

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

December 10, 2003

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Suite 109, Oakland, California.

Members present: Regents Marcus, Kozberg, Montoya, Murray, and Seigler;
Advisory member Pitts

In attendance: Regent-designate Novack, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Chancellor Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 10:20 a.m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

For the record, it was confirmed that notice had been given in accordance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders of The Regents for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing items on the Committee's agenda.

2. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, BUILDING 49 RESEARCH OFFICE BUILDING, LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY**

The President recommended that after review and consideration of the proposed project's environmental consequences as described in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- (1) Certify the Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Findings.
- (3) Approve the design of the Building 49 Research Office Building, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

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

The Committee was informed that the building will be constructed on lands owned by The Regents within the management boundaries of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). The Building 49 site is not leased to the U.S. Department of Energy.

A third-party development proposal has been created in order to address a pressing need for additional research office space at the laboratory. Although the laboratory has relocated administrative units to off-site leased space and optimized space use in its buildings, it continues to have a shortage of on-site office space for its multi-disciplinary research functions.

The third-party development approach is being taken because Department of Energy funding is not available for this multi-disciplinary need. Funding for the construction will be provided by the developer, OJO Associates, LLC. A groundlease from The Regents to OJO and a space lease of Building 49 from OJO to The Regents for use by the laboratory will be submitted for approval by The Regents. It is proposed that OJO Associates, LLC design, build, operate, maintain, and own the building. The University will lease the ground to the developer for a 30-year term. At the termination of the groundlease, the University will have the option of taking ownership of the building or having the developer demolish the building. The initial lease will have a term of 1 year with 19 one-year options followed by a first right of offer and first right of refusal to lease the building for the balance of the groundlease term. LBNL will fund space-lease rent costs using internally generated operating funds. Taking into account the cost of parking and loss of productivity associated with downtown Berkeley leased facilities, the cost of the Building 49 lease is favorable, especially as 60,000 gross square feet of space is not available in any single appropriately classified building in the city.

In October 2003, the appointment of JWD Group of Oakland, California, as executive architect for the project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site for Building 49 is adjacent to the main entrance to the laboratory and is in general accordance with the laboratory's 1987 Long Range Development Plan. It is bound on the west and north by Cyclotron Road, on the east by the Building 50 office and laboratory building complex, and on the south by a laboratory utility corridor. The terrain drops approximately 50 feet in elevation between Building 50 on the project's eastern edge and Cyclotron Road below the project's western edge. The project scope includes utility connections to the laboratory's Cyclotron Road utility corridors.

Project Design

Building 49 will be a six-story office facility of approximately 61,400 gross square feet, accommodating some 240 scientists and support staff. Enclosed and partitioned offices, interior common space, and support areas account for 56,000 gsf, while seminar and meeting rooms will occupy 5,400 gsf on the top floor. The office planning module allows flexibility in the arrangement of individual office spaces. The structure will conform to standard office occupancy requirements in the building code.

The first floor of the building opens to the west along Cyclotron Road and will be the primary building entrance. The middle four floors will contain offices. On the upper

floor an assembly of meeting rooms with an exterior common area will invite both structured and informal interactions among building staff and the larger laboratory community. Walkways will connect Building 49 with a shuttle bus stop and with the Building 50 complex.

The building's exterior, a curtain wall of blue-gray metal panels and low-reflectivity glazing, will be compatible with other LBNL exterior finishes. Building 49 will meet design criteria for the LEED Silver rating and will operate with energy performance that exceeds California Code of Regulations Title 24 requirements by 30 percent.

Building 49 will use a steel frame structure with unbonded braces for seismic resistance and will be set on spread footings tied to bedrock. The building is within the Alquist Priolo zone of the Hayward Fault. Trenching has been conducted to ensure that no trace faults are present. Groundwater monitoring in the area demonstrates that the excavation for Building 49 will not intercept the groundwater plane.

Because a private developer will own and maintain the building, an independent value engineering assessment has not been conducted. The Committee on Finance will review a comparative lease assessment during its review of the project. In accordance with University policy, Engle & Engle, Structural Engineers will conduct an independent structural review during the project's design phase.

The LBNL Facilities Division will oversee construction. An independent firm will conduct code compliance inspection under contract to the Facilities Division.

Environmental Impact Summary

The Final Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the project includes a copy of all comments received on a Draft EIR, responses to all comments, and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The Final EIR also includes review of proposed lease language related to the project.

Mitigation measures listed in the LRDP EIR, as amended, and project-specific mitigation measures will ensure that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. The Final EIR is accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, evidence that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR in conformance with CEQA.

Deputy Director for Operations Benson and Chief Architect Truchlikova presented slides of the project.

Regent Montoya noted that while the building would house 240 people, only 10 parking spaces were provided. Ms. Truchlikova explained that most occupants of the new building will be relocated from other buildings in the vicinity and already have parking. The employee population in the area will not be increased.

Regent Murray, noting that the construction will be designed to LEED Silver requirements, asked whether LEED certification will be applied for. Architect Truchlikova indicated that the intention was to get the building certified. In response to a further question, she reported that a light well will extend along offices on the side of the building that faces the hillside.

Regent Seigler commented on what appeared to be a stark color contrast between the building and its surrounding landscape. Ms. Truchlikova believed that the blue color that was chosen for the building was grey enough to be sufficiently subtle and that the building would blend well with the environment. She noted that other buildings in the area are light gray or blue.

Faculty Representative Pitts observed that many buildings on that hillside appear from the roadway to be too intensely blue. Ms. Truchlikova referred the Committee to a sample of the material, but Committee Chair Marcus believed it was too small to provide a good idea of what the color will look like when applied to the building. He suggested that a large sample of the pre-painted material be obtained and analyzed in its intended setting. He was assured that the design team would review the color choice to confirm that it would blend well with the natural environment.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation.

3. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, MISSION BAY BUILDING 23B PARKING STRUCTURE, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in Addendum No. 5 to the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the Findings.
- B. Approve the design of the Building 23B Parking Structure, Mission Bay, San Francisco campus.

[The Addendum No. 5 and the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report 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 the Mission Bay Building 23B Parking Structure was approved by The Regents in November 2003 for a total project cost of \$23,298,000, to be funded by

external financing. The proposed parking structure is needed to provide parking for the housing tenants and to meet other projected demand on the east side of the Mission Bay campus.

The appointment of Natoma Architects of San Francisco as Executive Design Professional was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The location for the parking structure is the eastern portion of Block 23 of the UCSF Mission Bay campus site, south of the planned plaza between 3rd and 4th Streets. It will be the seventh building project to be constructed in the first phase of the campus.

This project is consistent with the 1996 LRDP as amended. Its use conforms to the Support and Parking functional zone.

Project Design

The project is designed to contain 249,140 gsf of parking and 4,853 gross square feet of shelled retail space located at the ground level on the north side adjacent to the campus plaza, for a total of 253,993 gsf. The shelled retail space will not be developed until it is needed. An area in the southeast corner at ground level is also planned for future retail or office space to help activate 3rd Street alongside the garage, but it will be used as parking until it is needed.

The parking structure will provide space for 822 vehicles on nine levels, as well as space for parking bicycles and motorcycles, within an overall building height of 85 feet. Fifty-two surface spaces will be provided to the west of the building, where the structure is planned to accommodate future expansion, which will be a separate project and require separate design approval.

The north, east, and south sides of the parking structure will be clad with four levels of vertical panels of translucent channel glass arranged in patterns with voids for natural air ventilation. The ground level will be clad with horizontal concrete planks relating in appearance to the travertine on the research buildings. The building base and body cladding will serve to reduce the visibility of the concrete ramps, low walls, and columns of the structure.

If a mutually agreeable arrangement can be made with a solar energy developer to provide the capital and operational investment in exchange for the "air rights" to generate solar power and sell that energy to UCSF at a discounted price, patterned photovoltaic panels rather than glass will be installed on the south façade of the building and on the roof.

The west side of the structure will be clad only if it is determined to be within the budget after bids are received; otherwise, it will remain unfinished. A row of poplar trees will

be planted along this side of the garage until such time as an expansion may be constructed.

The building will have a cast-in-place, post-tensioned concrete system, selected primarily for its strength, durability, and maintainability. The foundation will be precast piles driven to an approximate depth of 70 feet, with a reinforced concrete slab at the ground floor spanning pile caps.

The UCSF Design Review Committee has reviewed the design of the 23B Parking Structure, in accordance with University policy. Independent parking design, cost consultation, and structural and seismic peer review have been conducted. The project will be delivered by a modified design build method. The architect will specify the cladding and lobby and will describe in performance specification terms the interior and structure, leaving remaining construction details to the design-build team to determine. UCSF Capital Projects & Facilities Management will manage the project, with University oversight by the Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance. Construction is slated to begin April 2004 and end by July 2005.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Addendum No. 5 was prepared for the Building 23B Parking Structure to consider any potential new significant impacts of the proposed project not previously considered in the 1996 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report and LRDP Amendment No. 1 and Supplemental EIR. This project was determined to be consistent with those documents. The entire project, the second phase of which will be subject to separate design approval, will be limited to 376,300 gsf and 1,180 parking spaces. Environmental analysis contained in Addendum No. 5 determined that project specific effects would not alter the conclusions of significance of the LRDP FEIR and LRDP Amendment SEIR and that the project is in furtherance of the Mission Bay South Plan. Significant environmental impacts were addressed in the LRDP FEIR and in the findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents concurrent with the approval of the LRDP in January 1997. Mitigation measures to reduce the project's contributions to significant effects have been incorporated into the project. Project specific monitoring of the implementation of all applicable LRDP FEIR and LRDP Amendment SEIR mitigation measures will be performed during the design and construction of the project and reported in the LRDP EIR monitoring program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding approval of the design for the project in conformance with CEQA.

Vice Chancellor Barclay and Architect Wiesenthal presented slides of the project.

Regent Montoya noted that project statistics indicated that fees for the executive architect and other design professionals accounted for 6.1 percent of the budget, campus project management and inspection were 1.4 percent, and special items, which appear to be administrative, were 14.7 percent, equaling 22.2 percent for administration of the project, which she viewed as excessive. Architect Wiesenthal responded that many costs under the term special items are Mission Bay infrastructure costs. Because the entire infrastructure could not be built to support the University's buildings initially, in effect each new building is taxed to make up for that cost. In response to her further question about cost per parking space, Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio expressed his confidence that the amount was reasonable considering the geography of the site and that it compared favorably to other University and industry costs for parking structures.

Regent Kozberg acknowledged that the structure was prominent on the site and had certain special requirements, but she was concerned that the University was rationalizing its costs for parking structures by using as its standard the cost of the most recent, unusually expensive parking structure it had built.

Regent Murray was complimentary about the location and design of the parking structure. He was hopeful that an agreement to provide solar panels could be secured. Mr. Wiesenthal responded that the campus would be in a position by March to confirm whether solar panels could be used. He reported that four developers had expressed strong interest. Mr. Barclay noted that completion of the west façade would depend on how fast other research buildings in the quadrant were approved. He estimated it would be within five years.

Regent Seigler asked about the efficiency and maintenance costs of photovoltaic panels. Mr. Wiesenthal responded that the developers would not only construct but would operate and maintain the solar equipment. He believed that the life span of the cells was about 25 years. The cost of electricity from a solar energy plant is greater than from off the grid, but because subsidies are available, it makes financial sense for developers to enter into such an agreement. For this building, the campus' direct costs would be structured to be 10 percent less than prevailing Pacific Gas and Electric rates.

Faculty Representative Pitts noted that, as surface parking disappears with the construction of new buildings and is replaced by parking structures, the cost of parking increases substantially. The Faculty Welfare Committee has proposed that the cost of a new building should include replacing surface parking with structured parking rather than rolling the cost over to the faculty and staff. Mr. Barclay responded that based on the business model used on the San Francisco campus and endorsed by the campus parking

committee, which has faculty representatives, parking rates will be raised by about 4 percent per year. He noted that campus rates are at least 50 percent below market.

Regent Montoya asked about future demand for parking at Mission Bay. Mr. Barclay believed that it will be possible to keep pace with demand over time, given that the campus has a rough idea of what the pace of future development will be for research buildings. The campus has the advantage, until full build out is reached, of using land that is not yet developed for permanent buildings as surface parking, which costs little to convert from bare ground to asphalt and stripes.

Faculty Representative Pitts asked whether the campus gets any income stream from providing parking for Pac Bell Park. Mr. Barclay responded that none has been realized yet, because much of the Catellus land, which ultimately will be developed, provides temporary parking for use by the Giants. The campus will be ready to supply additional spaces if they are needed. He reported that one of the campus' affiliates, the Gladstone Institute, which is completing a research building across the street from Genentech Hall, will buy from the campus 200 permits, the income from which will go directly to the parking system.

Committee Chair Marcus commended the campus on the creative design of the structure.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation.

4. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ROBERT MONDAVI INSTITUTE FOR WINE AND FOOD SCIENCE, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the 2003 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the Findings and Statement of Overriding Consideration and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- B. Approve the design of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science, Davis campus.

[The 2003 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, Findings, Statement of Overriding Consideration, 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 November 2001, The Regents approved the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science (RMI) at the Davis campus at a total project cost of \$54.8 million, to be funded from a combination of State funds (\$33 million), gift funds (\$20 million), and campus funds (\$1.8 million). Subsequently, the appointment of

Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership, of Portland, Oregon, as executive architect for this project, was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science will be located within the new south entry neighborhood at the main entrance to the UC Davis campus. The building will be visible from Interstate 80 and adjacent to the recently completed Robert and Margrit Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts. The site is consistent with the 2003 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan, which was approved by The Regents at its November 2003 meeting.

Project Design

The Institute for Wine and Food Science is designed to contain 75,000 assignable square feet of space within a total area of 130,000 gross square feet, providing sensory and teaching laboratories, research laboratories, faculty offices, departmental offices, and conference rooms for the departments of Viticulture & Enology and Food Science & Technology, and offices for the Institute. The building wraps around a courtyard containing event spaces and demonstration gardens. The three-sided courtyard opens on the west side to a teaching vineyard and dedicated open space that forms the centerpiece of a new gateway to the campus.

The building is designed as a reinforced concrete structure consisting of three wings: two three-story wings for each of the two departments, plus a two-story wing for the shared labs and the offices of the Institute. The building is clad in a combination of glass curtain wall, exterior cement plaster, and stone veneer. The roof is copper. The campus intends to apply for LEED Silver certification and expects to receive energy rebates for saving energy costs.

The Robert Mondavi Institute has been planned ultimately to contain three components: the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science, an academic building; the Viticulture and Enology Research and Teaching Winery; and the Anheuser-Busch Brewing and Food Science Laboratory. The LRDP EIR evaluated the combined impacts of all three components of the project.

The design of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant and value engineering teams. UC Davis Architects & Engineers Department will manage the project, with assistance from the executive design professional's project team, with outside consultants and testing agencies employed as necessary. The Campus Architect will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act to analyze the environmental effects of the 2003 LRDP, including project-level review of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science. The EIR, which also was certified in November 2003 by The Regents, contains a summary of refinements of the project description, the comment letters received on the Draft EIR, transcripts of the public hearings, detailed responses to the comments received, and changes that were made in response to comments.

Implementation of the RMI project has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, significant and unavoidable impacts from the RMI and 2003 LRDP will remain in some categories.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The campus will be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents, and continuing programs and procedures that serve to reduce environmental impacts identified in the EIR. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the Final EIR provides a reporting mechanism for the mitigation measures and programs and procedures that are made conditions of approval to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, mitigation monitoring program, and alternatives. The Findings also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant impacts.

Campus Architect Strand and Assistant Vice Chancellor Segar presented slides of the project.

Regent Montoya noted that the administrative fees for the project seemed unusually high. Mr. Strand explained that architectural fees vary depending upon the complexity of the project. In this case there are a number of laboratories included in the design. Administrative fees cover the design contract, field inspectors, testing of materials, and printing.

Committee Chair Marcus expressed concerns about the design. He believed it was important to establish a harmonious, integrated appearance on the campus. This design appeared to have too many elements and unrelated materials. He was unsure whether the unusual shapes were necessary to accommodate the building's functions or whether the architect wanted to make a statement. He suggested that the Committee be given a better feel for the building on a human scale.

Faculty Representative Pitts commented that, although the courtyard of the project looked very attractive, the perimeter buildings seemed choppy and the smokestacks were too prominent.

Regent Murray believed that the positive elements of the project were the courtyard, the landscaping, and the vineyard. He believed it was the outside façade that was of concern.

Senior Vice President Mullinix acknowledged that the renderings that were provided made it difficult to assess the exterior facades. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio believed that the illustrations made it appear as though the building's elements were not sufficiently related to each other. He suggested producing further elevations. Regent Montoya asked that these show the project in relation to the adjacent Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts.

Although Regent Kozberg was complimentary about the landscape plan, she was unwilling to approve the building design without first developing a better understanding of it. She asked whether the time frame was an issue. Architect Strand believed that a delay until the next meeting would not be a major hindrance. Committee Chair Marcus suggested reviewing the project at the Regents' meeting in January. He believed it would be helpful for the campus to work with the President's staff to produce some design choices for the Committee.

The Committee agreed to delay consideration of the President's recommendation until a further assessment of the design could be made.

5. **EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SCIENCES BUILDING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

This item was withdrawn by the President.

6. **COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH BUILDING, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson discussed the plan for building the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) Instruction and Research Building and showed slides to illustrate its design. The 110,000-gross-square-foot, four-story project will cost \$32 million, to be funded entirely by the State. The architect is Pei, Cobb, and Freed in association with Leo A. Daly. Construction will begin in about a year.

Mr. Johnson reported that the instruction and research building will be located on the arts mall adjacent to the recently completed arts building. The arts mall will bisect both buildings. The relationship between the two buildings and how the new building will fit into the entrance of the campus were of particular concern to the design team. The design also took into account pedestrian circulation between the new buildings and related buildings to the south.

Mr. Johnson noted that the instruction and research building will echo the stepped-back approach of the arts building and has areas of transparency. Both of these characteristics soften the scale for people approaching the entrance. The landscaping of the arts mall, which runs north-south, is relatively formal. The new building will have a formal courtyard on the southern end but a more irregular courtyard on the north side. The first floor of the building will be public space, with the upper floors containing general assignment classrooms and faculty offices, which are on the perimeter in order to take advantage of the natural light and mountain vistas. The brick façade will be enhanced by vertical sun shades.

Regent Murray asked about the placement and relationships of buildings on the campus. Mr. Johnson noted that there are orthogonal relationships on the arts mall, but the relationship between the arts building and the new building is more playful, with the arts building embracing the orientation of the existing building. He noted that, although the two buildings are in the same college, they have no programmatic relationship.

Faculty Representative Pitts commented that the way in which the buildings were integrated seemed a reasonable and well-done approach. He also admired the use of stepped back the surfaces.

Regent Seigler also admired the placement and relationship of the two buildings.

7. **COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CHASS)
PSYCHOLOGY BUILDING, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

This item was withdrawn by the President.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary