

The Regents of the University of California

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UC MERCED

March 18, 1999

A Special Meeting of the Special Committee on UC Merced was held on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bustamante, Connerly, Davies, Davis, Khachigian, Kozberg, Lee, Nakashima, and Parsky; Advisory members Dorr, Espinoza, and Willmon

In attendance: Regents Bagley, Eastin, Hopkinson, Johnson, Lansing, Leach, Miura, Montoya, Moores, Preuss, Sayles, and Villaraigosa, Regents-designate Pannor, Taylor, and Vining, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Dorr, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Hershman, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Grey representing Chancellor Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 1:40 p.m. with Committee Chair Parsky presiding.

UPDATE ON PLANNING FOR UC MERCED

Vice Provost and Senior Associate to the President for UC Merced Tomlinson-Keasey noted that today's presentation would be the fifth quarterly report concerning the planning of the new campus at Merced. She recalled that approximately \$10 million in operational funds had been provided by the State to facilitate planning, and \$55 million for the initial infrastructure was included in a bond measure passed last November. During the last year, a great deal of attention has been focused on laying the research foundation for the campus and on physical planning.

Academic Planning

An Academic Senate Task Force on UC Merced has been appointed and has held its first two meetings. The task force represents a vital step in the continuation of academic planning for UC Merced. The Regents has delegated to the Academic Senate responsibility for curriculum development, as well as a range of advisory responsibilities, including advice on recruitment of faculty. The task force will help develop the structure by which these critical activities will be undertaken for UC Merced until the campus has its own divisional Senate.

The UC Merced Task Force has completed its review and report on academic planning to date for UC Merced. It has also initiated a discussion of planning for general education, humanities, and arts at UC Merced and is in the process of formulating a proposed structure for reviewing faculty appointments.

Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey explained that the primary issue from an academic standpoint is building a campus that will become, as quickly as possible, a peer of the other nine campuses by attracting the most distinguished faculty. It must be recognized that all of the other campuses will be hiring faculty to accommodate the surge in students expected over the next decade. In order to hire the best faculty for the new campus, there must be a few areas of excellence that are both unique and attractive to these scholars.

The Sierra Nevada Research Initiative capitalizes on existing networks within UC and envisions potential partnerships as a basis for supporting faculty scholarship. It also builds on the natural laboratory created by the San Joaquin Valley-Sierra Nevada region. Two demonstration projects are well advanced. The first focuses on transportation to and in Yosemite National Park, while the second is translating scientific findings of the massive three-year Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project into readily accessible electronic forms that can be used by planners. These projects have been joined to a related effort to locate one or more Natural Reserve System sites in proximity to UC Merced.

Planning for a Sierra Nevada Research Institute has led to many potential partnerships with the State and federal agencies that manage Sierra lands, particularly those responsible for the three National Parks located near UC Merced – Yosemite, Sequoia, and Kings Canyon. These partnerships have the potential to expand educational and research resources for UC Merced, both through collaborative relationships with working scientists and resource managers and through the intrinsic value of these public lands as natural classrooms and laboratories. The National Parks in particular are prepared to collaborate with UC's K-12 outreach initiatives in the San Joaquin Valley and to explore with UC Merced faculty options in undergraduate education, including internships that combine academic and work experience. Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey reported that on May 13 UC Merced will sign an agreement with the National Parks commemorating this partnership.

The Sierra Nevada Research Initiative Advisory Group will complete its proposed structure for the Institute this spring. UC Merced founders will be able to select early curricular emphases from among a wide range of biological sciences, environmental sciences, computational sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, policy studies, and regional planning, with the expectation that the Sierra Nevada Research Institute will be a potential magnet for attracting excellent individuals and even groups of faculty in those fields.

A second advisory group representing several social sciences and policy studies-oriented units is working on an initiative that would support the development of programs in selected social sciences, policy studies, arts, and humanities. A UC Merced Engineering Advisory Group will make recommendations for starting strong engineering, computer science, information sciences, and related science programs. Among its members are past and current UC deans of engineering and representatives of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The group will advise on ways in which a UC Merced-Livermore partnership can effectively make a contribution to the development of technology-oriented fields. This spring, the advisory group will meet with the President's Engineering Advisory Council, which includes CEOs of several California companies. The advisory

group will consult with the Council on strategies for developing UC Merced relationships with industry.

The UC Merced campus will be the hub of a network of distributed learning centers throughout the San Joaquin Valley. This network will enable the campus to broaden access to qualified students and to extend the benefits of the University throughout the Valley, both before and after UC Merced opens for residential campus instruction in 2005.

At the UC Center in Fresno, over 1,000 students will be served this year through extension programming offered in cooperation with existing campuses. This spring and summer the center will co-sponsor with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Valley school districts a series of professional development workshops on lasers and optics for K-12 teachers. These workshops will help to strengthen science curricula in Valley schools. In addition, the center will co-host with the UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education a professional development program for K-12 teachers that focuses on new strategies to work more effectively with limited-English-proficient students.

The second of UC Merced's network of centers, the Merced Tri-College Center, opened in February. The Tri-College Center, which is the only one of its kind in California, houses programs from UC Merced, California State University Stanislaus, and Merced College. A primary focus of the center will be to facilitate transfer of Merced area students from Merced College to either CSU or UC. The University is also providing extension programming at the center through the UC Merced Division of Professional Studies, as well as student outreach programs and professional development workshops for K-12 teachers in the area.

A UC Center in Modesto is scheduled to open in summer 1999 at the Stanislaus Agricultural Center, and a UC Center in Bakersfield is scheduled to open in early 2000 at the Kern County Office of Education. A wide variety of academic programming is being planned for these centers.

In spring 1998, a UC Merced Student Planning Advisory Committee, consisting of senior student affairs officers from several UC campuses and representatives from a Valley high school and a community college, was appointed to advise on outreach to K-12 students, especially in the San Joaquin Valley; student recruitment; enrollment estimates; physical planning for student life, on and off campus; and co-curricular planning that would enhance student success. The committee has finished a working paper on principles to guide planning for student life at UC Merced, with an emphasis on three major themes: integration, flexibility, and community. The committee also has endorsed the creation of a "passport program," a new approach to encourage Valley children to prepare for college and to provide continuing information about programs at UC and qualifications for admission to UC.

This spring, the committee will hold focus groups with Valley students and parents, and with coastal students, to gather their views on what would make UC Merced most attractive to them. The committee will also develop a detailed set of recommendations to campus physical planners on the range of student services that need to be planned on and off campus and will recommend a staffing

plan with timetable for UC Merced student academic services. The initial work of the committee should be completed by summer 1999.

Physical Planning

Ms. Trudi Heinecke, Director of Physical Planning and Budget for UC Merced, presented a status report on the collaborative planning process that has just been completed to define a development approach for the new University Community which will surround the UC Merced campus site. The UC Merced campus will be developed on 2,000 acres donated by the Virginia Smith Trust, located about 5 miles northeast of downtown Merced. The greater University Community area is about 10,300 acres, with 5,000 acres owned by the Virginia Smith Trust, 3,100 acres owned by the Cyril Smith Trust, and 200 acres owned by the County of Merced. The entire University Community area is about 16 square miles, roughly equivalent in size to the City of Merced.

It was determined that the first necessary step in planning the campus was to engage in a joint planning process with the landowners and local government agencies. This process was designed to produce a development concept for the entire University Community, both to deal with practical, nuts and bolts issues such as roads and infrastructure and to take advantage of the unique opportunity to establish a vision and joint planning principles for the entire community.

The concept planning process began last April and involved representatives from the University, the County of Merced, the Virginia Smith and Cyril Smith trustees, the City of Merced, and the Merced Irrigation District. The group has been supported in its work by the consulting firm of EIP Associates.

The planning process began with the articulation of a vision for the University Community. It describes how the land will be developed, the character of its neighborhoods, how people will interact, and UC's commitment to respect the area's environmental resources and history. Another step in the planning process involved looking at the site itself – its topography, views, biological resources, and hydrology. These form the physical opportunities and constraints of the site. The site is characterized by panoramic views to the south and west of Lake Yosemite, Merced, and the Valley floor, and of the foothills and the Sierra to the north and east.

The planning process also looked at how much population and employment growth will be generated by the presence of the Merced campus. At the build-out of the campus, which has been defined as 25,000 students, it is estimated that there will be 6,600 faculty and staff and that about 8,000 students will live on the campus. From this base, an estimation was made of the University-related population who will live off-campus, their household size, and their annual expenditures in the community. This results in a University-related residential population of 31,500 people and 8,500 additional jobs in commercial and business enterprises to support the campus. These numbers were used as the basis of estimating the amount of land required for housing, stores, and businesses, as well as public facilities such as schools and parks. The result is that approximately 3,000 acres are required for development to support University-related economic growth.

While some people associated with the campus will choose to live and do business in other nearby communities, this will be offset by others from the region who choose to live and work within the University Community due to its special character.

As a part of this planning process, three public events were held to solicit ideas from the public, with several hundred people in attendance at each event. As part of an outreach program called Kids Around the University, local fourth graders visited the site and provided their ideas about how the campus should be developed.

Director Heinecke reported that, with the vision for the community, the analysis of the site, and economic assumptions in hand, a development concept was defined. The concept has three components: an open space concept, a land-use concept, and a circulation concept. Open spaces will be used to help shape development, to provide on-site amenities, to maintain views, and to protect significant natural resources. About 60 percent of the total land area will be held as open space. Open spaces will be used to connect Lake Yosemite and other perimeter areas to the core of the community and the campus. Greenways and trails will connect residential neighborhoods and commercial and business centers. Important wetlands and other natural resources will be protected. Development will be configured to reflect the natural topography and to take advantage of views.

The land-use concept concentrates development around a high-intensity activity center – the campus core and the town center – which form the heart of the University Community. The campus core is about 200 acres. The boundary between the campus and the town at this point will be permeable, and it will be a pedestrian-oriented area, with the potential for shared facilities developed around common public areas.

The town center, also about 200 acres, will be a mixed-use development that includes retail, office, and residential uses. Business centers will be located adjacent to the town center. A network of residential villages will be developed around the core area, each identified by a distinct neighborhood center that might consist of a school, community center, or neighborhood retail services

The circulation concept calls for three transportation corridors to connect the community to the surrounding region, entering from the south from the Campus Parkway which will connect to Highway 99, entering from the southwest from Bellevue Road and, in the long-term, entering from the northwest along La Paloma Road. These primary corridors will be sized to handle a mix of transportation modes as they evolve, beginning with cars, buses, and bicycles. The corridors from the south will be extended near the campus boundaries, providing the opportunity for access to the campus at several points along its western and eastern edges. The circulation pattern within the town center will be based on the traditional grid pattern used in Merced.

Ms. Heinecke explained that it was important to test these concepts in terms of the financial feasibility of the proposed scope of private development. One measure is to ask whether the real estate value created at full buildout is sufficient to support the cost of backbone infrastructure and public facilities. The consultant engineers estimated the total cost of backbone systems such as water, wastewater

treatment and drainage, as well as major roads, schools, parks and other public facilities. These estimated costs total \$300 million over the buildout period, which is anticipated to be forty years or more. The total real estate value that will be created was also calculated, looking at the value of housing, commercial buildings, and business centers that will be built. This value is estimated to be \$2 billion. This level of infrastructure costs in relation to the real estate value created is within the standard of affordability.

The next steps in planning for the campus and the community will use the development concept as a foundation. A Long Range Development Plan and Environmental Impact Report will be prepared for the campus. The LRDP will establish the aesthetic character of the campus in terms of urban design, landscaping, and open spaces. One challenge is to make sure that each phase of development feels as complete as possible, while recognizing that buildout will take forty to fifty years to complete.

The County will develop the University Community Plan and its associated Environmental Impact Report. This will be an amendment to the County's General Plan, laying out the parameters and policies that will guide private development. The Community Plan will include a Capital Improvement Plan for infrastructure development and financing and will define the first phase of development necessary to support opening of the campus.

Joint planning with the County and the landowners will continue to deal with issues of common and regional concern. There will be a joint approach to conservation issues and mitigation of development impacts, especially those dealing with the biological resources of the site. This joint approach could expedite the process of obtaining development permits from federal and State agencies.

Joint technical studies are already under way, including a detailed biological assessment of the site and development of digital topographic data. Others will involve regional traffic and air quality studies, additional economic analysis, and infrastructure financing options.

These activities need to occur on a parallel time frame in order to begin site development for the campus in summer 2001. EIRs for the campus and the Community will be developed on the same schedule and will be issued for review in May 2000. It is anticipated that the campus plan will be presented to The Regents for approval in November 2000, at the same time that the Community Plan will be presented to the County Board of Supervisors for adoption.

There are challenges related to maintaining this aggressive schedule. The first is to assure that the parties are working in tandem. Another is making sure that the plans are consistent in terms of assumptions, data, development approach, and mitigation standards. A third challenge involves managing a number of complex projects involving many consultants, regulatory agencies, and decision-makers. As with any large-scale development, there will be forces beyond the control of the University and the County that can influence this schedule, such as regulatory agencies or funding requirements. In addition, there is the challenge of acquiring implementation funding from many sources to support these projects.

At the same time, there will be an opportunity to approach development in a positive, integrated way, rather than dealing with each issue in isolation. For example, all water-related issues will be dealt with as an integrated plan, both to identify potential economies and to emphasize conservation in its broadest sense. Planning the Merced campus presents an exciting and positive challenge of continuing to work with the County and the landowners to develop a model of responsible growth and development.

In response to a question from Regent Eastin, Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey stated that opening day for UC Merced would be in September 2005, when 1,000 students will be in attendance. It is anticipated that up to 5,000 students would be enrolled by 2010, with the final buildout in 2035.

Regent Eastin recalled that, during his eight-year term as Governor, Pat Brown was instrumental in the founding of the Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz campuses. She urged the University to expedite the planning for the Merced campus, particularly if the State's economy improves and the State is thus able to provide additional funding.

Regent Espinoza commended the University's administration for its involvement of the Merced community in the physical planning for the campus and asked how much of the community's input would be taken into consideration when the planning is implemented. Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey responded that the University is trying to have the campus fit the needs of the Valley in whatever ways it can, from the concept that it will be a hub that serves the entire Valley to the integration of the campus with the community in the physical planning.

In response to a question from Regent Lee, Vice President Hershman reported that the campus will require capital funding totaling about \$250 million between now and 2005 and a total of \$400 million between now and 2010. The University administration believes that the \$10 million in core funding that was provided by the State plus funding for enrollment growth and maintenance will provide the basic funding required for the operating budget.

Regent Lee asked how many square feet will be required to accommodate 5,000 students at UC Merced. Director Heinecke agreed to provide Regent Lee with that figure. She added that the \$400 million will fund construction of instructional and research space, libraries, computer centers, and student services. Additional funding will be needed for traditional auxiliary enterprises such as student housing and parking.

Vice President Hershman noted that the \$55 million that will be provided through the passage of Proposition 1A will go mainly for infrastructure. As discussed in the Assembly hearings, the University intends to ask the Legislature for a source of funds for initial construction of campus facilities. He stressed that the University and the State would need to agree on a funding plan during the course of the year. He also commented that while the University needs \$500 million in capital funding each year, at present it is receiving \$210 million from the bond measure. The University is also considering other opportunities, including year-round operations, to accommodate its students.

Regent Bustamante asked for the administration's thinking on how UC Merced would be integrated into the various communities in the Central Valley. Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey noted that there is a UC Center in Fresno, and the center in Modesto is scheduled to open in June. In each site in the Valley the University has created partnerships with K-12 schools, other colleges, and local agencies. Regent Bustamante asked about the proposed curricula for the Merced campus. Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey explained that the institute concept is designed to bring people from different disciplines together working on problems such as the Sierra Nevada eco-system. Multiple majors may be derived from the work of the Sierra Nevada Research Institute, including environmental technology and environmental science. The campus also plans to develop courses of study in engineering in consultation with scientists from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

In response to a question from Regent Bustamante regarding the acceleration of the buildout of the Merced campus, the Vice Provost recalled that when the University constructed three new campuses in the 1960s, the current regulatory environment did not exist. Because of this new environment, it is expected that the permitting process will take from the present time to 2001. Regent Bustamante asked that he be informed if the University runs into problems with CEQA or other issues that could be resolved through the legislative process. Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey noted that the University had suggested that an implementation team be created by the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor; such a team would help to resolve these types of problems.

In response to a comment by Regent Lee about the importance of UC Merced's working with companies in the Silicon Valley, President Atkinson reported that the administration had contacted several companies with the suggestion that they may wish to locate some of their facilities in the Merced area. Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey added that the large amount of space available at the Merced site will facilitate the accomplishment of initiatives such as this.

Governor Davis asked for a comparison of the time it will take to complete the Merced campus with that which was required for a campus such as UC San Diego. President Atkinson pointed out that the newer campuses are not yet complete. The original plan was to have UCSD accommodate 27,500 students; at present, the enrollment is about 19,000. The University is building for the next century, and the planning process is crucial in order to ensure excellence. The University will meet its schedule for opening the Merced campus if it receives full cooperation from the State.

Governor Davis assured the President that the University would have the full cooperation of those elected officials who were present.

In response to a further question from the Governor, Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey estimated that it would take 20 to 25 years for the Merced campus' enrollment to grow to 15,000 students. She added that it is difficult to add more than 800 students per year. President Atkinson stated that UC Merced would have 15,000 students by 2030.

Committee Chair Parsky suggested that it would be helpful to circulate a paper that outlines the administration's current thinking in terms of the costs for the new campus broken down by capital

costs and operating costs. He asked that the report separate out the time that it takes to have a quality campus from the time it takes to complete the construction project. He noted that the University should be able to put in place effective management of the construction phase. Regent Willmon asked that the report distinguish between funding sources.

Regent Johnson pointed out that the University faces an expensive seismic replacement program on its existing campuses as well as in its hospitals, which must be in regulatory compliance by 2008. In addition, the University has a deferred maintenance problem which will require considerable funding if it is to be addressed. While she supported planning for the Merced campus, Regent Johnson expressed her concern about an accelerated time frame in light of the funding that is available. She recalled that when the Board adopted a policy statement for the planning of the tenth campus, it was understood that such planning would take place "provided that there is no risk to the existing campuses."

Lieutenant Governor Bustamante noted that while he understood the need for additional resources for the system as a whole, he also believed that it was important to move aggressively in ensuring that the Merced campus is built out as quickly as possible because the Central Valley continues to be underserved with respect to higher education. He suggested that the time had come to begin planning for even more campuses in order to provide children throughout the state with the opportunity for a college education.

President Atkinson agreed with Regent Bustamante's remarks, noting that he is dedicated to the building of the Merced campus on the schedule that was established over two years ago. He added, however, that the University will be moving into the most difficult decade in its history. At present, 150,000 FTE students are enrolled; within ten years, that number will grow to 210,000. He suggested that attempting to accommodate these additional 60,000 students is a daunting task, the likes of which the University has never faced. The Merced campus, while important for the future, will play a minimal role by absorbing about 5,000 students. The University must quickly build out its other campuses in order to begin to meet the coming demand. President Atkinson pointed out that in accommodating the coming demand, the quality of the University must not be destroyed. He noted that while K-12 had been the focus of the 1990s, higher education would be the central focus of the decade to come.

Regent Eastin believed that the Governor's proposals to improve the accountability of K-12 schools as well as economic trends would indicate that 60,000 additional students is the least that the University should plan for. She urged the Regents to consider a long-range plan which would include the construction of an eleventh campus.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Attest:

UC MERCED

-11-

March 18, 1999

Secretary