

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

March 14, 2002

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at UCSF–Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, T. Davis, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Moores, Morrison, Pattiz, and Seymour; Advisory member Sainick

In attendance: Regents Blum, Davies, Lansing, Lee, Marcus, Montoya, Parsky, Preuss, and Saban, Regents-designate Ligot-Gordon and Terrazas, Faculty Representatives Binion and Viswanathan, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Dynes, Greenwood, and Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 10:40 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. ***Certification of Environmental Impact Report, Amendment of Long Range Development Plan, and Approval of Design, Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building, 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 recommend:

- (1) Certification of the Final Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building.
- (2) Adoption of the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Plan.
- (3) Amendment of the 1994 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan to change approximately two acres designated for *Support to Teaching and Research Fields*.
- (4) Approval of the design of the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building, Davis campus.

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

B. *Certification of Environmental Impact Report, Amendment of Long Range Development Plan, and Approval of Design, East Campus Apartment Project, Phase 1, Irvine Campus*

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

- (1) Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adoption of the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- (3) Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- (4) Amendment of the 1989 Irvine campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) to reflect proposed changes in the alignment of Palo Verde Road, and to combine “graduate/family” and “undergraduate” student housing LRDP land use designations for areas covered by the project site in order to accommodate both types of student housing across the site.
- (5) Approval of the design of the East Campus Apartment Project, Phase 1, Irvine campus.
- (6) Authorization of the President to approve any required design changes, if such changes do not materially alter the scope of Phase 1 of the project.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, 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 Mitigated Negative Declaration and Approval of Design, Natural Sciences Unit 2, Irvine Campus*

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

- (1) Adoption of the Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- (2) Adoption of the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- (3) Approval of the design of Natural Sciences Unit 2, 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.]

D. ***Adoption of Negative Declaration and Approval of Design, Biological Sciences Building, Riverside Campus***

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

- (1) Adopt the Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration.
- (2) Adopt the Findings.
- (3) Approve the design of the Biological Sciences Building, Riverside campus.

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

E. ***Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Approval of Design, Pharmaceutical Sciences Building, San Diego Campus***

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

- (1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- (2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Findings.
- (3) Approve the design of the Pharmaceutical Sciences Building, San Diego campus.

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

F. ***Certification of Addendum to Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Design, California Institute for Bioengineering, Biotechnology, and Quantitative Biomedical Research (QB3) Building at Mission Bay, San Francisco Campus***

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in Addendum 3 to the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- (1) Certify Addendum 3 to the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Findings.
- (3) Approve the design of the California Institute for Bioengineering, Biotechnology, and Quantitative Biomedical Research (QB3) Building at Mission Bay, San Francisco campus.

[Addendum 3 to the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report and Findings were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

G. ***Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Design, Engineering Building, Santa Cruz Campus***

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

- (1) Certify the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- (3) Approve the design of the Engineering Building, Santa Cruz campus.

[The Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report, Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, 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.]

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendations with respect to Items B through G and voted to present them to the Board. Item A was considered separately. In order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, Regent Davies abstained from discussing or voting on Item F.

Associate Secretary Shaw drew attention to the report of communications received pertaining to Item A, ***Certification of Environmental Impact Report, Amendment of Long Range Development Plan, and Approval of Design, Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building, Davis Campus.***

Committee Chair Kozberg called on Chancellor Vanderhoef to provide details about Item A. Chancellor Vanderhoef commented that the project will join the Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts, the Mondavi Institute, the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center, and a future

center for the visual arts to form an impressive new front entry to the Davis campus. The conference center will accommodate up to 500 people, and the performing arts hall will hold 1,800 people. He noted that the local hoteliers, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Downtown Business Association, which have had access to the analyses of impacts, all support the project. The conference center is about a ten minute walk from downtown Davis, and there will be a shuttle service between the two.

Mr. Vanderhoef recalled that an alternate site had been suggested by members of the public. The site in question is part of the County and would have to be annexed to the City, which, according to County authorities, is highly unlikely. Also, there is a Hillel house across the street from the site that has waited two years for approval to enlarge because of neighborhood opposition. He believed that, for these reasons, the suggested site would not be viable for a large conference center.

Mr. Vanderhoef reported that the County Board of Supervisors supports the project. As to the City Council, a recent election shifted support diametrically from its previous three-to-two-member opposition to the project.

Regent Seymour reported that he had reviewed the project thoroughly and had concluded that any negative impacts of the proposal were minor and were far outweighed by the positive aspects.

Regent-designate Terrazas praised the proposal. He noted, however, that the voices of the faculty and the alumni were not reflected in the information presented about the project. Mr. Vanderhoef responded that the faculty are very supportive. They believe that the campus needs the capacity to host conferences.

Regent-designate Sainick observed that the community had voiced concerns about the impacts of the project on traffic and asked how these impacts had been mitigated. Mr. Sid England, Environmental Planner for the campus, reported that the modeling of traffic impacts that included extreme event scenarios showed that employing traffic directors during such events will maintain traffic at acceptable levels.

Regent Morrison commented that he and his family had enjoyed a long-term, close relationship with the Davis campus community, including his service as president of its alumni association. He was accustomed to making many trips to the Davis campus and not being able to find overnight accommodation easily. He believed this was because academics, business partners, and the families and friends of UCD students occupied all the nearby hotels. He stated that the conference center and hotel would rectify this situation and that it had been well-planned and had undergone a thorough review.

Regent Moores asked what the average daily rate would be for the hotel and what would be its impact on the local hotel market. Mr. John Yates, campus Special Projects Director, responded that the projected average daily rate was \$125 for the first year, which places it at the high end of the local market. Hotels within the city limits have an occupancy rate of about 65 percent. The ones nearest campus have much higher occupancy rates. Regent Moores

noted that the Davis hotel will have only 75 rooms, which seemed to him could make it too small to be efficient. Mr. Vanderhoef reported that studies had made it apparent that the hotel would be financially viable at its planned size. The size of the site is such that rooms could be added later, contingent upon the support of the local hotel industry and the City.

Regent Kozberg commented that the performing arts and catering space were important to the vitality of campus life. She emphasized that the project had undergone solid planning and was very well thought out.

[For speakers' comments, refer to the March 14 minutes 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 10:55 a.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary