### CHILDREN’S CENTER STUDY
**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE**  
February 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Scheme A</th>
<th>Scheme B</th>
<th>Scheme C</th>
<th>Alt. Site</th>
<th>Exist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Site Work</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Site Work</td>
<td>46,460</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>76,680</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>235,600</td>
<td>235,600</td>
<td>258,400</td>
<td>235,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000 (90,000-30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$330,060</td>
<td>$364,800</td>
<td>$382,980</td>
<td>$354,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 1**  
Wood Deck $20,000

**Option 2**  
Addn'1 Property $15,000

**Total Cost w/Opt. #1** $350,000

**Total Cost w/Opt. #2** $345,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building---Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>3,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Play---Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>6,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Cliff Drive</td>
<td>Weldon Rd.</td>
<td>Weldon Rd.</td>
<td>Weldon/Loma Alta</td>
<td>Cornel St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking -- No. Cars</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Curb Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I understand that we are meeting to discuss when a consultant should be hired. It costs no more to have the consultant from the beginning of the project than it does to bring him in later. The fee for Educational Design Consultants is 1% of the total cost of the building.

I have submitted to you testimonials from other colleges on the work that Mr. Messano has done for them. In most of these colleges, a planning committee was set up. The opinion of the architects was that what they had from the committee was meaningless because it did not fit modern concepts. At Chemeketa Community College in Salem, Oregon, out of 15 people on the committee, two to three did the work. Santa Monica had developed specifications over a period of a year. They had 30 people on the committee with three people doing the work. Their plans were not meaningful to today's needs. Therefore, they brought in Mr. Messano in July and he had to develop the educational specifications for them. The same situation is existent at Harbor and West L. A. Colleges. Yuba was almost complete on working drawings, ready to go to bid. The planning had to be thrown out and Frank Messano wrote the educational specifications. A committee puts down needs which have to be translated for the architect. Concise philosophies are rare. People don't know what they want. To get the most input and most review a consultant should meet with the committee. He can pull together the total instructional program support and act as translator between the committee and the architect.

Generally a committee is developed from various divisions that represent the college. These people have a practical sense of the college needs. They lack experience of what other colleges have done and achieved on a national basis. They lack the planning experience of physically turning the educational specs of the college into a physical, concrete learning center. The planning committee develops in written form the educational specifications for a library. The administration sees the written form, also the architects. At that time, the educational specs must be translated into architectural language. During interpretation most buildings either become good buildings or bad buildings. The finished product of a planning committee is not coherent enough. In many cases, a consultant has been brought in to make a concise translation into architectural language. In many cases, consultants have been forced to begin from the very beginning. In all cases, the educational
specifications have changed dramatically. A consultant can develop a
pre-planning philosophy so that the faculty can become critics. The consultant
can develop graphics, drawings and slides so that the committee understands
before not after.

If a consultant is not hired, I would have to spend time visiting
other libraries, an expensive and time-consuming process which I cannot
afford with a limited staff.

Very few architects understand the unique needs of a community college.
Some will build a miniature university library or a glorified high school
library. In most cases, as in our present library building, the architect
took over completely and the results were disastrous. I am qualified to
give the state figures on space for books and students, but I am not qualified
to put intricate plans into architectural language. With the present building,
because the architect did not go along, the Board did not go along either.
As a result, we have a 100º sauna bath atmosphere in the library during
most of the hot months. Even if I had the necessary qualifications, I have
no time to explore the different problem areas. On the first building I
worked for four months, including nights and weekends. I enlisted the help
of everyone I could find and made inquiries all over. I could never get in
touch with the architect. I was turned down a basement for storage, air
conditioning and carpeting. The architect put in the useless pergola around
the building, a large patio used only for graduations, too much glass, which
causes a glare during the winter months. I don't want to repeat the same
experience.

We are short by three librarians. To do even a mediocre job on the
planning, I would have to divorce myself for covering for sickness, meetings,
lunch hours, and coffee breaks. Mr. Messano is qualified to do the entire
job from the formulation of the educational philosophy to interior design,
which includes color, materials and quantity, as well as types of furniture
to consider. He knows a variety of manufactures and does all bids
specifications. Because of his knowledge, Cuesta saved enough to pay for all
of his services. He can advise on lighting (number of foot candles), acoustical
treatment, noise separation between areas, air velocity and heating.
It is hard to anticipate what the future needs of the library will be. Libraries are becoming more involved in individualized study and more and more involved in new techniques. We have to consider computerization, computer assisted instruction, and other innovations that are now being put into effect. We are erecting a building that should last for the next 50 years. I am asking that we have a competent consultant to help us plan this very important facility.

**COLLEGE AND OTHER LIBRARIES ON WHICH MR. MESSANO HAS BEEN A CONSULTANT**

- Cuesta
- Yuba
- Sacramento State
- UC - Davis
- Harbor
- West L. A.
- Santa Monica
- Porterville
- San Diego
- U. S. Army
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December 11, 1974

Mr. Donald Trent
Director of Facilities and
Resource Development
Santa Barbara Community
College District
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, California

Subject: Childrens Center, Feasibility Study for Alternate Site

Dear Mr. Trent:

As per our discussions, we have proceeded with a study of an alternate site for the Children's Center. The alternate site is at the southwest corner of Weldon Drive and Loma Alta, directly across Loma Alta from McKinley Elementary School. The street address is 365 Loma Alta Drive and the assessor's parcel number is 35-232-5. It is nearly one acre in size, 150 ft. wide and an average length of 286 ft.

The site is well located for a Children's Center. It is within easy walking distance of the existing campus, but yet is isolated from the campus. It is the site of an older residence, and is heavily wooded with a wide variety of trees. The trees tend to give the site its feeling of isolation, and make it very desirable for a Children's Center of the size anticipated.

In order to utilize the site, it will be necessary to remove the existing dwelling and garden structures. It will also be necessary to remove some trees in order to make room for the proposed building and the adjoining playground area. However it appears to be possible to save all of the larger (and most desirable species) trees.
Since the streets are narrow in this area, it will be necessary to provide off-street parking within the site for a minimum of twelve spaces plus a temporary loading and service area. There is ample room for this amount of parking on the property plus related driveways. We believe the access driveway system should enter the property from Weldon Drive and then exit onto Loma Alta where the present driveway is located. This would provide the safest access by automobile to the property, since the volume and speed of traffic on Loma Alta is far greater than on Weldon Drive.

We have determined that all utilities are available to the site, and all services to the building would be short, when compared to the original site.

We have also determined in our study to date that the building of the same size as proposed in our previous studies can be easily accommodated, along with the parking mentioned above. This would still leave an open outdoor play area of 9600 sq.ft. graded so as to be approximately at the same level as the floor of the building. That much area for open playground is very desirable and is, we believe, the biggest factor in favor of this site over the previous site. In our previous studies the largest level play area we could work out was 25 percent less than this one, and in all cases the cost of grading and site work is considerably more than what we estimate for this site.

In comparing our overall estimated cost for improvements on this site with the previous site, development will be considerably less than in any of our previous schemes. It is $35,560.00 less than Scheme "A", $ 70,300.00 less than Scheme "B" and $85,480.00 less than Scheme "C". In considering this with the other advantages of closer proximity, better access, and larger area for level outdoor playground facilities, we recommend this site over the original site.

Should the Board elect to proceed with studies on this site, it will be necessary to apply to the City of Santa Barbara for re-zoning or a conditional use permit. We have not been able to discuss this with the City Planning staff as yet, but since the intensity of use would be less than what present zoning would allow (even at half-density) it seems likely there would not be a problem in getting approval. Purchase of the property must be made contingent on approval of the use intended, in any event.

Very truly yours,

Williams C. Hall
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ESTIMATED COST FOR CONSTRUCTION - LOMA ALTA SITE

Off Site Work

Public sidewalks along Weldon Drive
and Loma Alta Drive .................. $ 2,000.00

Site Work

Demolition of existing residence,
tree trimming and removal of trees,
as necessary ........................ $ 5,000.00
Grading ............................... $ 6,000.00
Parking area & access drives ..... $ 5,600.00
Fencing, playground area only .... $ 2,300.00
Landscaping, including irrigation $ 9,000.00
Concrete walks and exterior slabs $ 3,000.00

$30,900.00 $ 30,900.00

Building - Capacity for 50 children

6200 sq.ft. at $38.00 per ft................ $ 235,600.00

Contingency ...................... $ 26,000.00

Total Cost for 50 children ........ $ 294,500.00

Note: A smaller center with capacity for
35 children would be approximately
$42,000.00 less, or $252,500.00.
September 11, 1974

Mr. Donald Trent
Director of Facilities and
Resource Development
Santa Barbara Community
College District
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, California

Subject: Children's Center Feasibility Studies

Dear Mr. Trent:

We are submitting herewith our completed feasibility studies for the proposed Children's Center, on property generally lying northeast of the intersection of Cliff Drive and Weldon Place.

The property is well located for this use. It is isolated from the existing campus but yet is within easy walking distance of the campus. It would be generally convenient to parents attending the college and those students interested in child care and development.

On the other hand, the property is split in half by a natural stream which has cut deeply into the sandy soil. The banks on either side are so steep as to be hazardous in many places, particularly for children. We anticipate that the stream channel area will have to be carefully fenced off to prevent children from wandering into it.

The only portion of the property usable for this facility is the easterly half, which is the portion closest to the existing campus. The terrain in this area, although irregular at present, can be reshaped and utilized in a number of ways, allowing a facility with a capacity of either 35 or 50 children.

The balance of the property, or the westerly half, is unfeasible to develop for this type of use, and should remain in its present natural state. Since the property is subject to approval of the Coastal Commission, careful consideration must be given to preserving the natural qualities of the site.
The three schematic site plans represent the full range of possibilities for locating the building, the outdoor play areas, access roads and off-street parking area described. All of these schemes are based on the following criteria:

1. Building to be on one floor level, for maximum efficiency in operation and the necessity of close observation of the children served.

2. Outdoor play areas to be at or near the floor level of the building, and graded with only minimum slope for surface drainage.

3. Parking and access driveways to be as close to building as possible and as close to the level of the building as possible.

4. All areas to be accessible to the handicapped.

5. Building to be of wood frame construction and designed to allow for relocation in the future.

The building plans, while not shown on the small scale site plans, have been developed to a point where optimum building area could be determined, in relation to the program which you and the staff have outlined. The area required for a center for 50 children is 6200 sq.ft. and for 35 children is 5200 sq.ft.

These building areas were based on the following criteria:

1. Classroom space allowing an area of 35 sq.ft. per child. In the larger center this would be in two separate classrooms and for a smaller facility, one large classoom is assumed adequate. Each classroom to have adjoining storage rooms.

2. Toilet facilities for the children in accordance with the state formula, located to be accessible from the classroom as well as the outdoor play areas.

3. One special activity area, including childrens toilet and storage, to be utilized for instruction of college students in child care.

4. Administrative offices, conference room, a staff work room and serving kitchen (assuming meals will be delivered from the main campus).
5. Adult toilet rooms, custodial space and a mechanical-electrical equipment area.

6. Covered play areas located generally between classrooms and outdoor play areas. These are calculated at one-third of building floor area and included in the total area figures.

In most of our schemes, the playground area indicated is roughly twice the minimum area required by the state. Adequate level outdoor area which is easily supervised is one of the most important factors in the operation of a child-care facility, and this should not be compromised by poor site conditions.

One other factor, typical of all schemes, is the necessity to run a sewer main, 8 inches in diameter, to the property a distance of 650 ft. This has been researched with the City of Santa Barbara Public Works Department and is the only apparent way this property can be served. One hundred feet of the above distance will need to be bored under Cliff Drive and the entire line will require four manholes in that length.

The following is a brief resume of the schemes and the estimated construction costs for each.

**SCHEME A**

This schematic plan involves an access to the site directly from Cliff Drive with a parking area just inside the property. The building is situated on a leveled-out area cut into the hillside north of the parking lot. The building would be planned to orient the classrooms and playground area in the westerly portion of the leveled area. This places the play area and the building itself as far from Cliff Drive as possible and provides the most isolated classroom orientation and play area of any of the schemes. It also involves the least amount of site work and physical changes to the site of any of the schemes.

The area available for outdoor playground is small, however it does exceed state minimum standards. One way of increasing the width of this play area is to construct a platform or deck level with the "on grade" play area, supported along the creek bank by driven wood piles. Another possibility would be to purchase the small parcel to the west of the college parcel and extend the play area out into this property. These options, as you will note, are about the same in estimated cost.
Estimated Construction Cost for Scheme A

Off Site Work

Sewer main extension ................ $ 12,900.00
Cliff Drive access including deceleration lane, etc. .... $ 5,100.00

Total Off-Site Work ........ $ 18,000.00 $ 18,000.00

Site Work

Parking Area ......................... $ 4,760.00
Sidewalk and stairway ................ $ 4,250.00
Retaining wall ....................... $ 11,200.00
Grading ............................ $ 5,250.00
Storm drains ........................ $ 2,000.00
Fencing ................................ $ 3,000.00
Landscaping, including bank stabilization and irrigation ... $ 16,000.00

Total Site Work ...................... $ 46,460.00 $ 46,460.00

Building - Capacity for 50 children

6200 square feet at $38.00 per sq.ft. ..................... $235,600.00

Contingency ......................... $ 30,000.00

Total Construction Cost
Capacity for 50 children ............... $330,600.00

Optional additions to Play Areas

1. Construction of wood framed deck level with on grade play area ........ $ 20,000.00

2. Purchase of adjoining property and grading work thereon to develop extension of level play area.
   (Assuming property can be purchased for $12,500.00.) .............. $ 15,000.00
Alternate Scheme A Building -
with capacity for 35 children

5200 square feet at $38.00 per sq.ft. ........... $197,600.00
Site work as outlined above ............... $ 64,460.00

$262,060.00

Contingency .......... $ 26,000.00

Total Construction Cost
Capacity for 35 children ........... $288,060.00

Note: We believe that it would not be necessary
to provide the additional play area outlined above for this size of center.

SCHEME B

This schematic plan provides for access to the site through the privately owned parcel to the west. This obviously involves additional time and expense to purchase that parcel, but it does provide the safest access to the usable portion of the site. Access would be from Weldon Place, which has very little traffic compared with Cliff Drive.

The building would be planned to orient the administration and special activity area on the north and west sides of the building toward the parking and access drive. The classrooms then would orient toward the south, and the outdoor play area would be located between the building and Cliff Drive.

In order to provide space for the building and play area in this scheme it is necessary to extend the existing culvert one hundred feet west and fill in that portion of the existing stream bed. This scheme involves considerably more on-site work than the previous one because of this necessity.
Estimated Construction Cost for Scheme B

Off Site Work

Sewer main extension ........................................ $ 12,900.00

Site Work

Culvert extension and headwall ................................ $ 7,000.00
Parking area and access driveways ............................ $ 5,200.00
Concrete walks and stairway .................................. $ 4,000.00
Grading .................................................................. $34,500.00
Storm drains .......................................................... $ 1,500.00
Fencing .................................................................... $ 2,600.00
Landscaping ............................................................ $16,000.00

Total Site Work ...................................................... $70,800.00

Building - Capacity for 50 children

6200 sq.ft. at $38.00 per sq.ft. ................................. $235,600.00

$319,300.00

Estimated cost of adjoining parcel .......................... $ 12,500.00

Contingency .......................................................... $ 33,000.00

Total Construction Cost
Capacity for 50 children ....................................... $364,800.00

Alternate Scheme B Building -
with capacity for 35 children

5200 sq.ft. at $38.00 per sq.ft. ................................. $197,600.00

Site work as outlined above ..................................... $ 83,700.00

Estimated cost of adjoining property ....................... $ 12,500.00

$293,800.00

Contingency ........................................................ $ 29,000.00

Total Construction Cost
Capacity for 35 children ....................................... $322,800.00
SCHEME C

This schematic plan provides for access to the site directly from Weldon Place without passing through the adjoining parcel (as in the previous scheme). It is feasible to bring in an access driveway at about a ten percent grade and connect it to a parking area similarly sloped, all on the northerly side of the property.

The building in this case would be at a level lower than the parking lot, but would be accessible by ramps designed for the handicapped. The administration area and special services areas would be oriented toward the north and east of the building and the classroom area toward the west and south. The open play area would be west of the building and would again be on fill over a portion of the existing stream bed.

We illustrate in this scheme the possibility of utilizing concrete cribing which would reduce the culvert extension by at least forty feet and reduce the quantity of imported fill dirt. We cannot be certain if this method may be applied until soil tests and engineering studies are made, but it does at least seem to be a strong possibility.

Please note that only the smaller capacity of 35 children can be accommodated in this scheme because the location of the building is necessarily "wedged in" between property lines and the existing culvert. For this reason, and because of the rather awkward and hazardous access driveway, this scheme is, in our opinion, the least desirable of the three.

Estimated Construction Cost for Scheme C

Off Site Work

Sewer main extension .................................. $12,900.00

Site Work

Extension of culvert and headwall ..................... $4,700.00
Parking area and access drive ......................... $6,600.00
Concrete sidewalks and ramps ......................... $2,130.00
Grading .................................................. $15,750.00
Concrete cribing retaining fill slopes$28,000.00
Storm drains ............................................ $2,000.00
Fencing .................................................. $2,500.00
Landscaping, including bank stabilization & irrigation .................................................. $15,000.00

Total Site Work ........................................ $76,680.00
Building - Capacity for 35 children

5200 sq.ft. at $38.00 per sq.ft. . . . . . . . $258,400.00

+$347,980.00

Contingency . . . . $ 35,000.00

Total Construction Cost
Capacity for 35 children. . . . . . . $382,980.00

These studies have been made with only a very limited aerial survey, in order to complete the study in the time allowed by our agreement. For this reason we wish to make it clearly understood that our estimates are subject to change in cut and fill calculations and related site work. Accuracy in these areas cannot be expected without a proper topographical survey.

Thank you again for this opportunity to be of service. If there are any questions, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Williams C. Hall
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District: Santa Barbara Community College  College: Santa Barbara City College

Project: Children's Center

ANTICIPATED TIME SCHEDULE

Feasibility Study to Board - authorization to proceed with Schematic Drawings....................... September 26, 1974
Approve Schematic Drawings................................. October 24, 1974
Approve Preliminaries........................................ November 28, 1974
Submit reports to environmental agencies................. March 3, 1975
Complete Working Drawings.................................. March 7, 1975
Approval by environmental agencies......................... May 5, 1975
OAC Plan Check complete..................................... May 12, 1975
Advertise for bids............................................. May 20, 1975
Bids due......................................................... June 10, 1975
Begin construction............................................. June 27, 1975
Complete construction......................................... June 1976
Install equipment.............................................. July 1976
Occupy......................................................... September 1976
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Amount Paid 12/31</th>
<th>Estimated State Funds</th>
<th>Amount Bond Funds</th>
<th>Amount Other Funds</th>
<th>Bond Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Bldg. Landscape</td>
<td>$44,611</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$44,611</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,133,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Park - III</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Access Road</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,999,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama/Music Facilities</td>
<td>4,407,770</td>
<td>30,846</td>
<td>2,688,740</td>
<td>1,688,184 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,311,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Center</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Technology Bldg.</td>
<td>+8% 755,743</td>
<td>7,073</td>
<td>381,670</td>
<td>236,945 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,074,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Dev. - I West Campus</td>
<td>786,606</td>
<td>13,533</td>
<td>393,300</td>
<td>379,773 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>694,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Parking - I</td>
<td>183,110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>183,110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>511,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>461,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Center Renov. -75</td>
<td>+8% 40,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>421,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassign R1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>417,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Renovation -75</td>
<td>+8% 54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>365,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Barrier Renov.</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>281,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove TI, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus Parking - I</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>266,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Park-IV/LePlaya-I</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176,829</td>
<td>113,054 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama/Music Equipment</td>
<td>289,883</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176,829</td>
<td>113,054 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Campus Erosion Control</td>
<td>+16% 87,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>34,800 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reloc. &amp; Renov. R1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>+16% 230,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(161,711)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove T2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(162,461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Park-V/LePlaya-II</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science Addn. &amp; Renov.</td>
<td>+16% 870,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>522,000</td>
<td>348,000 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(510,461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Bldg. Renov.</td>
<td>+16% 512,056</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>307,234</td>
<td>249,610 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(760,071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 1975 Sale of 1969 Bonds

Estimated Balance of Bond Funds Available after Deducting Committed Funds

75-76

Total Estimated Cost: $4,722,378

Total Amount Paid: $1,156,236

Total Estimated State Funds: $3,000,542

Total Amount Bond Funds: $1,731,356

Total Amount Other Funds: $1,447,000

Total Bond Balance: $3,178,356
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Amount Paid 12/31</th>
<th>Estimated State Funds</th>
<th>Amount Bond Funds</th>
<th>Amount Other Funds</th>
<th>Bond Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77-78</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(810,071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove T7,8,9,11/E.Camp.Park-II +16%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(860,071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Ctr. Addn. &amp; Renov. +16%</td>
<td>1,002,932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>601,759</td>
<td>401,173 *</td>
<td>(1,261,244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Building - I +24%</td>
<td>2,132,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,279,680</td>
<td>853,120 *</td>
<td>(2,114,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershing Park VI/LaPlaya-III</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000(Community Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-79</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,164,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Ctr.-I +24%</td>
<td>553,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>331,920</td>
<td>221,280 *</td>
<td>(2,385,644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaPlaya - IV</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000(Community Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,435,644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stud. Serv. Renov. (Lib.) +24%</td>
<td>242,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145,411</td>
<td>96,941 *</td>
<td>(2,532,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove SS &amp; T10, 12 +24%</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(2,557,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaPlaya - V</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000(Community Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,607,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bookstore Renovation +32%</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>(2,765,985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stud. Activities Renov. +32%</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>(2,779,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration Bldg. Renov. +40%</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>112,000 *</td>
<td>(2,891,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaPlaya - VI</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000(Community Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,941,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>