

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**

November 16, 2000

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at Covell Commons, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Connerly, Davies, Fong, Hopkinson, S. Johnson, Kohn, and Kozberg; Advisory members T. Davis, Morrison, and Seymour

In attendance: Regents Bagley, O. Johnson, Lansing, Lee, Miura, Montoya, Parsky, and Preuss, Faculty Representatives Cowan and Viswanathan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Interim Treasurer Bowman, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice President Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Cicerone, Greenwood, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 3:10 p.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of September 13, 2000 were approved.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. ***Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Design, Genome and Biomedical Sciences Facility, Davis Campus***

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Final Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- (1) Certify the Final Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- (3) Approve the design of the Genome and Biomedical Sciences Facility, Davis campus.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring Program were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

**B. *Approval of Negative Declaration and Approval of Design, Croul Hall, Irvine Campus***

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Committee:

- (1) Approve the Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- (2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- (3) Approve the design of Croul Hall, Irvine campus.

[The Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring Program were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

**C. *Adoption of Addendum to Environmental Impact Report, Amendment of Long Range Development Plan, and Approval of Design, Plant Physiology Replacement Building, Los Angeles Campus***

The President recommended that the Committee, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Academic Health Center Facilities Reconstruction Plan certified by The Regents in November 1998, recommend that The Regents:

- (1) Adopt the Findings and Environmental Impact Report Addendum.
- (2) Amend the campus Long Range Development Plan to transfer 12,400 gross square feet from the Health Sciences zone to the Botanical Gardens zone to accommodate the proposed project.
- (3) Approve the design of the Plant Physiology Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus.

[The Findings and Environmental Impact Report Addendum were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Committee Chair Kozberg commented that all of the projects which are presented to the Committee are carefully reviewed by its chair and vice chair prior to the meeting, and the determination is made as to which items should be presented as a part of the consent agenda.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendations and voted to present them to the Board.

3. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOR TWO UNDERHILL AREA PROJECTS: CENTRAL DINING AND OFFICE FACILITY AND COLLEGE-DURANT STUDENT HOUSING, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed projects as indicated in the Final Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend that The Regents:

- (1) Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program including Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- (3) Amend the campus Long Range Development Plan to relocate 2612 Channing Way (the Fox Cottage) to a new site north of 2547 Channing Way (the Shorb House), the site of a surface parking area, and to designate the University-owned property covering the western third of the Underhill block for dining, student services, and offices.
- (4) Approve the design of the Central Dining and Office Facility, Berkeley campus, including the relocation of the Fox Cottage.
- (5) Approve the design of the College-Durant Student Housing, Berkeley campus.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring Program were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that in September 2000 The Regents approved the Central Dining and Office Facility (CDOF), Berkeley campus, for inclusion in the 2000-05 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2000-03 Capital Improvements Program. In May 2000, inclusion of the College-Durant Student Housing project, Berkeley campus, in the 2000-05 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2000-03 Capital Improvements Program at a project cost of \$11,430,000 was approved

administratively and by chairs' concurrence. These projects are two components of a multi-project development known as the Underhill Area Projects (UAP).

In October 2000 the appointments of Pyatok Associates of Oakland as Executive Architect for the College-Durant Student Housing project and of CannonDworsky of Los Angeles as Executive Architect for the Central Dining and Office Facility project were administratively approved within the Office of the President.

The Underhill Area Projects propose to develop on University property a mixed-use project including a replacement parking structure, playing field, dining commons, new residence halls and apartment-style housing, and offices. The Underhill area is anchored by one largely University-owned city block south of the central campus, bounded to the east by College Avenue, to the west by Bowditch Street, and to the south and north by Haste Street and Channing Way, respectively. Site selection criteria for the Underhill Area Projects seek to minimize construction impacts on existing operations and to improve long-term operational efficiencies. Development of the Underhill Area Projects will increase student housing and dining near the campus and reduce overall trip generation on a campus-wide level.

In a phased series of actions, the University plans to replace and expand upon a previously-demolished parking structure with a sports field located above; provide new student housing and residential support services; relocate the historic Fox Cottage, located at 2612 Channing Way, to a site currently used for surface parking across the street on Bowditch, north of 2547 Channing Way (the Shorb House), a City landmark; relocate dining services to a new, seismically enhanced CDOF, a facility that will serve two existing residence hall complexes; and consolidate and relocate in the CDOF administrative offices that provide student services.

The Environmental Impact Report evaluates all actions necessary to implement the Underhill Area Projects.

#### Central Dining and Office Facility Site

The CDOF will occupy the western third of the University-owned property at the Underhill block. The campus Long Range Development Plan proposed 475 to 550 beds in a residence hall at the site. This housing will be provided at alternative sites in the Underhill Area, including the College-Durant Student Housing Project site designated in the LRDP as a reserve site. The LRDP will be amended to modify the intended use of the CDOF site from housing to dining, student services, and office use.

The 1990 LRDP anticipated constructing housing around the Fox Cottage at 2612 Channing Way. The CDOF project overwhelms the existing context for the cottage, while programmatic and

financial constraints prohibit preservation on site. An LRDP amendment is proposed to move the cottage to a nearby surface parking lot.

#### Central Dining and Office Facility Design

The CDOF project will replace the existing dining facilities at Unit 1 and Unit 2. These facilities are rated seismically “poor” and must be either seismically retrofitted or vacated. The two buildings are separated by one city block, provide the same services to students residing in the units, and together provide 833 seats in approximately 50,000 gross square feet (gsf) of space. The costs of seismically upgrading, renovating, and continuing to operate the two existing smaller facilities are prohibitive compared to the cost of constructing and operating a single, large dining facility. Upon completion of the CDOF project, the existing dining common facilities at Unit 1 and Unit 2 will be demolished as part of a separately funded project. The CDOF project will provide seating for 800 in 40,688 gross square feet of dining space.

The CDOF will provide 46,465 gsf of office space to consolidate Housing, Dining, and Child Care Services (HDCCS) offices in a single location. The modular buildings vacated by the HDCCS relocation to the CDOF will be removed, and spaces leased by HDCCS units will be vacated.

The Underhill parking structure will give visitors to offices in the CDOF access to short-term parking. Adequate parking for service functions is an issue at every location operated by HDCCS.

Food service and dining functions will be located on the ground floor and administrative offices on floors two through four. An entry plaza on the corner of Channing and Bowditch gives access to the dining halls. An extended-hours café will be located off the Bowditch entry plaza. The administrative offices will have a dedicated lobby on Channing Way.

The building structure and key building systems have been upgraded to ensure that the CDOF will be operational after a major seismic event on the Hayward fault. The building’s seismic performance has been evaluated using site-specific ground motions, and a cost-benefit analysis was performed to optimize this added investment.

Principal exterior materials include plaster, clear and translucent glazing, and sloped metal roofing. The design concept preserves most specimen redwood trees existing on the site. New landscaping will create a landscaped environment compatible with the existing neighborhood.

The Berkeley campus’ Design Review and Seismic Review Committees have reviewed and endorsed the project. Independent structural and cost peer review will be conducted throughout project development, as required by policy.

Project oversight will be provided by the Vice Chancellor for Capital Projects for the Berkeley campus. Capital Projects will manage the project and provide construction inspection services, supported by the staff of the executive design professional. External consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary.

Construction will begin in spring 2001 and be completed in fall 2002, with occupancy of the dining facility scheduled in time for the fall 2002 academic semester.

#### College-Durant Student Housing Project

The project site is located on the southeast corner of College and Durant Avenues, two blocks south of campus. It is used as a surface parking lot for University permit-holders and is identified in the 1990 Long Range Development Plan as a reserve site. The project will construct 120 beds of apartment-style housing for undergraduate students. Existing surface parking on the site will not be replaced. The development of College-Durant Student Housing will help meet the demand for student housing close to campus. The building will occupy the majority of the J-shaped site with minimum set backs in order to maximize the available square footage for living units. The building will feature a central courtyard that acts as a social focal point while allowing natural light to penetrate to interior units.

The building will be of wood frame with a four-story face along College Avenue that steps back to three stories at the eastern side. The design calls for stucco and wood panel exterior surfaces and a composite shingle roof.

The Berkeley campus' Design Review and Seismic Review Committees have reviewed and endorsed the project. Independent structural and cost peer review will be conducted throughout project development.

Project oversight will be provided by the Vice Chancellor for Capital Projects. Capital Projects will manage the project and provide construction inspection services, supported by the staff of the executive design professional. External consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary.

Construction will begin in spring 2001 and be completed in fall 2002.

#### Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the potential environmental effects of the CDOF and of its concurrent construction with the College-Durant Student Housing were analyzed in the Final EIR entitled *Underhill Area Projects*. Related facilities analyzed in the Final EIR include a sports field/parking

structure replacement, new in-fill residence halls at Unit 1 and Unit 2, and the Channing/Bowditch housing, which will be considered for approval at the appropriate level at a later date. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project EIR was mailed to the State Clearinghouse, to various state, regional, and local agencies, and to interested individuals on October 10, 1997. A scoping session was publicly noticed and held on October 15, 1997. A second NOP, adding the housing components of the UAP to the scope of the project for environmental review, was published on April 12, 1999. A second scoping session was publicly noticed and held on April 29, 1999. Written and verbal comments on the NOP were received by the University and were taken into account during the preparation of the EIR.

On April 7, 2000, the campus filed a Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR, released the document, and initiated a sixty-day public review period which closed on June 9, 2000. Public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR was provided with advertisements in the *Oakland Tribune*, *Daily Californian*, *Berkeley Daily Planet*, and *The Berkeley Voice*. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available on campus and in the main branch of the Berkeley Public Library and were distributed to interested agencies, groups, and individuals. A public hearing was held on April 24, 2000, during which comments on the Draft EIR were received. A transcript of the hearing, along with all comment letters received, is included in the Final EIR. In total, two agencies (AC Transit, CalTrans), four offices of the City of Berkeley, and 23 individuals and private organizations provided written comments, with 22 individuals presenting oral testimony at the public hearing on the Draft EIR. Responses to all comments received during the public review period are contained in the Final EIR.

In the EIR under consideration, "UAP" refers to the replacement of the Underhill block parking structure/playing field, dining commons, offices, Unit 1 and Unit 2 housing and dining facilities, Channing/Bowditch housing, and the College-Durant Student Housing complex. The recommendation relies upon the UAP EIR for analysis of the CDOF and College-Durant Student Housing design, construction, operation, and related actions. It is expected that the various UAP components will be approved and implemented over an approximate ten-year period. The CDOF (referred throughout the EIR documentation as the CDSSB) and College-Durant Student Housing are the first components of the UAP. Subsequent approvals will be required for other components of the plan.

The UAP will implement development called for in the 1990 LRDP and will replace what was once an existing use at the time the LRDP was finalized (the former Parking Structure D and the rooftop sports field were demolished in 1993 due to structural instability). The site for the College-Durant Student Housing was designated in the LRDP as a reserve site; the proposed use is consistent with the LRDP. However, some components of the UAP will alter some land use designations of the LRDP and require an amendment to the LRDP. The need for a central (replacement) dining area was not anticipated in 1990 as a seismic assessment of the existing dining facilities had not been completed; the office component was subsequently removed from the 1995 Haste/Channing

(Cleary Hall) project and remains an outstanding need addressed by the CDOF. With amendment of the LRDP to designate the Bowditch site for dining and office and an amendment of the LRDP to relocate the Fox Cottage to a surface parking lot north of 2547 Channing Way (the Shorb House), the project will be consistent with the 1990 LRDP.

An Initial Study was prepared to help focus the EIR. The Initial Study relied upon the information and analysis contained in a previous EIR certified by The Regents in May 1990 for the Long Range Development Plan. The Initial Study concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of the mitigation measures adopted with the LRDP EIR: geology, soils and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; biological resources; utilities and infrastructure; public services; energy and mineral resources; hazardous materials; recreation.

The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project may, either by itself or cumulatively with existing and proposed development in the area, have potentially significant environmental effects in the following areas: land use and planning, circulation and parking, visual resources and historical resources. In response to comments received on the Initial Study, population and housing, noise, and air quality were added to the scope for environmental review in the EIR.

The Final EIR, which includes the Draft EIR focused by the Initial Study, indicates that the project would result in potentially significant impacts, prior to mitigation, in the following areas: land use and planning, circulation and parking; historical resources; and noise. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, land use (inconsistency with City zoning for height, setbacks, density), historical resources (demolition of existing dining facilities and relocation of the Fox Cottage) would remain significant and unavoidable impacts of the projects. All other impacts following mitigation would be reduced to a less- than-significant level.

Six alternatives to the project were analyzed in the EIR: (1) the CEQA-required No Project Alternative, in which the University would not develop any of the components of the UAP; (2) the LRDP Development Alternative, which would include only that development in the Underhill Area that was previously described in the LRDP; (3) the Reduced Program Alternative, which would include fewer parking spaces at the Underhill lot; (4) the Reduced Program and Expanded Housing Alternative, which would differ from the Reduced Program Alternative in that the number of beds of new housing would be increased above the UAP levels; (5) the Dispersed Program Alternative, which would include the same housing component at that same locations of the UAP and equivalent parking, office space, and the sports field at alternative locations, maintaining the Fox Cottage and the existing dining facilities in their current locations; and (6) the Dispersed Program and Expanded Office Alternative, which would differ from the Dispersed Project Alternative in that office space would be increased beyond that proposed as part of the UAP.



A mitigation and monitoring program, to ensure implementation of project-specific mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts, is included as an Appendix to the Final EIR. Monitoring of the implementation of mitigation measures will be conducted during various phases of the project development as appropriate.

The proposed UAP has been the subject of significant community controversy. The parking structure, the expanded student housing, the design of the CDOF, the proposed demolition of existing dining facilities, and the Fox Cottage move are controversial within the community, with divergent viewpoints widely held on nearly every item.

### Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures for the projects, project alternatives, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. The Findings also set forth Overriding Considerations for approval of the projects in view of their unavoidable significant environmental effects for land use and historical resources.

Regent-designate T. Davis referred to the students from the Berkeley campus who had raised objections to the project during the public comment period, particularly in reference to changes which occurred between the Draft and the Final EIRs. Chancellor Berdahl observed the necessity of reaching a proper balance between competing needs when designing the Underhill projects. The students who addressed the Board are focused on the housing crisis at the Berkeley campus. In addition to housing, the campus administration must address the seismic condition of Units 1 and 2 and the need for additional parking. The number of parking spaces on the campus has decreased by approximately 900 over the past 12 years, due in part to the demolition of the Underhill parking lot in 1993. Two-thirds of the faculty and staff do not live in Berkeley, and for many of them public transportation is not an option. Berkeley has fewer than one parking place per five faculty or staff members, and this problem must be addressed. A fourth element of the project is the need to provide recreational space for the additional students who will be housed in the College-Durant student housing.

Vice Chancellor Denton explained that the campus administration is concerned that the Southside neighborhood of Berkeley is becoming a student ghetto as students represent 8,000 of the area's 10,000 residents. The campus recognizes that student housing should be dispersed throughout the community, and this issue is being addressed in the New Century Plan. It is hoped that the City will realize that a relaxation of its zoning requirements would assist the campus in its efforts to address housing needs through the use of private developers.

Vice Chancellor Denton addressed the issue of "Alternate F" in the Draft EIR which was raised during the public comment. He explained that this proposal, which did not permit the location of all of the dining and offices at the Underhill location, did not meet the campus' needs. It also failed

to provide for an adequate recreational facility and adequate parking at the site. The campus did adopt the recommendation contained in Alternate F that the Fox cottage be relocated rather than demolished.

Regent Connerly stressed the need to communicate to students the fact that the Regents are aware of the housing crisis that exists in communities with UC campuses. The Regents must explore options to address the problem.

Regent Lee observed that, due to the high cost of housing in Berkeley, the campus must provide parking for faculty who cannot afford to live there.

Regent Fong stated that while he supported the project, he also believed that the matter should have come before the Committee at a meeting in northern California. Chancellor Berdahl responded that there had been 18 public meetings to address the project and that he had met with members of the City Council to discuss their concerns. Many of these discussions led to changes in the nature of the project.

Secretary Trivette distributed communications received concerning the Underhill Area Projects and Committee Chair Kozberg's responses to them.

(For speakers' comments, see the minutes of the November 16, 2000 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary