DETAILED SCOPE DESCRIPTION

- Identify the state’s project category and include the project category’s essential data elements.
- Define the scope with succinct descriptors (e.g., location, number of stories, footprint, gross square feet (GSF), assignable square feet (ASF), space type, programs, buildings/spaces that are going away, programs that will be relocated).
- Discuss capacity/load ratios and ASF, include relevant information, tables can be cut and pasted into Word from the project’s FUSION Project Scenario Summary Report.

Example:

Remove the western wing of Building D, and the eastern wings of buildings E and F, and construct a replacement building on the same site. The 31,015 GSF with 20,160 ASF replacement building includes 9200 ASF classroom, 3200 ASF laboratory, 2190 ASF Office, 1600 ASF Library, 1000 ASF AV/TV, and 2970 ASF other space. The site location for the project will be adjacent to and north of the existing Home Economic buildings.

Capacity-Load Ratios

Upon completion of the project, capacity-load ratio for lecture spaces reduces from 102.4% to 101.5%. Laboratory spaces capacity load ratio reduces from 102.4% to 98.5%. In realigning overbuilt space at project completion, the office space capacity-load ratio reduces from 132.6% to 89.0%, a decrease of 43.6%, and Library space capacity-load ratio reduces from 117.2% to 90.7% capacity-load ratio, a decrease of 26.5%. AV/TV spaces remain below 100% capacity-load ratio.

Space Analysis (ASF):

Type	Lecture	Lab	Office	Library	AV/TV	Other	Total
Primary	9,200	3,200	2,190	1,600	1,000	2,970	20,160
Secondary	-5,173	-1,200	-5,951	0	-3,462	-1,469	-17,255
Net	4,027	2,000	-3,761	1,600	-2,462	1,501	2,905
Beg. Cap/Load Ratios (2017)	102.4%	102.4%	132.6%	117.2%	45.4%	N/A	106.9%
End. Cap/Load Ratios (2021)	101.5%	98.5%	89.0%	90.7%	18.1%	N/A	91.6%

3. BASIS FOR COST INFORMATION

- Briefly describe for the proposed project, and how the cost estimate was determined. The information to be used should match what's on the JCAF32.

4. FACTORS/BENEFITS OF THE RECOMMENDED OTHER THAN THE LEAST EXPENSIVE ALTERNATIVE.

- If the least cost solution is selected, state "The least cost alternative was chosen."
- If the least cost alternative was not selected, the response for this section is very important. If the justification is not convincing, another alternative will be selected or the proposal may be denied.
 - Clearly justify why this alternative was chosen over the least cost alternative (why don't the discussed lower cost models work?).
 - The programmatic benefits to choosing a higher cost alternative must clearly outweigh the least cost alternative (please provide quantitative information for support).
 - If a compelling argument cannot be made to choose the least cost alternative, then, perhaps, the least cost solution should be proposed or give more careful thought to the solution criteria.

5. COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT ON SUPPORT BUDGET

- Briefly describe impact of project on the campus' support budget, if any.

Example:

This project will not result in a need for additional faculty or staff positions. This project will include installation of efficient mechanical and electrical devices, which will result in a reduction of operational and maintenance costs.

6. IDENTIFY AND EXPLAIN ANY PROJECT RISKS.

- Identify any known project risks.
- Advise of possible risks due to structure or location (e.g., historical building, located in a seismic region, possible review by other governmental compliance entities, etc.)
- If there are no risks, state “None at this time.”

7. LIST REQUESTED INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION AND/OR SPECIAL PROJECT APPROVALS

Please include mandatory reviews and approvals (e.g., technology proposals). If applicable, California Coastal Commission, TRPA

Example:

The Division of the State Architect and the State Fire Marshal review for structural safety, access compliance and fire/life/safety plan and field reviews. State Public Works Board approval of preliminary plans and working drawings are also required.

E. Consistency with Government Code Section 65041.1:**Example:**

The California Community Colleges are exempt from the specific provisions of this Government Code Section.

F. Attachments:

JCAF31

JCAF32

JCAF33