

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

April 17, 2003

A Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was held on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Suite 109, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Marcus, Sainick, Hopkinson, Johnson, and Ligot-Gordon

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

The meeting convened at 10:30 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 compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing items on the day's agenda.

2. **UPDATE ON FEASIBILITY STUDY TO RECOMMEND A SYSTEMWIDE GREEN BUILDING POLICY AND CLEAN ENERGY STANDARD**

Senior Vice President Mullinix recalled that the Committee had passed a resolution requesting a study to be completed for the May Regents meeting that would prepare certain recommendations for a new policy and new clean energy standards for University buildings in consideration of the capital and maintenance costs of any recommended changes. The Committee requested that input from a range of groups be included. He reported that while substantial progress had been made in accomplishing the objectives that were laid out, a number of concerns have been raised about the preliminary recommendations. Some of those concerns were related to misunderstandings about what some of the recommendations pertain to, and some resulted from concerns about the lack of data and assuredness about the cost or impact of some of the recommendations. Finally, there were some concerns that the recommendations did not reflect an appropriate balance between cost and sustainability. Because of these concerns, he recommended that adoption of a specific policy be deferred to the next meeting.

Mr. Mullinix reported that his committee had received presentations from the U.S. Green Buildings Council and the Center for Resources Solutions, the two groups that have done the most research in the area. After its initial level of research, the committee had a student forum in February. Also, there were ongoing discussions between students and a large number of people on the campuses and in the Office of

the President. Ultimately, the committee discussed a draft feasibility study generated by staff in consultation with campus vice chancellors, budget planning officers, and others on the campuses. It was during this discussion that the issues mentioned previously were raised.

Mr. Mullinix highlighted areas of the feasibility study. He noted that there was no disagreement that the development of an explicit UC sustainability policy and guidelines would increase internal awareness and improve the University's performance in energy conservation. The focus of these guidelines and policy would be energy efficiency and conservation. It was agreed that, in order to move forward, there needs to be a system for evaluating and measuring sustainability. It was recognized that sharing information and increasing awareness on the campuses would enhance the University's ability to address the issue. The committee also agreed that the real, immediate, and easiest payoff would be to reduce energy use, which would provide environmental and financial benefit. There was general recognition also that funding constraints must be considered. The level of capital funding and life-cycle cost funding are such that care will need to be taken not to suggest strategies that could not be supported by the available resources. Finally, the committee was aware that care must be taken not to make funding for energy conservation and sustainability an afterthought in University projects, because it is the last dollars put in that tend to be value-engineered out. The changes must be conceived of as part of the overall design process. To do this, the committee is focused on LEEDS (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification and the Laboratories for the 21st Century certification process, which would establish an objective standard for building construction. Goals could be set and advantage could be taken of work that has been done nationally in order to set benchmarks for the University.

Mr. Mullinix recalled that the LEEDS and Labs-21 focus on individual building projects, and many of the criteria used for those projects are part of a campus-based strategy. It may be preferential to develop some system whereby each project coordinated with campus-based approaches automatically receives points rather than going through separate certification processes. The possibility of self-certification was discussed, also, which could reduce paperwork and be better tailored to individual projects.

Mr. Mullinix reported that the committee's work group concluded that a primary level of new-building sustainability could be achieved within the existing budget parameters. This conclusion was based on the examination of existing projects and the objectives of individual campuses. It was determined that the assumption needs further testing. The LEEDS standards were not developed for the University's largest consumers of energy, its laboratory research buildings, and need further refining.

Mr. Mullinix noted that the University is adding over 2 million gross square feet of space during this decade, including substantial laboratory space. It is incumbent on the University to increase its consumption of sustainable energy as opposed to buying more fossil fuel to accommodate the increase in space. Small pilot programs are under

way that test the use of photovoltaics to provide energy. Those programs generally have external subsidies. The University may seek further external funding for pilot programs to try to make the use of this technology economically viable. In addition, it would be possible to purchase green energy from the grid. The Governor has an objective to increase California's renewable energy to 20 percent by 2017. The immediate cost of purchasing green energy is estimated at \$600,000 per year. On the other hand, most of the campuses do not have their current energy bill funded. The impacts of taking this direction need further evaluation.

Mr. Mullinix reported that the committee is recommending that The Regents adopt three general policies regarding implementation of energy efficiency and green building sustainability practices and then develop a series of standards and policies to implement the adopted general policy.

Committee Chair Marcus emphasized that the Committee needs to be presented with specific objective standards by which the University can measure itself. He supported the idea of investing in more efficient use of renewable energy sources as a way to make the University a model for change, but he suggested that detail be provided about costs. Mr. Mullinix reiterated that it was his plan to come back with a policy statement but then to provide to The Regents explicit statements on how that policy would be implemented. It was not his intention to have The Regents implement a detailed policy, because the policy will be refined over time as experience is gained and technology improves.

[For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the April 17, 2003 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.]

3. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, MOLECULAR FOUNDRY, LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY**

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

- A. Adopt the Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

The Committee was informed that funding for construction of the Molecular Foundry building totaling \$85 million will be provided by the United States Department of Energy, Office of Science. The building will be constructed on lands belonging to The Regents within the management boundaries of the Lawrence Berkeley National

Laboratory. Upon approval of the building design and environmental documents, a standard parcel lease agreement will be developed for approval by The Regents at a subsequent meeting.

In February 2002, the appointment of SmithGroup of San Francisco as executive architect for this project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site for the Molecular Foundry is in the central portion of LBNL's Nano and Materials Sciences complex. It was chosen in accordance with the 1987 Long Range Development Plan and is bounded on the east by Lawrence Road (LBNL's primary east-west roadway), on the south by the Surface Science Laboratory (Building 66), on the west by undeveloped lands, and on the north by the National Center for Electron Microscopy (Building 72). The topography slopes downward approximately 60 feet in elevation from Lawrence Road to the access drive below the project's western edge. The project scope includes utility connections to the Laboratory's Lawrence Road utility corridor.

Project Design

The Molecular Foundry will be an approximately 94,500-gross-square-foot research facility accommodating 140 scientists, students, support staff, and visiting researchers. The research structure will be a six-story laboratory and office building containing research laboratories, clean rooms, vibration sensitive instrument rooms, offices, a seminar room, and conference rooms. Utilities will be provided from a separate reinforced concrete building of approximately 7,000 gsf to be constructed adjacent to the Molecular Foundry.

The planning module used to design the laboratory spaces effectively addresses a range of research activities and allows flexibility in the arrangement of laboratory equipment. Offices are clustered to encourage interaction between researchers, and an open stairway adjacent to the office modules encourages communication with researchers on other floors.

The two lower floors of the building housing experimental instruments and clean rooms will be recessed into the hillside. The four upper floors will contain research laboratories, offices, and assembly and common spaces and will afford direct access to Lawrence Road. A laboratory shuttle bus stop will be located at the entrance, and a pathway will connect the Molecular Foundry with the adjacent National Center for Electron Microscopy. At the base level of the office and laboratory floors, an assembly of interior common spaces and exterior gathering areas will form a central common area, inviting both structured and informal interactions among staff and guests. The main floors of both the Molecular Foundry and the adjacent Surface Science Laboratory (Building 66) will open onto a new outdoor terrace.

The Molecular Foundry will provide physical, functional, and visual links with surrounding buildings and draw them together into an identifiable complex. Finishes and colors have been selected to complement and enhance surrounding structures.

The foundation system will be a slab on grade over drilled piers. The main retaining wall system will be tie backs with shotcrete facing. The building structure will be a structural steel frame with a seismic resistance system of concrete shear walls on the first two floors as well as buckling restrained braced frames for the full six stories.

In accordance with University policy, an independent value engineering team, Cambridge CM, Inc., has reviewed the design of the Molecular Foundry. An independent structural review has been conducted by Engle & Engle, Structural Engineers.

The LBNL Facilities Division will manage the construction of this building, with oversight by the Division Director. A construction management firm will be engaged during the pre-construction, bidding, and construction phases, and outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. A Federal Project Manager will provide oversight for the U.S. Department of Energy.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, a Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the Molecular Foundry. The analysis was tiered from the LBNL 1987 Long Range Development Plan EIR, as amended. The Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated whether the project would result in any new environmental impacts not previously identified and mitigated, if necessary, in the LRDP EIR, as amended. The Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration identified all amended LRDP EIR mitigation measures that are relevant to the project and have been incorporated into it.

The Construction and Operation of the Molecular Foundry Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 35-day public review period. The University extended the public review period twice at the request of the City of Berkeley and local citizens' groups, for a total of 58 days. Comments were received from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the East Bay Municipal Utility District, individual City of Berkeley officials, and several local citizens. Responses to the comments are included in the final Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Based on the analysis provided in the Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, it was determined that the project might result in a new, potentially significant project-specific biological resources impact to the Alameda whipsnake, a federally-designated "threatened" species. Four new project-specific mitigation measures were identified and incorporated into the project to reduce the potentially

significant impacts to a level that is clearly less than significant. On the basis of the tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project incorporation of the LRDP EIR mitigation measures, and proposed implementation of project-specific mitigation measures for biological resources, there is no substantial evidence that the project as mitigated will have a significant effect on the environment.

The Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration 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, and evidence that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

[The Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, 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].

Ms. Sally Benson—Deputy Director for Operations and Ms. Danica Truclikova—Chief Architect presented slides of the building.

Regent Hopkinson asked how many buildings of this size the laboratory has built in the past few years. Architect Truclikova responded that the last, the Human Genome Laboratory, was completed in 1996. Regent Hopkinson encouraged her to focus on cost efficiency and control in order to assure that the project remains within its budget. Ms. Benson noted that the Department of Energy had no tolerance for cost overruns.

Upon expressing concern about the external panels that would be used, Regent Hopkinson was informed that the steel or aluminum panels would be factory finished with baked enamel, would be guaranteed for 20 years, and would weather well. In response to her concerns about project management, Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio assured her that staff at the laboratory would be in close communication with the people who would be developing the project.

In response to a question by Regent Johnson, Ms. Truclikova explained that parking spaces would be in the vicinity of the main entry, with additional parking at the side and on top of the building. This should be sufficient because half of the people using the building will be students, who do not need parking. Regent Johnson noted that the Hayward Fault must be very close to the new building. Ms. Truclikova assured her that the building is designed to very strict lateral force resistance criteria. Mr. Bocchicchio noted that the laboratory uses ground motion spectra developed by the Berkeley campus.

Regent Johnson asked whether there were a potential for expansion on the site. Ms. Truclikova responded that, although this site is very tight, expansion may be possible on the other side of the lower road. Regent Johnson complimented the overall building design.

Faculty Representative Pitts asked about the proximity to the project of Strawberry Creek and its tributaries. He noted that the East Bay Municipal Utility District analysis in the EIR summary raised no questions. Ms. Truclikova explained that there is no creek plume in the vicinity of the site.

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

[For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the April 17, 2003 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.]

4. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, COMPUTER SCIENCE BUILDING UNIT 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

- A. Adopt the Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Approve the design of Computer Science Building Unit 3, Irvine campus.

It was recalled that in November 2001, The Regents approved the State-funded 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements, which included the Computer Science Unit 3 project at a sum of \$49,520,000. In July 2002, The Regents approved use of external financing resulting in a total project cost of \$50,620,000. The project will be funded from a combination of State funds (\$34,822,000), campus funds (\$3,000,000), and external financing (\$12,798,000).

In December 2002, the appointment of Esherick Homsey Dodge & Davis (EHDD) as Master Architect for the project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The project site is located in the campus core within the Engineering/Computer Science Quad. The facility will be developed on Parking Lot 18 and a portion of the inner Ring Mall adjacent to the Information Computer Science Building and ICS 2. The total area of the site will be approximately 2.25 acres bounded by Aldrich Park

to the north, Cal (IT)² to the south, the Information Computer Science Building and ICS 2 and the Engineering Gateway building to the east, and the University Club and Reines Hall to the west. The site, which is in conformance with the campus 1989 Long Range Development Plan, is bisected by the Ring Mall.

Project Design

The Computer Science Unit 3 project will provide approximately 87,400 assignable square feet within 146,180 gross square feet, to include laboratory, office, and conference room space for the School of Information and Computer Science, and general assignment classroom space and surge space for general campus use.

The project program has been divided into two buildings: a main six-story building for the School of Information and Computer Science and surge space and a smaller two-story building to accommodate the general assignment classrooms. This division reflects the distinctly different uses for the spaces and the differences in activities that the two must accommodate.

The School of Information and Computer Science building (Main Building) will be located on the outer side of the Ring Mall adjacent to the Cal (IT)² building. The first level will contain class laboratories and a mix of faculty/research offices and research laboratories. Also at this level will be service access to the building from the service area of the adjoining Cal (IT)² building. The second and third levels will contain flexible surge space for use by other campus departments. The fourth and fifth levels will contain additional faculty and research offices and research laboratories for the School of Information and Computer Science. The partial sixth level will contain the administrative offices for the School of Information and Computer Science as well as additional faculty offices. The configuration and location of spaces on all levels has been developed to encourage interaction among the various faculty and post-doctoral researchers and graduate students working in those spaces.

The main building will be constructed of poured-in-place concrete for both the frame and the exterior shear walls. The concrete exterior, trimmed with brick masonry veneer, will complement the adjacent Cal (IT)² building in mass, scale, and color. The design has been developed as a visual bridge between other recent buildings located on the Ring Mall and the eclectic mix of buildings in the School of Engineering Quad and reinforces the developing contextual design of the campus. This is accomplished through the incorporation of a classical design approach and the use of construction materials that reflect a traditional collegial atmosphere.

The classroom building will be located adjacent to Aldrich Park and across the Ring Mall from the main building. This two-level building will be nestled into the slope overlooking Aldrich Park. The upper level, which will be accessible at grade directly from the Ring Mall, will contain a 250-seat lecture hall, two 50-seat case study classrooms, and four standard 30-seat classrooms. The lower level, which will have

an exit at grade towards Aldrich Park, will contain a 125-seat lecture hall, a 65-seat classroom, and four standard 30-seat classrooms.

The classroom building will be constructed of load-bearing concrete masonry shear walls with structural steel beam framing and long-span concrete-filled steel deck at the first level and open-web steel joists and light-weight concrete-filled metal deck at the roof. The concrete masonry exterior will be finished with cement plaster and brick veneer to emulate the poured-in-place concrete and brick veneer of the Main Building across the Ring Mall.

The design of the Computer Science Unit 3 project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant, and independent seismic and structural consultant, and an independent cost estimator.

The campus Office of Design and Construction Services will manage the project. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Services will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the Computer Science Unit 3 project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedures for implementation of CEQA. During the 30-day public review period, the Draft Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was reviewed by various local, State, and federal agencies and service providers, as well as interested individuals and organizations. Written comments received on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Irvine campus responses to these comments are included in the final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Implementation of the project will have no impact or a less-than-significant impact in the following: agricultural resources; biological resources; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; mineral resources; population and housing; and recreation.

The proposed project has the potential to have significant impacts to the following areas unless the recommended LRDP EIR mitigation measures described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are incorporated into the project: aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; noise; public services; transportation and traffic; and utilities and service systems. After adoption of the recommended mitigation measures, all impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels. All mitigation measures will be monitored through the Mitigation Monitoring Program established for the LRDP.

Findings

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

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

Vice Chancellor Brase and Campus Architect Gladson showed slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson liked the building's looks but had some questions. She noted that architects' fees in general seem to be edging up notwithstanding the slow economy. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio reported that the University has a fee guideline that is adjusted to the size and type of the project. Every architect appointment is reviewed and is approved by the Office of the President following comparison with the guideline. Regent Hopkinson had further questions about the cost per square foot. Mr. Bocchicchio explained that square footage is measured differently in the education sector from the way in which it is measured in the commercial sector. Committee Chair Marcus suggested that a one-page memorandum to the Committee that compared standards for educational versus commercial building and for office versus laboratory building would help to clarify the issue.

Regent Johnson noted that the main building will be used mainly by graduate students and the other building by undergraduates. She asked whether there was any discussion as to how undergraduates would interact with the graduate students and professors who would populate the office building. Ms. Gladson responded that an outside consultant ascertained where points of melding could take place. Based on that analysis, interaction areas were built into the design.

Committee Chair Marcus registered his continuing concerns about establishing an architectural set of relationships on the campus. He viewed the design as very faddish and not making any contribution to establishing a theme for either the entire campus or its individual segments. He asked the design team to offer some alternative design solutions that would not delay the project. Ms. Gladson responded that the campus intended to go out to bid in four weeks. She pointed out that the nearby McDonnell Douglas Lecture Hall is totally clad in traditional brick and that the Cal IT² building has an all-brick base. She recalled that the campus lacks distinguished quadrangles, so within each pie section the planners tried to create a vocabulary of base materials that would be specific to that quad. In engineering, humanities, and social sciences it is brick; in physical sciences it is stone. She explained that the method for setting the brick into the concrete for this project has not been decided. Committee Chair Marcus encouraged her to come up with a more comprehensive strategy that can begin to pull the campus together. He was concerned about the Committee's getting designs submitted for approval so close to their being put out for bid.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio believed that the details could be modified significantly, but Regent Marcus was skeptical that the glazing and masonry systems would turn out to be attractive. He asked for a major modification of the design. He was concerned about approving building designs that did nothing to establish a campus identity.

Regent Sainick noted that, although this may be a background building, the fact that it is on the main thoroughfare, the Ring Mall, should warrant consideration.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation subject to further review by the Committee concerning the elevations.

5. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, STUDENT RESOURCE BUILDING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

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

- A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Amend the Long Range Development Plan to add Building Site #37.
- D. Approve the design of the Student Resource Building, Santa Barbara campus.

It was recalled that in July 2002, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Student Resource Building, Santa Barbara campus, in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of \$24,522,000. The project is funded by external financing (\$19,202,000), University Registration Fee reserves (\$2,820,000), gift funds (\$250,000), President's Matching Child Care Funds (\$750,000) and Student Resource Fee reserves (\$1,500,000).

In August 2002, the appointment of Sasaki Associates Inc. of San Francisco as Executive Architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The two-acre site for the proposed building is located in existing Parking Lot 23 on the southwestern edge of campus, east of Ocean Road, and bordered by Parking Lot 22 and the Pardall Corridor bike path on the north. On the east is a bicycle path and Snidecor Hall. The location is close to on-campus student housing to the south and adjacent to Isla Vista on the west. It is readily accessible to students during the day and evening.

LRDP Amendment

While the proposed project is consistent with the Academic Uses land use designation identified in the 1990 LRDP, which includes some administrative and student support uses, an LRDP Amendment is required to identify the project site as a potential building location. The project proposes to construct approximately 43,200 asf on new Building Site #37. The amendment to the LRDP will result in no net change in the allocated development potential of the UCSB Main Campus. The LRDP amendment will transfer unused building area from Building Site #6, Building Site #8, and Building Site #2.

Project Design

The Student Resource Building will be three stories with a single-story wing and will be organized around a central forum. The building is oriented east-west to get the best light and ventilation. The north side of the building is designed to house storefront student resource centers that open onto a plaza bounded by the busy Pardall Corridor. The multipurpose room serves as the focal point of the plaza. The garden-like south side has a single-story element that is a childcare facility for infants and toddlers. It is designed to be homelike and directly accessible to secure outdoor play areas.

The forum serves as a meeting place and a multi-use space for a variety of student activities. This will foster interaction and integration across groups and among the departments of Office of Student Life, Campus Learning Assistance Services, Office of International Students and Scholars, Educational Opportunity Program, Education Program for Culture Awareness, Women’s Center, and Children’s Center.

The major student spaces, including the student resource centers, multipurpose room and kitchen, computer lab, and library are located on the first floor. Meeting rooms and services provided by departments draw students to upper floors and reinforce student and staff interaction at all levels. Roof terraces at the third floor accommodate tutoring and allow meetings to expand to the outdoors and take advantage of the views.

A reinforced concrete frame is used for the main building structure, with two-way reinforced concrete slabs transferring loads to concrete columns and conventional spread footings. Where possible, concrete slabs are exposed and finished ceilings are

held to a minimum to permit high windows and natural ventilation. The one-story wing is a steel frame on spread footings.

The lateral force resisting system is comprised of concrete moment frames at north and south exterior walls and concrete interior shear walls in both directions. A seismic joint separates the north and south bars of the main building and separates the single-story wing from the main building.

Building materials include painted aluminum and glass storefront, metal panels, clay tile rainscreen panels, and exposed concrete. The open north and south facades reveal the building's activities and make a nighttime beacon at the west entry to campus. The modular units of the clay tile echo the concrete block used on many campus buildings.

The design of the Student Resource Building has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by the campus Design Review Committee and an independent design review team including cost consultant Cumming, LLC and mechanical, electrical, plumbing consultant, Engineered Automation Systems. Independent structural review will be conducted at each stage of project development by Howard & Van Sande Structural Consultants.

The Campus Office of Design & Construction Services will manage the construction of the project, with assistance from the Executive Architect's project team. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Director of Design & Construction Services will perform project oversight.

Construction is scheduled to begin in May 2004 and completion is expected in January 2006.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), dated March 2003, was prepared for the proposed Student Resource Building project. As stated above, the project requires amendment to the campus' 1990 LRDP. The IS/MND was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, local agencies, utility providers, and other interested parties and was circulated for a 30-day public review period. Copies of the IS/MND were made available at one on-campus and two community libraries and were distributed to interested agencies, groups, and individuals.

The IS/MND concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of proposed mitigation measures: lighting, fugitive dust, short-term erosion, short-term water quality, potential for disturbing archaeological resources, soil erosion and sedimentation, water quality, land use, construction noise and vibration, utilities and service systems.

Three comment letters were received from the State Clearinghouse, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The Clearinghouse letter acknowledged receipt of the document and distribution to State agencies. The DFG letter stated the belief that 16 eucalyptus trees scheduled for removal from the parking lot could be nesting or roosting sites for several species of birds and monarch butterflies. The campus disagrees with this assessment based on inspections of the trees by the Associate Director of the Museum of Systematics and Ecology, and disagrees with the potential for monarch butterflies based on published documentation of monarch overwintering sites in Santa Barbara County. DTSC indicated that as part of a former Marine base, the site may contain contamination. The campus has evaluated the site for this potential and has no indication that such contamination is present. Detailed responses are included in the Final IS/MND.

In conformance with the 1990 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), mitigation measures to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant have been incorporated into the project. A project-specific MMP is included as an appendix to the Final MND. Monitoring of the implementation of all mitigation measures will be performed in connection with the annual report for the LRDP MMP and will be conducted during various phases of project development as appropriate.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and evidence that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

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

Mr. Mark Fisher—Associate Vice Chancellor and Mr. Jack Wolever—Director, Design and Construction Services, showed slides of the project.

Although Regent Hopkinson admired the building in general, she disliked the sunscreen system, which she viewed as antiquated.

Regent Sainick was pleased that the project would provide parking. He asked whether when parking spaces are taken up by staging or building, parking services get reimbursed or bought out. Mr. Fisher explained that in this situation there was an agreement to buy out a number of parking spaces at the replacement cost of surface spaces. He noted that State-funded projects do not allow for site acquisition costs. A department that wanted to move parking in order to construct a State-funded building would have no mechanism within that funding process to buy out parking. Regent Sainick believed that those costs should be funded along with the construction. Senior Vice President Mullinix noted that this is a major issue at the University. There is no source of State funding with which to provide parking for State-funded buildings. The

campuses are encouraged to provide the buyback of space. The feeling is that the academic program or student housing should not be burdened by increasing costs in order to support parking.

In response to a question by Regent Ligot-Gordon, Mr. Fisher explained that the new building will bring together student groups that are spread around the campus and provides additional day care space for the campus.

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

6. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SNIDECOR HALL OFFICE WING SEISMIC REPLACEMENT, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

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

- A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Approve the design of the Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement, Santa Barbara campus.

It was recalled that in November 2001, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement project, Santa Barbara campus, in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-07 Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of \$12,280,000. The Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2002 will fund the project.

The project was amended by the Vice President for Budget to include a 1,850-sq-ft Dance Facility as part of the project, at a total project cost of \$13,045,000. The budget increase of \$765,000 is funded by campus funds.

In March 2003, the appointment of AC Martin Partners, Inc. of Los Angeles as the Executive Architect for this project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The proposed building site, which is in the southwest corner of the main campus, is bounded on the north by the Pardall pedestrian and bike path corridor, on the east by the Arts Building, on the south by the Faculty Club, and on the west by a bike path. The project site is consistent with the campus Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement project provides 22,498 asf feet within a total area of 34,614 gsf in a one- and two-story structure. The program includes instruction and research space for the Department of Dramatic Arts and Acting, Dance, and Design Studios, and general assignment classroom space. The project involves replacement of the partial two-story office wing west of the Hatlen Theater. The office wing has a seismic rating of “Poor” and will be demolished.

The replacement building consists of an L-shaped classroom, office, and studio building, and a freestanding 150-seat classroom and acting studio. The buildings are arranged to form a courtyard. Acting, dance, and voice studios open directly to the courtyard with large sliding barn doors for indoor-outdoor performances and are adjacent to the faculty offices forming the south side of the building. To the east is a two-story element that houses administrative offices, a design studio, and several smaller studios and support spaces. A second story provides faculty and administrative offices and a 60-seat general assignment classroom.

The foundation system is comprised of drilled piles with grade beams under a reinforced concrete slab-on-grade floor. The vertical structure is steel-framed with concrete shear walls to resist lateral forces. Finish materials include poured-in-place concrete, precision concrete masonry units, standing seam copper panels, and UCSB campus block, relating the new building to the existing Snidecor building complex.

The design of the Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by the campus Design Review Committee and an independent design review team that includes cost consultant Davis Langdon Adamson. Independent structural review is being conducted by Howard and Van Sande Structural Consultants, Inc., at each stage of project development.

Campus Office of Design & Construction Services will manage the construction phase of the project, with assistance from the Executive Architect’s project team. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Director of Design & Construction Services will perform project oversight.

Construction will begin in February 2004 and completion is projected in March 2006.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, a Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), dated December 2002, was prepared for the Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement project. The project is consistent with the campus 1990 LRDP. The IS/MND was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, local agencies, utility providers, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period, and

copies were made available at one on-campus and two community libraries and were distributed to interested agencies, groups, and individuals.

The IS/MND concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of proposed mitigation measures in the areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic.

Four comment letters were received during the review period addressing the issues of air quality regulations, potential for tree removal to affect birds, and potential for site contamination from the former military use of the UCSB site. The Air Pollution Control District clarified a permit requirement related to boilers. The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) indicated the loss of 14 mature pine trees on the site could be a nesting or roosting site for birds. The Department of Toxics Substances Control indicated the former military use of the site may have left contamination. The campus' evaluation of the trees indicates they are not used as nesting or roosting sites for sensitive species. The project landscape plan calls for planting 16 mature trees. The campus has evaluated the site for potential contamination and has found none. Detailed written responses are included in the Final IS/MND.

In conformance with the 1990 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), mitigation measures to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant have been incorporated into the project. A project-specific MMP is included as an appendix to the Final MND. Monitoring of the implementation of all mitigation measures will be performed in connection with the annual report for the LRDP MMP and will be conducted during various phases of project development as appropriate.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and evidence that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

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

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher showed slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson acknowledged that the Santa Barbara campus is a challenge in that it was built at a time that was not stellar in architectural history. There seems to be no consistency as to approach, palette, and materials. Mr. Fisher informed her that a campus urban design plan is being created that discusses spatial qualities and the evolution of a campus vision.

Regent Hopkinson expressed concern about the courtyard entrance, which to her seemed stark and uninviting. Also, the west elevation seemed uninviting at the human

level, and she believed it should be made more habitable. The most difficult issue, in her view, was the separate classroom building, which she observed was out of context and forbidding. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio believed that a decision will need to be made about the appropriateness of the exterior treatment.

Mr. Fisher acknowledged that the building was large and needed to be a fairly solid piece in order to conform to the faculty's wish that it not have windows. He suggested that it be clad in the same metal panel as the building next door. Regent Hopkinson believed that the building's appearance could be softened by the creation of outside spaces where students could sit.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation subject to further review by Regent Hopkinson, Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio, and any other Committee member interested in the issue.

7. ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, TERCERO HOUSING AND DINING EXPANSION, DAVIS CAMPUS

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

- A. Adopt the Negative Declaration for the project.
- B. Adopt the Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion, Davis campus.

It was recalled that in November 2002, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion project, Davis campus, in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program, at a total project cost of \$44,879,000. The cost will be funded from a combination of external financing (\$35,879,000) and the Davis campus' share of the University of California Housing System Net Revenue Fund (\$9,000,000).

In March 2003, the appointments of Fisher-Friedman Associates of Emeryville, California as executive design professional for the Tercero Housing portion of the project and BAR Architects of San Francisco, California as executive architect were approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The Tercero Housing Expansion project will be located to the south of the existing Tercero Housing and adjacent to the existing Tercero Dining Commons. The expanded Tercero Dining Commons will be located south of Tercero Housing. The

proposed developments are consistent with the 1994 Long Range Development Plan Housing land use designation.

Project Design

The Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion project is designed to contain 122,513 asf within a total area of 166,116 gsf. It will provide accommodations for new freshman students and common space for lounges, study rooms, laundries, and community kitchens. Phase 1 will provide 400 beds by the fall of 2005. Two additional phases, to be submitted for approval at a future meeting, are planned to provide 800 additional beds by 2007-08, for a total of 1,200 beds when all three phases are complete.

The Tercero Dining Expansion project will be a two-story addition to match the existing facility, with dining functions housed on the second floor and other student services and recreation housed on the first floor. The expansion will add 19,630 asf to the existing 24,820 asf facility, expanding the dining commons capacity from 464 seats to 900 seats in order to accommodate anticipated enrollment increases through 2010.

Housing

The first phase of the Housing project consists of two buildings, each four stories high. The buildings will be wood frame, Type V one-hour construction, with stepped exterior walls. The lateral system will be plywood shear walls. Exterior finish materials will consist of glass, cement plaster, and terra cotta tile. The two housing buildings will create a courtyard that opens to a pedestrian garden path.

Dining

The building will be steel frame, Type II construction, with glass and cement plaster exterior finishes similar to the existing structure. The expansion to the south will open on to a semi-circular plaza that connects the dining commons to the main pedestrian walkway for the housing. The existing lateral system components are concrete shear walls. New lateral system components will be steel-braced frames. The project will also have an independent, freestanding snack shop building with a moment frame.

The Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion project will also connect to the utility infrastructure for steam, chilled water, storm drain connections, domestic water, and electrical and telecommunications systems for the Tercero Housing District.

An independent architect, structural engineer, and cost estimator have reviewed the design of the Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion project in accordance with University policy.

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 used as necessary. The Campus Architect will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, a Draft Tiered Initial Study was prepared for the project. The Notice of Intent and Draft Tiered Initial Study/Negative Declaration were circulated for a 30-day public and agency review. The Tiered Initial Study, entitled *Tercero Housing Improvement Projects*, evaluates all three phases of the Tercero Housing and Dining Expansion project and a catering kitchen building in the Tercero area that will be submitted for approval at a future meeting.

Comments received during the public and agency review period are included in the Final Tiered Initial Study/Negative Declaration. The Tiered Initial Study identified no potential for project-specific environmental impacts. Accordingly, no project-specific mitigation measures are proposed. Relevant LRDP EIR mitigation measures are identified in the Initial Study. All of the relevant Long Range Development Plan EIR mitigation measures are incorporated into the project and will be monitored as part of the LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program, approved by The Regents in its certification of the LRDP EIR in September 1994.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding adoption of the Tiered Initial Study/Negative Declaration for this project in conformance with CEQA.

[The Negative Declaration and Findings were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Campus Architect Strand presented slides of the project.

In response to a question by Regent Johnson, Mr. Strand reported that the dormitory was co-educational by grouping, with eight-room suites sharing one bathroom. Regent Johnson was adamant that for women such an arrangement provided insufficient bathroom facilities. Committee Chair Marcus asked Mr. Strand to conduct further analysis and review survey data and reconsider the arrangement.

Regent Hopkinson liked the way the project was integrated with its surroundings and noted that it looked inviting.

Faculty Representative Pitts asked about parking. Mr. Strand reported that no parking space would be taken over by the project in the first phase, but in the second phase a temporary lot will be removed. Dr. Pitts believed that as parking diminishes on campuses, new projects should have built into them the cost of replacing it.

Mr. Strand noted that the Davis campus has been following a plan to add parking structures to the corners of the campus.

Regent Ligot-Gordon asked about areas where students could congregate. Mr. Strand believed that a modest amount of space would be provided outside the living areas.

Committee Chair Marcus suggested that the issue of what were perceived to be inadequate bathroom facilities could be serious enough to require a redesign. Senior Vice President Mullinix suggested that adding fixtures within the bathrooms could solve the problem.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation subject to further review by the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary