

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

October 9, 2002

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at 223 Twin Dolphin Drive, Redwood City.

Members present: Regents Hopkinson, Marcus, Moores, and Sainick; Advisory member Seigler

In attendance: Regent-designate Murray, Faculty Representative Pitts, Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Chancellor Yang, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting, which due to the lack of a quorum was conducted as a briefing session, convened at 10:20 a.m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

1. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, GEMINI SCIENCES, INC./LA JOLLA INSTITUTE FOR ALLERGY AND IMMUNOLOGY BUILDING AT SCIENCE RESEARCH PARK, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The Committee was informed that at the November 2002 meeting the President will recommend that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project, the Committee take the following actions:

- A. Certify Addendum #1 to the Science Research Park Environmental Impact Report.
- B. Adopt the Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Gemini Science, Inc./La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology Building Project, San Diego campus.

[Addendum #1 to the Environmental Impact Report and the Findings were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that in May 2002, the Committee had discussed the relationship of the Science Research Park Development (SRP), San Diego Campus to the campus Long Range Development Plan and reviewed the project's objectives, development concept and capacity, programmatic criteria, strategic development guidelines, permitted uses, development method, and tenant approval process. Later that month the President

approved the external financing of the SRP infrastructure at a total project cost of \$4,917,000.

The SRP has been designed to have five building lots in a campus-like layout on an approximately 30-acre site on the eastern edge of the campus. The project includes three shared perimeter parking lots, open space, and landscaped areas. Total building area on each lot ranges from 80,000 to 130,000 gross square feet, comprising a total development capacity range of 400,000 to 500,000 gsf on approximately 15 acres. The remaining 15 acres support the streets, terraces, walkways, parking, and open space.

The first proposed tenant of the SRP is Gemini Sciences, Inc./La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology (Institute). The Institute proposes to construct and own a 130,000 gsf facility on Building Lot #1 of the SRP through a groundlease. The Institute has significant links with campus research programs in the School of Medicine and Division of Biology. The terms of the groundlease will be submitted to the Committee on Finance at its November 2002 meeting. Certification of the Addendum with approval of design will support the related groundlease action to be considered by the Committee on Finance at that meeting.

Project Site

The East Campus site is bounded by Regents Road, undeveloped areas, I-5, Health Sciences Drive and the Regents Road parking lot, plus the East Campus Health Sciences Neighborhood and the Mesa Student Housing Complex. The site for the facility on Building Lot #1 is located on the northeast side of the SRP and bounded by the SRP entry plaza, one of the common parking lots, and terraces and walkways.

Project Design

The Institute's building will cover 3.43 acres. The facility will include bioscience research laboratories, research support space, a vivarium, assembly and common areas, administrative space, and public spaces, at an estimated cost of \$40 million.

The facility is three stories above grade, with basement parking, and rooftop penthouses that will conceal mechanical equipment. The Institute will also construct a portion of the terraces on the southern, western, and northern sides of the building, the parking area located within Building Lot 1, and a portion of the common Parking Lot 1, which is located in the northeast corner of the SRP site.

The structure will consist of a steel moment frame with stone cladding on all sides. Glass and aluminum panels will enclose the north and south facades.

A third-party construction manager will oversee the project for the Institute. The Office of Facilities Design & Construction will manage the project for the campus.

Construction is expected to begin in March 2003 and be completed in December 2004.

Environmental Impact Summary

The potential environmental effects of proposed building development were analyzed in the EIR for the Science Research Park, which assessed the potential environmental effects of mass grading and infrastructure development of the site as well as the phased development on the five lots within the park. During the Draft EIR public review period, comments were received from the United States Marine Corps and the City of San Diego. In addition, a public hearing on the Draft EIR was held during which comments were received from executive committee members of the University Community Planning Group. Responses are contained in the final EIR.

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Addendum #1 to the Science Research Park Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the Gemini Science, Inc./La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology Building Project. The UCSD Chancellor certified the SRP EIR on July 25, 2002, in conjunction with the approval of infrastructure development at the SRP.

Addendum #1 evaluated whether the project would result in any new environmental impacts not previously analyzed in the SRP EIR. None of the conditions or circumstances that would require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code 21166 or CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15163 exists in connection with the Institute groundlease. The Addendum found no substantial changes in existing circumstances and no new information of substantial importance that would result in new significant effects, and thus no changes to conclusions of the SRP EIR were necessary and no further analysis was warranted.

Based on the Addendum, the University concluded that the proposed project is fully consistent with the SRP EIR and that the project will not have significant impacts on the environment because the University has agreed to mitigating measures identified in the SRP EIR.

Findings

Findings are being prepared which will discuss the project’s consistency with the Science Research Park EIR.

Vice Chancellor Woods, Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellman, and Director Kossan presented slides of the project.

Committee Chair Marcus commented that a consistent architectural theme was not readily evident on the campus. Vice Chancellor Woods responded that the San Diego campus will always be a campus of distinctive neighborhoods, one of which will be the research park. Regent Marcus advocated developing an eclectic thematic approach

that would bring cohesion to the plans. Director Kossan believed that the design reflects the architectural guidelines for the east campus and works to unify the research park neighborhood.

It was the consensus that the President's recommendation would be presented for adoption at the November meeting of the Committee.

2. CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, CALIFORNIA NANOSYSTEMS INSTITUTE BUILDING (CNSI) AND CAMPUS PARKING STRUCTURE 2 (CPS2), SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS

The Committee was informed that at the November 2002 meeting the President will recommend that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend the following actions:

- A. Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.
- B. Adoption of the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Amendment of the Long Range Development Plan.
- D. Approval of the design of the California Nanosystems Institute Building.
- E. Approval of the design of the Campus Parking Structure 2, Santa Barbara campus.

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

It was recalled that in January 2001, The Regents amended the 2000-01 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2000-03 Capital Improvement Program to include only the pre-design studies and preparation of preliminary plans for the CNSI Building project, including approval of parking reserves for preliminary plans for a non-CNSI parking component. In November 2001, The Regents approved an amendment of the 2001-02 Budget for Capital Improvements and of the 2001-04 Capital Improvement Program to include the California Nanosystems Institute Building, at a total project cost of \$74,920,000. The project will be funded from State funds (\$34,200,000), matching funds from external financing-Garamendi funds (\$17,000,000), and matching gifts (\$23,720,000). In September 2002, The Regents approved an amendment of the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and of the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program to include the Campus Parking Structure 2 at Santa Barbara at a total cost of \$16,409,000. The parking structure will be funded from

external financing (\$12,751,000), parking reserves (\$3,500,000) and campus funds (\$158,000). The appointment of Altoon + Porter Architects of Los Angeles as Executive Architect for this project, in association with Design Architect, Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, Inc. of Philadelphia, was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site is located on the northeastern edge of campus, south of Mesa Road. Most of the site is an existing paved and landscaped parking lot, bounded on the west by the Engineering II and Engineering Science Buildings and by Kohn Hall on the south. The project will require the demolition and removal of two temporary buildings and six trailers. A pedestrian plaza connecting through Engineering II and linking to the Campus Green on the west will replace a vehicular loop on the southern portion of the site.

Project Design

CNSI and CPS2 have been designed in unison to be independent though interconnected structures with individual identities and distinguishing architectural characteristics. The CNSI building will provide 63,149 asf of interdisciplinary modular research laboratories and specialized shared laboratories for imaging, spectroscopy, and bio-nanofabrication; digital media research laboratories; and conference and multipurpose facilities, offices, administrative space, and support facilities within a building of 109,042 gross square feet. The 204,812 gsf CPS2 will have 607 parking spaces and will contain approximately 2,700 gsf for a food service facility to be leased by campus dining services.

The main body of the CNSI is designed as a simple three-story rectangular building to provide the degree of flexibility and dimensional regularity that the numerous labs, offices, and conference spaces require. In contrast, the north part of CNSI, which houses the multipurpose facilities and digital lab and has less demand for flexibility, has been designed with an irregular geometry reflecting unique space requirements. A courtyard is defined by the area that lies between the CNSI Building and CPS2, which will be a five-level 45-foot-tall rectangular parking structure with three entry and exit lanes, two-way circulation, and elevators and stairways in the northeast and southwest corners. An arcade wraps around the courtyard and south elevations of CPS2, and the upper levels have been set back to reduce the vertical bulk and create a friendlier scale to pedestrians at the food service facility and adjacent plaza to the south.

In the future, the campus plans to develop an additional related facility – a digital media auditorium seating up to 250 people – at the northernmost position on the site. This auditorium facility will be presented for approval and implemented as an independent project at a future date when donor funds are available, but it is reflected

in the current design presentation to provide a comprehensive understanding of the EIR project.

The Mesa Road façade of the CNSI will be distinguished by alternating vertical bands of windows and colored limestone that will impart a sense of rhythm and movement, and will culminate in an iconographic mural that artistically reflects the research, artistry, and dynamism of the Institute's research. Stone cladding will be used on the south face of CPS2 to match CNSI. Remaining facades of both buildings will be clad in precast concrete.

Reinforced concrete building frame systems will be used for both buildings. CNSI will use one-way reinforced concrete slabs to provide direct support of floors and roof and transfer loads to concrete beams and girders, which are supported by concrete columns. The foundation system consists of friction piles embedded into bedrock and restrained at the top by interconnected pile caps. Lateral-force-resisting systems consist of reinforced concrete shear walls along the exterior and interior column lines of the building. The slab-on-grade has been designed to provide maximum resistance to vibration and resonance, and the structural system and bay sizes are based on recommendations of the structural engineer and vibration consultant to accommodate the level of sensitivity required by the users.

CPS2 will use post-tensioned slab between post-tensioned concrete beams and a foundation system of continuous reinforced concrete strip footings under the column lines in the longitudinal direction of the building. The lateral-force-resisting system comprises two reinforced concrete shear walls in the longitudinal direction on the exterior lines of the building and a moment resisting design in the east-west direction.

The design of the structures will feature a pedestrian plaza between the CPS2 and Kohn Hall that will promote interaction without disturbing the activities of Kohn Hall. A new intersection and a dedicated left turn lane at Mesa Road will provide access to CPS2 and service access to adjacent engineering facilities. Most significantly, the project will integrate its landscape with the design of a proposed new East Gate entry to the campus.

The design of the CNSI/CPS2 project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design review team including cost consultant, Cumming LLC and Engineered Automation Systems. Independent structural review is being conducted at each stage of project development by Howard & Van Sande Structural Consultants.

The campus Office of Design & Construction Services will manage the project with assistance from the Executive Architect's project team. Construction is expected to begin in July 2003 and be completed in October 2005.

LRDP Amendment

While the projects are generally consistent with the land use designations identified in the 1990 LRDP, a technical amendment will be required to transfer development potential of 26,000 asf from Building Site #20, existing Parking Lot 11 to the new site. There will be no net increase in development on the main campus from that identified in the LRDP. Minor additions to the LRDP describe the proposed location of the CNSI Building and Parking Structure, the entrance to the proposed parking structure, and the configuration of the proposed drop-off loop.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the campus prepared an Environmental Impact Report to consider potential environmental effects due to implementation of the two parts of the project. An Initial Study concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures: geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality. The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed projects may, either by themselves or cumulatively with existing and proposed development in the area, have potentially significant environmental effects in the following areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, traffic, circulation and parking, and utilities.

A Draft EIR for the California Nanosystems Institute and Campus Parking Structure 2 projects and LRDP amendment were circulated and a public hearing was held. No comments were made at the hearing, and four letters were received during the review period. The comments received addressed project impacts on air quality, traffic, tree removal, and lighting. All impacts following mitigation will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Findings

Findings will be prepared to elaborate on consistency with the projects' EIR.

Acting Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas, Director Levy, and Mr. Duke Oakley presented slides of the project.

The Committee expressed some reservations about the design of CNSI. Regent Hopkinson thought that the facade of the building made too strong a statement in that the building was the first that travelers on Mesa Drive would see when entering the campus from that direction and that it was meant to form a backdrop for Kohn Hall. Regent Sainick also expressed concern about the facade, and Faculty Representative Pitts thought roof structures were too much in evidence. It was noted that the Santa Barbara campus is prohibited by the Coastal Commission from building over 45 feet high, which tends to reduce the design options for such a large building. Mr. Oakley stated that planting a row of tall palm trees would add interest to the long facade and would not obscure the ocean view that would be enjoyed by faculty occupying the upper-floor offices. Regent Hopkinson, however, took issue with the use of palms and

asked that the landscaping plan for the Mesa Road facade be returned to the Committee for approval. She also asked that the design of the surface treatment of the facade and the mural that is planned for a portion of the building be approved by the Committee.

Regent Hopkinson believed that the campus should strive to create a campus entrance from Mesa Road that is attractive and reflects the personality of the campus. Senior Vice President Mullinix assured Regent Hopkinson that the Santa Barbara campus would present a progress report on the vision of its Long Range Development Plan to the Regents at a meeting next spring, during which the issue of planning an appropriate entryway for the campus could be discussed.

It was the consensus that, contingent on further review as described above, the President's recommendation would be presented for adoption at the November meeting of the Committee.

3. **APPROVAL OF SITE AND AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The Committee was informed that, at the November 2002 meeting, the President will recommend that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Committee recommend the following action:

- A. Approval of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adoption of the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Approval of the site of the Child Development Center.
- D. Amendment of the UCDMC 1989 Long Range Development Plan accordingly.

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

In a separate item being presented to the Committee on Finance at the November 2002 meeting, The Regents will be asked to approve the terms of a 27-year groundlease between the University of California and The Hallmark Group, a limited liability corporation, for the construction of a Child Development Center on the grounds of the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento.

The Child Development Center is designed to accommodate 144 children, comprised of at least 132 children of UCDMC faculty and staff, up to four children of Child

Development Center staff, and up to eight children with neurodevelopmental disorders.

Project Site

The site is a 1.4-acre undeveloped parcel of land on the eastern boundary of the medical center campus, adjacent to the M.I.N.D. Center, the Ambulatory Care Center, and city residential areas. As it was purchased after the 1989 Long Range Development Plan and its EIR were approved, it is not included in those documents.

The site was selected to minimize the impact of this development on potential future development of the medical center and to locate it near compatible uses. The property is not near planned medical, research, or academic facilities. The site also provides a buffer between the residential community and large-scale medical center construction and is in keeping with medical center planning objectives for the adjacent property and its potential future development.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedures for the implementation of CEQA. Comments and responses received during the public review period will be included in the final document.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Declaration includes mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts in the areas of noise, dust control, evaluation of the site for pre-existing hazards, burrowing owls, Swainson’s hawks, and migratory birds. A Mitigation Monitoring Program is included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

Findings are being prepared to address the project’s potential impacts and conclusions regarding approval of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project in conformance with CEQA.

Facilities and Design Manager Rush presented slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson questioned the need to place the facility on campus land, particularly as it was being built and leased by a third party. Committee Chair Marcus also expressed this concern in that the land may become important later for situating research or medical care functions. Senior Vice President Mullinix responded that the facility needs to be convenient for employees whose children will be located there. He also pointed out that situating the facility on campus was an incentive for the third party to participate. Mr. Rush assured the Committee that the medical center campus has sufficient land reserved for its future building needs.

It was the consensus that the President’s recommendation would be presented for adoption at the November meeting of the Committee.

4. ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, DAVIS HALL NORTH REPLACEMENT BUILDING (CITRIS II), BERKELEY CAMPUS

The Committee was informed that, at the November 2002 meeting, the President will recommend that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as indicated in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects Environmental Impact Report certified by The Regents in January 2002, the Committee adopt the Findings and approve the design of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building, Berkeley campus.

It was recalled that, in September 2001, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), Berkeley campus, in the 2001-02 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-04 Capital Improvement Program. Funding for preliminary plans of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building (identified as CITRIS II in the September 2001 agenda item) was approved in the amount of \$6,300,000, funded by the State through the California Institutes of Science and Innovation program (\$6,200,000) and gift funds (\$100,000). In January 2002, The Regents certified the Environmental Impact Report for the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects (NEQSS), Berkeley campus, which includes this project, and amended the Berkeley campus 1990 Long Range Development Plan to extend the LRDP envelope.

The total project cost will be funded from a combination of State funds through the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (\$87,325,000) and gift funds (\$14,625,000). The total combined budget for the Davis Hall North Replacement Building is \$101,950,000.

In September 2002, the appointment of Johnson Fain Partners of Los Angeles, California as Executive Architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President. Berkeley Campus Capital Projects unit will manage the project, with assistance from the Executive Architect’s project team.

Project Site

The site for the facility is the existing Davis Hall North building site and the adjacent open area between Naval Architecture and Davis Hall South, along Hearst Avenue. The use of this site is consistent with the Berkeley 1990 Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The project will replace the Davis Hall North building and is designed to contain 79,420 assignable square feet within a total area of 145,580 gross square feet. It will be the headquarters for CITRIS and its research and instructional programs. Major building components of this research and teaching facility include flexible dry laboratory space, distance learning classrooms and an auditorium, a multi-media center, and office and administrative space. Approximately 18,700 assignable square feet of this facility will be dedicated to a state-of-the-art silicon based micro-fabrication facility, which will provide the type of space needed for the technology upon which much of the CITRIS research will be based.

The massing and materials are consistent with planning principles developed in the College of Engineering Facilities Master Plan study of February 2002 to ensure compatibility with the existing buildings and to create a scale sympathetic to the Naval Architecture Building. The new building has the same set back on Hearst Avenue as the Naval Architecture building. The wing of the building closest to Naval Architecture and Hearst Avenue is three stories high. The mass increases to five stories above grade as the building abuts the existing Davis Hall South tower. The basement levels further reduce the visible mass of the building.

The building enclosure is predominantly pre-cast concrete panels with integral color. Windows are rectangular, with proportions that relate to the windows of Naval Architecture. A three-story atrium provides space for interaction between the public floors at the main entry. The plaza at the front of the building provides a generous separation that is respectful of the Naval Architecture building.

Environmental Impact Summary

In conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedures for implementing CEQA, environmental effects of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building were analyzed in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety (NEQSS) Project Environmental Impact Report. The NEQSS EIR was tiered from the 1990 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report adopted by The Regents in 1990. The NEQSS EIR was certified by The Regents in January 2002 in conjunction with their approval of the amendment to the 1990 LRDP, extending the LRDP envelope for net new space from a total of 333,300 gsf to a total 658,300 gsf, adding 325,000 gsf to accommodate the Davis Hall North Replacement and three other building projects.

The Davis Hall North Replacement Building project is essentially the same as analyzed in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects EIR. No substantial changes are proposed, and no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken have occurred since certification of the NEQSS EIR.

The Draft EIR was reviewed by various State and local agencies, as well as by interested individuals. Letters were received from 8 public agencies and from 36 individuals. A public hearing was held on July 9, 2001, at which 23 people commented publicly and 10 people wrote comments on cards. The Final EIR contained the comments on the Draft EIR, responses to these comments, and revisions based on comments received.

Subsequent to certification of the EIR by The Regents, the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley campus, with participation of the Office of General Counsel, reached agreement on a set of further steps to address community concerns with impacts of the NEQSS projects. In honor of that agreement, the campus expects to replace tennis courts that will be converted to parking by the NEQSS projects. Significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, either because mitigations are not available or are currently considered infeasible, include short-term significant noise impacts due to demolition and construction. The Berkeley campus is responsible for implementing all mitigation measures identified in the NEQSS EIR applicable to this project as an element of the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program included in the Final NEQSS EIR.

Findings

Findings will be prepared to elaborate on the project’s consistency with the NEQSS EIR.

Vice Chancellor Denton, Assistant Vice Chancellor Gayle, and Assistant Vice Chancellor Lollini presented slides of the project.

Committee Chair Marcus was not satisfied that the design represented a successful transition between the monumental concrete of nearby buildings and the Craftsman style of the adjacent Naval Architecture building. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio noted that, because of the site and the scale of the new building, the design team had a particularly difficult task in trying to integrate it with its surroundings. Regent Sainick commented that he was satisfied with their approach, but several other Committee members expressed concern about the details of the design. Regent Hopkinson was concerned about the durability of the anodized aluminum window frames. Committee Chair Marcus suggested that the campus bring back to the Committee specified design elements for further review in order to assure its members that the building material being used for the window frames was long-wearing, that the structure had been integrated with its surroundings effectively, that more attractive roofing material had been chosen, and that the overall appearance of the plan had been softened, perhaps through the application of different surface treatments.

Regent Hopkinson requested a future presentation relating the costs of assignable square footage to those of gross square footage, disclosing the University’s guidelines on the subject, and comparing the University’s buildings to industry standards.

It was the consensus that, contingent upon further review as noted above, the President’s recommendation would be presented for adoption at the November meeting of the Committee.

The Committee recessed for lunch at 12:25 p.m.

.....

The Committee reconvened at 12:50 p.m.

5. **UC IRVINE MEDICAL CENTER REPLACEMENT HOSPITAL DESIGN UPDATE, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Brase and Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Gladson presented ideas for the design of the replacement hospital.

Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson reviewed the following design goals for the replacement hospital: create a place where families and patients will feel special and where they can find their way around easily; design landmark architecture that will be identifiable with the medical center and related to other buildings there but also to the Irvine campus; and develop plans that will be flexible enough to accommodate changes over time. She noted that former Irvine City Planner and University Architect William Pereira had executed the master plan for the medical center, which is 15 miles from the main campus. It has separate sectors designated for inpatients, outpatients, and research. Many of the current buildings will be demolished and replaced in the foreseeable future, making sites available for future construction in all three sectors. The challenges involved in planning include using buildings as markers for entering the environment, creating identifiable places, and unifying old and new buildings. She described the architectural strategy and the thought behind the direction the development of the medical center campus is taking.

Ms. Gladson reported that, in the design of the replacement hospital, attention was given to framing exterior spaces that relate to the environment. Buildings will be given their identity through detail and form that will be influenced by buildings on the main campus. The vehicular approach from City Drive will pass a central garden. Arcades and elevated walkways will connect the current and future buildings. The lobby and services will occupy the first floor of the replacement hospital, the second floor will house operating and recovery rooms, the third floor will have laboratories, and the upper four floors will contain patient rooms.

Ms. Gladson reported that the campus has adopted the idea of developing architecture that reflects the classical concept of creating a distinctive base, middle, and top. This goal is challenging in a 115-foot-high building. The plans envision a central tower, housing elevators and family waiting rooms that will look out over the central garden. The shape and symmetry of the tower are under discussion. One idea is to have it terminate in a glass piece that could become a beacon at night, easily seen from the

adjacent Interstate 5. She showed some facade studies to illustrate possible fenestration treatments and window materials.

Regent Hopkinson was impressed with the planning and its evolution. She asked whether the floor plan will be flexible enough to accommodate new uses over the years. Ms. Gladson responded that careful attention has been paid to making the infrastructure as flexible as possible. Regent Hopkinson liked the idea of creating an icon with the predominant tower but asked that thought be given to its appearance during the day, noting that in Orange County glass can blend into the smog. Ms. Gladson agreed that the tower must be made solid enough to be visible day and night. Regent Hopkinson cautioned against using a design for the tower that was likely to cause controversy and possibly discourage donors.

Faculty Representative Pitts suggested that it might be economical to expand the floor space in the tower to accommodate conference and teaching rooms and that perhaps the tower could be made more solid and be lit from outside in order to achieve the desired prominence.

Regent-designate Seigler noted that the plan showed placing the emergency room in one building and operating rooms in another, requiring the transportation of patients between buildings. Ms. Gladson responded that State funding requires that certain space lost in the original facility be replaced. The design team believes that the transportation of patients will be accomplished quickly through dedicated elevators and a bridge. Dr. Seigler noted also that the third floor, which seemed more appropriate for housing patient care areas, housed the morgue and staff sleeping quarters. Ms. Gladson explained that at the final location of the morgue has not been decided.

Committee Chair Marcus did not believe that the medical center, which is far from the campus, can be connected through design in any significant way. He did believe, however, that the replacement hospital has the potential to become one of the most attractive hospitals in the country. He advised the design team to stay with its initial principles of creating classical, durable buildings and to keep the design clean and simple. He considered the idea of creating an icon with the tower to be important and hoped that ideas for its design would continue to be reviewed.

In response to a question by Regent-designate Murray concerning recycling during building demolition, Ms. Gladson explained that, although as much building material as possible is recycled, recycling is prevented sometimes because of the dust and noise involved and the special handling required for hazardous materials.

Regent Sainick commented that it has proved difficult to eradicate from people's minds the hospital's former identity as a county hospital. He stressed the importance of trying to tie its design to the Irvine campus and of taking advantage from a design perspective of its proximity to the freeway.

Vice Chancellor Brase reported that the project will be presented to The Regents for approval in January.

6. AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, IRVINE CAMPUS

The Committee was informed that at the November 2002 meeting, the President will recommend that, upon review and consideration of the environmental documentation on the proposed project, the Committee recommend the following action:

- A. Adoption of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.
- C. Amendment of the Irvine Campus Long Range Development Plan.

It was recalled that in September 1989, The Regents approved the Irvine Campus Long Range Development Plan and certified the LRDP Program Environmental Impact Report. The LRDP designates 203.7 acres within the 1,470-acre campus to accommodate a development program of 1,100 faculty and staff housing units.

The Irvine Campus Housing Authority (ICHA) implements faculty and staff housing at the Irvine campus through a groundlease from The Regents. The groundlease area includes approximately 153 acres, with 838 faculty and staff homes completed or under construction. In a related item at the November 2002 meeting, the Irvine campus will request approval of an increase in the existing groundlease of 14 acres for the construction of approximately 80 faculty and staff homes within an area referred to as “University Hills Area 8 Expansion.” This area is designated Elementary School/Open Space and Recreation in the Irvine LRDP. The Elementary School designation on the Irvine campus is a result of a mitigation measure in the 1989 LRDP EIR which reads as follows:

UCI shall continue to work with Irvine Unified School District [IUSD] to resolve long range elementary school issues, and UCI shall provide to IUSD bi-annually an estimate of future projected on-campus housing for graduate students, faculty, and staff. The LRDP designates an 8-acre elementary school site on the campus, and future University Hills faculty/staff private residential housing development projects will continue to be assessed a K-12 schools development fee consistent with the K-12 school development fees assessed for off-campus housing development projects located within the City of Irvine.

Description of the Proposed Amendment

The land use designation of an 11-acre area will be changed from its current designation of Elementary School/Open Space and Recreation to Faculty/Staff Housing. The description of permitted uses within the Faculty/Staff Housing

designation will be expanded to include elementary schools, which will allow the development of an elementary school within the Faculty/Staff Housing area. Any specific proposal for an elementary school will require future action by The Regents. The Irvine LRDP program will not change, nor will the ability of the LRDP to accommodate a future elementary school as described in LRDP Mitigation Measure 100, but the location of the elementary school site will change.

Environmental Impact Summary

In conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedures for implementation of CEQA, a Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project that describes the Area 8 Expansion Project, the proposed LRDP Amendment, and future projects within the vicinity. During the public review period, interested individuals and organization will review the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Written comments received and Irvine campus responses will be included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

Findings are being prepared to discuss the project impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding adoption of the environmental document for this project, in conformance with CEQA.

It was the consensus that the President’s recommendation would be presented for adoption at the November meeting of the Committee.

7. CAMPUS DESIGN VISION, IRVINE CAMPUS

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio recalled that vision presentations were started last year with the goal of ensuring that campus planning is consistent with the Long Range Development Plan, produces standards for building design and guidelines, and in some cases creates templates of material so that the built environment will demonstrate a cohesive campus statement. The buildings, places, and spaces should create a sense of place.

Vice Chancellor Brase, Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Gladson, and Director of Campus and Environmental Planning Demerjian discussed the campus design vision.

Mr. Brase recalled that he has been responsible for campus design since his appointment in 1991. His first undertaking had been to address the capital design, construction, and delivery process. At that time, a majority of projects were over budget, late, or litigated, and consistency and coherence in campus architecture and design were in decline. The architecture was starting to look dated, and many buildings needed maintenance prematurely. The campus also had 9,000 aging trees, most of which were eucalyptus. There were, however, some strong fundamentals in

the original campus plan established by former Campus Architect Pereira, such as its central park and its circumferential circulation elements, to which the campus still conforms. The campus was planned with the City of Irvine, where Mr. Pereira was a master planner. The town and gown interface was thought out before the campus was built so that zoning would be compatible with University uses. New goals were adopted in 1991 that would assure the creation of timeless architecture, an identifiable place with a feeling of permanence and quality, density management that addresses scale, exemplary energy efficiency, the completion of projects on time and on budget, and circulation and parking that reinforce campus design goals.

Director Demerjian explained how the planning process derives from the Long Range Development Plan. He recalled that the campus planning vision began in 1960 with the selection of the Irvine Ranch as the site. The University and City jointly retained William Pereira to develop a master plan for the campus and community. The 1963 LRDP envisioned a comprehensive academic community that included an academic core supported by outer campus neighborhoods, the formal central core contrasting with the more informal outer campus; a well-conceived circulation network to link the campus and the community; and a focus on landscape as a key element in establishing cohesiveness on the campus. Six academic quads are organized around the circular ring mall. A large central park forms the central open space. More formal landscaping in the core and urban areas is contrasted with less formal landscaping in green belts. The Irvine campus is unique in that the initial planning vision has remained intact and the campus master plan is part of a master-planned community. Based on that history, a master plan approach has become part of the planning culture on the campus.

Mr. Demerjian discussed the planning process used to ensure that LRDP planning goals and the goals adopted in 1991 are carried forward to the project level. The overall development program, planning goals, and land allocation are established at the LRDP level. The next level, master plan studies and implementation plans, identify how the LRDP goals will be implemented within specific sectors of the campus. The LRDP adopted in 1989 retains the 1963 plan framework and the concept of using landscaping as an image maker for the campus. Formal streetscape planning defines primary vehicle and pedestrian circulation ways, identifies and defines public open spaces, and unifies and compliments the more urban character of the core area while it contrasts with the less formal landscaping in the open space corridors that link the sectors of the campus. He noted that UCI is implementing the landscape concepts in a way that is sustainable. It has adopted a "Green and Gold Plan" for landscaping that involves substantial use of native and drought-tolerant plants. When first implemented, the plan resulted in UCI's having to purchase most of the available inventory of trees, so it joined in a partnership with the local water district to start an on-campus tree nursery. Through an aggressive planting scheme, the number of trees on the campus has been doubled since 1991.

The next step in the planning process is planning studies for specific campus areas. Mr. Demerjian reported that the square footage within the academic core is planned

to double. Three of the most important aspects to be addressed in that sector are managing density, maintaining human scale, and building a cohesive campus environment. Base projections show a need for 6.6 million square feet within the core six quads. Sites for future building and parking structures have been identified in each quad.

Mr. Demerjian stressed the importance of considering human scale, or how people experience the campus at eye level. One way this is addressed is by examining the campus circulation network: the ways in which people arrive on campus, how they are oriented there, and how conflicts with automobiles can be limited. Entries are identified with a landscape theme. People arriving on campus by car immediately enter parking structures that are linked to primary pedestrian ways. The radials in the ring mall allow people to find their way within the central core, and bridges separate pedestrians from vehicles. The landscape framework in the central core supports the consideration of human scale and of cohesion. Canopy trees define public spaces and diminish building scales. Landscaping is used also to define circulation routes, orient people, identify individual quads, and link the quads along the ring mall.

Regent Sainick noted that bike travel onto campus is accommodated from the east campus, where new housing is being built, but is difficult from outer campus areas and is forbidden in the ring mall. Regent-designate Murray also asked whether bicycle access could be improved. Vice Chancellor Brase expressed his frustration that the campus has not been able to create a more bike-oriented culture. He was hopeful that a planned bike highway linking thousands of housing units to Aldrich Park will be a catalyst for increasing bicycle use on campus.

Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson discussed the campus' architectural framework, which has been defined by cold-looking concrete buildings that lack identifiable entrances and ignore the importance of human scale. Buildings constructed during the 1980s and early 1990s were mostly outside the ring mall and had various architectural styles. They did nothing to contribute to the overall contextual vocabulary. In order to integrate these buildings into the development of the campus, a plan was initiated to standardize certain features and to adopt a classical architectural vocabulary employing a tripartite order tailored to the 21st century. Tripartition gives buildings a strong base, a middle section, and a top or crown. Public spaces are connected by pedestrian bridges, building entrances are clear and welcoming, and building materials are highly durable. Under this plan, each school on the campus is developing its own identity.

Vice Chancellor Brase discussed how projects are developed. Proposals are presented to campus staff, where the campus architect sets the design direction and ensures consistency with the principles that have been adopted. Before a design gets to the campus' physical environmental committee, which is chaired by the Chancellor, a design review team debates its merits and checks that it is true to the principles of achieving permanence and quality. If a proposed project does not confirm to the LRDP, it is reviewed also by the Academic Senate. He commented that all projects

have been on time and on budget since 1991. Because of that fact, it has been possible to assure their high quality. Buildings have been designed to conform to the principles of good design and durability, but they are sensitive also to their relationship in the larger context, that of neighboring buildings, outdoor spaces, hardscape, and landscape. Some core campus buildings that were low density were torn down and were replaced by larger facilities that would be practical in the long term. Transparency at eye level has been created by using arcades and scaled plazas and entries. The new design standards for these buildings exceed State requirements for energy efficiency and are expected to result in more durable construction. Automobile circulation also reinforces campus design goals, and parking is kept at the perimeter of the core. The changing landscape reflects the goal of being sustainable. Mr. Brase was optimistic that these changes will enhance the campus' chance of becoming the most attractive research campus in the nation.

Regent Hopkinson expressed satisfaction with the new design approach, which she noted is concise and coordinated in the face of challenges resulting from the previous lack of focus. In response to her question about accommodating student housing, she was informed that there is a ten-year housing plan in place for each campus.

Committee Chair Marcus expressed his support for the design concept for the development of the Irvine campus. He asked whether students have expressed appreciation for the new architecture. Mr. Brase responded that not many comments are received from them, but he noted that the campus is becoming a more popular choice with applicants and that visitors often express surprise at how attractive it is.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary