

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**

June 11, 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 Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Ligot-Gordon, Marcus, Moores, and Sainick; Advisory members Bodine, Murray, and Seigler

In attendance: Faculty Representative Pitts, General Counsel Holst, Associate Secretary Shaw, and Recording Secretary Bryan

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

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF SPECIAL 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 this month's agenda.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of December 13, 2002, February 25, 2003, and April 17, 2003 were approved.

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

The President recommended that he be authorized to:

- A. Adopt, as University policy for all capital projects, the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability in the planning, financing, design, construction, renewal, maintenance, operation, space management, facilities utilization, and decommissioning of facilities and infrastructure to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements.
- B. With the overarching goals of improving the University's effect on the environment and reducing the University's dependence on non-renewable energy, implement programs to reduce consumption of non-renewable energy by creating a portfolio approach to energy use, including energy efficiency, local renewable power, and green power purchases from the electrical grid,

with the intent of minimizing increased use of non-renewable energy for the University's built environment during this next decade of growth.

- C. Develop and implement this policy for all proposed and existing University facilities, and provide an annual report to The Regents that examines impacts on energy utilization and building design and the effects of this policy on capital and operating costs.

It was recalled that at the December 13, 2002 meeting of the Committee, it was requested that the President undertake a feasibility study for the adoption of a Green Building policy and Clean Energy standard for all proposed and to-be-renovated buildings. The study was to assess the financial impacts of the recommended sustainability policies and standards on both capital and building maintenance programs.

To initiate the Green Building and Clean Energy policy process, the University assembled a committee made up of State government officials from the California Energy Commission and the State Consumer Services Agency, faculty members with expertise in these disciplines, and administrators from each of the ten campuses and the Office of the President. The committee met at least once a month from January through May 2003, with numerous subgroups and ad hoc meetings to complete the work. In late February, student representatives from each campus that had passed referenda requesting that the University develop policies for integrating sustainability into its energy purchasing practices and building guidelines met with the committee to share information and provide input about sustainability policy. The committee also met with representatives from GreenPeace, the U.S. Green Building Council, and the Center for Resource Solutions.

Consistent with the Regents' request, the feasibility study has been conducted in two parts, one for Green Building design policies and the other for Clean Energy standards. Both included input from and coordination with students, faculty, staff, government agencies, and other higher education systems, as well as non-governmental organizations.

A draft Presidential Implementation Policy was developed that contains recommended policy actions that are the first steps toward developing and implementing a larger and comprehensive sustainability policy for the University.

Senior Vice President Mullinix reported that a letter had been received from Ms. Aileen Adams, Secretary of State and Consumer Services Agencies, indicating her strong support of the draft policy and offering to work with the University and the State to try to facilitate economies and changes in the regulatory and development areas.

Mr. Mullinix discussed the three basic recommendations, the first of which addresses energy efficiency and sustainability in current and future buildings, beginning with

laying out the programmatic needs for the buildings and continuing through the planning, design, and construction. It recommends that both cost and programmatic impact be considered. The second recommendation is to strive to reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy sources in broad strategic ways that allow each campus to create its own balance, subject to systemwide goals and standards. The third recommendation calls for the development of implementation policies to make sure that substantial progress is made on these goals and objectives and that annual progress reports be provided to the Board.

Mr. Mullinix reported that the area that received the greatest attention was the goal that all new building projects should exceed the California Energy Code (Title 24) requirements by at least 20 percent. A number of campuses are meeting that goal. The cost of energy the University procures off the grid is increasing, which makes this measure particularly cost-effective. Another goal is that all new buildings, except for laboratories and acute-care facilities, should be, at the minimum, the equivalent of LEED "Certified." It appears, based on studies of University buildings that already meet this standard, that this will be possible without adding unduly to the costs and that in many cases it may be possible to meet the LEED "Silver" rating. The experience differs depending on the campus and its environment, and more analysis needs to take place before Silver certification can be set as a floor.

Mr. Mullinix commented that the LEED process for laboratories is not fully developed, as LEED was established initially as an office building standard. For this reason, the University intends to use a mixture of Laboratories for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Labs21) Environmental Performance Criteria and the LEED rating to develop basic criteria for laboratories. Specific criteria will be developed during the next few months. Acute-care facilities need further study before opportunities for changes can be identified.

The second area will be to develop ways to implement the policies. Mr. Mullinix reported that it is hoped that the University can develop its own strategies for devising a LEED-equivalent certification process. In many cases, the cost of going through the LEED process for consultants and commissioning could increase the cost of construction significantly. Projects will be analyzed in a campus setting rather than individually. Work will continue with the Green Buildings Council on developing a joint self-certification system and on overall standings. A number of campuses have already decided to move forward to get Green Building certification, which would negate the need for additional systemwide certification.

Mr. Mullinix commented that, although it is the University's intention to move ahead expeditiously, it will take time to set the process in motion. It is hoped that the standards may be presented in early fall so that campuses can begin to program and design buildings consistent with those standards. It is hoped also to put more focus on life-cycle cost and to be more responsive to changes in those costs. With the increased cost of energy, increased cost-effectiveness must be established. One area where potential savings lie is refrigeration. The University has indicated to

manufacturers of such equipment its desire to help develop and then to procure more efficient refrigeration units.

The next area addressed in the study is clean energy. Mr. Mullinix reported that three efforts are involved: energy efficient projects, the development of local renewable sources, and green power purchases. The committee discovered that there are enormous opportunities for efficiency measures with a high level of payback. A balanced approach will set a long-term goal that is dependent upon the development of more cost-effective, particularly photovoltaic, collectors. In the meantime, the University will be more aggressive in establishing pilot projects and seeking external funding to support such efforts, to configure buildings that will be ready to adopt such technology in the longer term, and to work with others to push this technology forward. Another area that offers immediate benefit is to buy green energy off the grid. The University hopes to meet the goal of purchasing 10 percent of grid-supplied electricity from renewable sources in the short term and 20 percent in the future and is working with its power supplier to see if this can be facilitated.

The next area addressed longer-term clean energy to be developed by the University. Mr. Mullinix noted that the goal of providing up to 10 megawatts of local renewable power will take time to attain, but one area, while hampered by the current budget situation, promises a high payoff; that is, finding ways of financing energy-efficient projects in existing buildings. These investments would make sense in terms both of current operating costs and long-term energy savings.

Mr. Mullinix commented that work remains to be done in developing specific criteria that are needed in order to move forward on individual projects. Longer-term strategies need to be developed for energy purchases and clean energy use. The students, faculty, and others need to be kept involved and enthusiastic in support of these goals and objectives. He anticipated that a tremendous amount of progress will be made during the next two years.

Regent Kozberg stressed that the draft Presidential policy will need to be analyzed by General Counsel so as to avoid litigation later, especially if goals become standards. She liked the idea of self-certification for the flexibility it offers. She noted that some of the language in the draft implementation policy concerning developing laboratory standards seemed inconsistent. Mr. Michael Bade, Assistant Director for Project Design and Construction, reported that LEED is working on standards for laboratories. The Labs21 environmental performance criteria which the University wants to use are well worked out and have been put forward as the basis for LEED to use in developing its own LEED for laboratory standards. The University wishes to take elements from LEED and Labs21 criteria to use in the development of its own performance criteria for laboratory buildings in a way that anticipates the final LEED standard for laboratories. The University intends also to work with the Green Building Council as it develops laboratory standards.

Regent Johnson, noting that the University is on an aggressive building campaign, asked when criteria would be implemented and when the Committee on Grounds and Buildings would begin to evaluate buildings using the new criteria. Mr. Mullinix, noting that UC Merced is building all of its buildings to the Silver standard, informed her that buildings entering the funding process in 2004-05 would be subject to the policy. Meanwhile, campuses are being encouraged to use as many of the standards as possible.

Regent Ligot-Gordon complimented the committee for doing so much work in a short amount of time. He believed that the Presidential policy was well-drafted and visionary and that when implemented it will put the University at the forefront of the technology and will influence the setting of standards in industry. He asked how the Committee would be assisted in gaining an understanding of how to evaluate new construction plans once the policy is implemented. Mr. Mullinix responded that information would be provided as to what level of implementation is being achieved with each new project and that the Committee would be informed if a project deviates from the standards that have been adopted. Regent Ligot-Gordon then asked how life-cycle methodologies could be incorporated into the decision-making process. Mr. Mullinix indicated that approaches will be developed that are standard and can be shared among the campuses. Eventually, the University may be able to coordinate its buying with State purchasing in order to improve pricing and inspire innovations in technology.

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

[For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the June 11, 2003 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.]

4. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, APPROVAL OF SITE, AND AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, PARKING LOT EXPANSION, MEDICAL CENTER, DAVIS 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 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- C. Approve the site of the Parking Lot Expansion.
- D. Amend the UC Davis Medical Center 1989 Long Range Development Plan to designate 11.4 acres as Administrative and Parking.

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

*Project Site*

The proposed project site for the parking lot expansion is on land acquired by the University from Sacramento County in December 2000, after the 1989 LRDP was adopted; thus, there are no applicable LRDP planning zone designations at that location. The LRDP boundary will be extended south to include the approximately 11.4-acre project site and will be amended to designate the project site land use as Administrative and Parking Zone. The site for the Parking Lot 14 Expansion was selected to minimize impact on future development of the medical center and to locate parking near compatible uses.

The Parking Lot 14 Expansion is designed to provide 305 permanent parking spaces to replace parking lost due to anticipated construction projects. In addition, the project will provide approximately 500 temporary parking spaces, as well as storage yards for those construction projects.

*Environmental Impact Summary*

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

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

*Findings*

The Findings address the project's potential impacts and conclusions regarding the approval of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Campus Architect Strand and Associate Director Boyd presented slides of the project.

Regent Sainick noted that the Final Tiered Initial Study describes tree removal. He believed that the campus should pay special attention to carrying out its plan for replacing those trees.

Regent-designate Murray asked whether the project had any potential for using photovoltaics. Mr. Boyd responded that, although attention to sustainability and green buildings is always part of the campus' planning process, the use of photovoltaics was

not considered applicable to this surface lot but that it would be considered when the next covered parking structure is designed.

Regent Pitts noted that the parking lot was going to replace parking that is being displaced by construction. He observed that both parking lots will have been paid for out of parking funds, so in a sense, the people using the new spaces will have paid twice for them. He believed it would be reasonable, when considering construction costs, to build a cost into the construction process that could be applied to the new parking spaces. Mr. Boyd explained that the displacement of parking is temporary in this case. The net impact is to increase the amount of parking on the site, so in effect, while some spaces will be taken out, they will be replaced as part of the project cost. In this case the cost of the parking and site improvements will not be paid for directly by the parking program.

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

5. **PREPARATION OF HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN FOR FACULTY HOUSING PROJECT, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

The Committee was informed that the Santa Cruz campus is developing plans and preparing an Environmental Impact Report for the Ranch View Terrace project, a developer-financed-and-constructed project that will provide 95 units of faculty and staff housing. The project will occupy 13 acres of the 25.5-acre Inclusion Area D, one of five inclusion areas established in the UCSC 1988 Long Range Development Plan. The Ranch View Terrace project also includes the relocation of farming research plots managed by the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems that are located on the site.

A proposed equipment storage facility portion of the Emergency Response Center, a separate project also in preliminary planning, is proposed to be located in the vicinity. Because of its proximity, it will be included in the proposed Incidental Take Permit for the Ranch View Terrace project by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Since the UCSC LRDP was approved by The Regents in 1989, two species found on the Santa Cruz campus have been listed as Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants by the USFWS. The California red-legged frog was listed as threatened in 1996 and the Ohlone tiger beetle was listed as endangered in 2001. Under the provisions of the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, the University as land owner and developer is required to protect the listed species and their habitats when an incidental “take” is likely to occur.

Both of these species occur near the proposed Ranch View Terrace housing project. The USFWS has indicated that there is limited but sufficient probability of an incidental take such that preparation of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and Implementing Agreement (IA) and the issuance of an Incidental Take Permit would likely be required. The campus acknowledges that, although not likely, by virtue of its

location near the UCSC Arboretum and the character of its land, the project could result in incidental take of the frog. The Ohlone tiger beetle has not been observed on the project site, but it has been found in nearby campus grasslands of similar description.

Campus staff and USFWS field staff have reviewed biological studies and discussed approaches to the HCP and IA as the basis for issuing an Incidental Take Permit. Drafts of the HCP and IA and terms of the permit proposed by the campus have been submitted to the USFWS, where they are being reviewed. If the terms are agreeable to both parties, the HCP will be subject to public review during the summer of 2003. The final HCP will be presented to The Regents for approval in spring 2004, along with the project design for Ranch View Terrace, its EIR, and related amendments to the campus LRDP. The HCP would also support development of the Emergency Response Center project that is subject to a separate approval. The Incidental Take Permit application includes a draft National Environmental Policy Act compliance document and an Implementing Agreement between the property owner and the USFWS. This process ensures that the effects of the authorized incidental take will be mitigated to the extent practicable. The HCP and the accompanying Implementing Agreement between The Regents and the USFWS will outline the conservation measures intended to mitigate impacts from the proposed projects on the California red-legged frog and Ohlone tiger beetle. The Implementing Agreement will serve as a contract between The Regents and the USFWS, specifying the rights and obligations of each party.

Typically, HCPs involve the protection of comparable habitat where there is the potential for loss of habitat through development. In this case, the primary conservation measure intended to mitigate project impacts on the California red-legged frog will be the permanent preservation of 13 acres of grassland and forest habitat within the 47-acre Inclusion Area A and the 78-acre Campus Resource Land areas at the southwest corner of the Santa Cruz campus. Also, an undeveloped 12.5-acre portion of Inclusion Area D will be set aside as the Inclusion Area D Preserve as mitigation to benefit the Ohlone tiger beetle. In total, 25.5 acres of campus land will be preserved under the HCP.

The Incidental Take permit for the project is requested to be for a period of 50 years, from permit issuance in spring 2004 through spring 2054. This is the maximum allowed under USFWS guidance. The permit term will cover the construction period and approximately 49 years of occupancy, during which the likelihood of a take of either species is expected to be extremely low. Construction of the proposed Ranch View Terrace housing project is expected to begin in spring 2004 and last for 16 months. Construction of the ERC equipment storage site is expected to begin in the summer of 2004 and take six months. The permit will also cover construction of farm research plots that must be relocated to make room for the housing, but it will not cover farming of this site because no take of either species is expected from farming operations.



Vice Chancellor Vani and Associate Vice Chancellor Zwart presented slides of the project.

Mr. Vani noted that this will be the first project-related conservation plan prepared by any campus. Under University policy, only The Regents may approve the dedication of land necessary to implement the plan.

Chairman Moores asked whether, should the beetles and frogs disappear from the land that is to be dedicated in perpetuity as habitat, the area could be allowed to revert to campus use. University Counsel Waltner responded that it was likely the designation could be renegotiated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The University has attempted to create a flexible mechanism that relies on the IA, which is the contract with the Service, to make the dedication binding. If there were circumstances where the agreement were no longer necessary, discussion of the issue could be renewed. He reported that, although the University is operating under standard provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Service, because the University is a public entity it has been given more flexibility with regard to future changes.

In response to a question by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Zwart reported that, although the agreement is still under review, the Fish and Wildlife Service appears to be looking upon it favorably. Regent Kozberg asked him to inform the Regents if he thought they could advance the process.

**6. COMPUTER SCIENCE BUILDING UNIT 3 UPDATE, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson recalled that the Committee had requested previously that this project be considered further. She noted that the project consisted of two pieces – a 120,000-square-foot office research building and a 26,000-square-foot classroom building – and that it was the design of the office building that had caused concern. She showed slides of the project to illustrate its setting on the campus. The office building is six stories of poured-in-place concrete with brick banding. The new rendering of the elevations in question showed that the glass stair towers had been remodeled. Vice Chancellor Brase noted that wrapping the concrete around the corners of the building gave it a more substantial appearance.

Regent Sainick stated that the new treatment had addressed the concern about having glass-on-glass corners. Committee Chair Marcus believed that the design was improved markedly.

**7. STUDENT CENTER EXPANSION, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Brase reported that the campus wished the Committee to be introduced to the Student Center Expansion so that the observations of its members could be addressed during the development of the project.

The student center is a core building on the ring mall that will become a focus of campus life. The existing student center is a patchwork of structures with low density. The expansion is higher density and is more related to the context of the campus. Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson reported that the existing building was 170,000 square feet. The project will add 210,000 square feet of new construction, will renovate 35,000 square feet, and will demolish 41,000 square feet. The old two-story wood portion is not up to code and will be replaced by a steel building that will be more practical programmatically. In the new areas there will be 163,000 gross square feet for student activities, the food facility will double in size, retail space will increase slightly, and the space for student administration activities will increase from 13,000 gsf to almost 40,000 gsf. Housing administration will move into the new structure from another campus location.

Ms. Gladson reported that the students have indicated that they would like the student center to be in the vernacular of the concrete and brick humanities building, the academic building closest to the site. Other buildings in the area also have brick cladding and classical features. A big part of the students' program is to create a large multi-purpose performance space. It will be free span space separated from the Emerald Bay conference area by an atrium, so that the new construction will not be supported by the old structure. The wood building to be knocked down will be replaced by a four-story area that will create a new front on the ring mall with an attractive courtyard space and a more inviting entrance.

Regent Sainick asked whether students will be encouraged to ride bicycles to the new student center. Vice Chancellor Brase believed that bicycle use must be encouraged in general on the Irvine campus, as there is limited parking available. To help in this effort, the campus shuttle service is being expanded and a bicycle highway through the campus is being created. The student center will have a parking area for bikes.

Regent Kozberg noted that, although Aldrich Park is a beautiful space, there is little activity there. Mr. Brase responded that the bicycle highway from campus housing will be directed to the park. Eventually, buildings will occupy the inner ring mall, which should also encourage more use of the park.

Ms. Gladston reported that the students would like their center to be classical in design, with a campanile. The draft design features tiles, bright colors, and more glass than in an academic building. The architect for the project is WTW of Pittsburgh. The approach is a modified design-build that will be finished by another architect and contractor.

Committee Chair Marcus asked why the existing buildings are being kept. He was concerned about the need for reinforcing the developing campus vernacular. Mr. Brase responded that students had assessed themselves a fee to pay for the project. The available funding puts constraints on design possibilities. He emphasized that nearly 10,000 square feet of the old structure will be torn down. Regent Marcus maintained that retaining any of the old architecture was problematic and expensive.

and might make it impossible to design a harmonious space that would be acceptable to the Committee. A student center built from scratch could be made far more attractive and would have a life of 50 years. Mr. Brase explained that the level of student fees that would be required to support such a project would be prohibitive.

Senior Vice President Mullinix reported that earlier approaches to the project had envisioned retaining even more of the existing space. Creative approaches had to be found in order to produce a design that integrated old and new construction. Regent Marcus was concerned that this approach would result in perpetuating the kind of design problems that have kept the campus from developing attractively in the past. He believed that everything should be torn down and then rebuilt in phases as money becomes available.

Regent Ligot-Gordon asked whether there had been any precedent for State support for buildings of this type. Mr. Brase did not believe that there had ever been any State support made available for student facilities. Mr. Mullinix was of the opinion that the State would not change its stance on the issue. He believed it may be possible to consider phasing the project in order to bypass having to renovate old space.

Ms. Gladson pointed out ways in which the building would conform to the overall design approach for the campus. It will have the familiar exterior treatments but will be more transparent and use brighter colors.

Regent-designate Seigler suggested soliciting funds from alumni and donors. Regent Sainick noted that the replacement hospital is the current focus of all campus fund raising and that competing campaigns could be harmful to both efforts.

Regent Johnson acknowledged that the students have indicated a preference for certain design features, including numerous towers, but she was concerned that the draft design for the exterior was too unusual to fit comfortably with its surroundings.

Regent Kozberg believed that the planners had made the most of the situation, especially considering that the project is flanked by a very unattractive administration building.

8. **SNIDECOR HALL OFFICE WING SEISMIC REPLACEMENT UPDATE, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher, Project Manager Strahl, and Director of Design and Construction Services Wolever provided an update of a project first presented to the Committee in April. A portion of an existing building is being demolished and the building redesigned. Committee members had expressed the concern that portions of the project did not relate well to each other.

The original design called for a copper-clad classroom and a main building with copper cladding and masonry. In the new configuration, the building has been completely redesigned, the orientation has been changed, the copper cladding has been removed, and a lobby with a glazed entry has been added, along with a new terrace. The architecture is more in keeping with the other parts of the building and with the area of the campus in which it is located. The new design makes the building more accessible.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the new design was a huge improvement over the original.

9. **TERCERO HOUSING UPDATE, DAVIS CAMPUS**

Manager of Facilities Design and Construction Rush recalled that at the previous meeting, Regents had expressed concerns about the number of restrooms that were being provided for the Tercero Housing expansion project. He provided an explanation of the methodology that was used to determine the count.

Mr. Rush explained that the methodology that was used was the same as that used for all student dormitories. It was verified using student focus groups that indicated what they believed was needed in the way of bathrooms and bathroom fixtures and the number of rooms that should share a bathroom. Use intensity was determined based on the diverse daily schedules of the students. A program was developed that considered all the variables of student life and was tempered by project costs. The student viewpoint that the first priority was roommate compatibility is linked to their second priority, which was that bathrooms should serve no more than eight people. The Tercero housing project is designed to have four rooms containing a total of eight students share a bathroom. In discussions with the students, it was determined that the amenities of the bathrooms were more important than the fixture count. Based on this data, the Tercero bathrooms were designed to have the eight students share seven fixtures, and to meet other priorities the students expressed, the bathrooms will provide individual storage spaces and be effectively soundproofed.

Mr. Rush reported that in order to address the concerns expressed at the previous meeting, 18 University projects were studied. He displayed a chart to illustrate that the Tercero project falls within the mainstream for similar housing.

Mr. Rush stated that the campus departments that participated in the review concluded that the new facility meets the necessary standards. The Committee accepted this conclusion.

10. **SAN CLEMENTE STUDENT HOUSING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

Senior Vice President Mullinix commented that the San Clemente Student Housing project has a tortured history and continues to have issues concerning its scope and design. The campus is bringing it to the Committee earlier than usual to get feedback on those issues.

Associate Chancellor Fisher reported that the project will provide 976 beds in apartments for graduate students. About 12 acres of the existing Storke playing field will be used to create the site. Those portions of the field will be reconstructed elsewhere, and an existing parking lot will be moved to the north. A comprehensive campus development plan is near completion that will provide more regulation to campus design features, creating a series of open spaces that connect the major campus areas. The San Clemente housing project is consistent with the campus master plan.

Mr. Fisher reported that the San Clemente project architect, Harry Wolf, and the landscape architect, Dan Kiley, are both renowned figures. The building design is modernist, with a combination of two and three stories with some loft sleeping spaces. Part of the project is over podium parking and part is on grade. The views of the mountains from Isla Vista have been protected. The campus is required to go through Coastal Commission review, which involves working with the County. When first envisioned, the building was raised on top of podium parking, which the County felt made it too far removed from the street and too tall. In response to these concerns, the edge of the project was redesigned in an attempt to create a character that the County and community found acceptable. It has a series of large glazed openings and living spaces, balcony access to apartments, and porch-like terraces at the front of the building. The campus is also working with the County to rebuild El Colegio either as a five-lane road with a tree-lined boulevard down the middle or as a two-lane road with a series of roundabouts.

Regent-designate Bodine asked what will happen to the bike path along El Colegio. Mr. Fisher responded that the redefined street will have a surface bike path separated from the driving lanes and that also there will be a bike path between the project and the playing field.

Regent Sainick commented that the buildings presented a slab-sided face to the street that had little articulation and looked industrial. Mr. Fisher acknowledged the simplicity but pointed out that the design builds up detail toward the entry points. He reiterated that it was a modernist design by an architect known for his clean, simple lines.

Regent Hopkinson asked about the design choices for El Colegio. Mr. Fisher responded that the campus has a preference for the two-lane redesign with roundabouts. The County Department of Public Works has taken a position that a five-lane road would be safer. Negotiations will continue on the character and cost of the road.

Regent Hopkinson liked the style of the architecture, but she offered that it may not be the best choice for housing on a campus. Regent-designate Bodine agreed that modern architecture has its place, but she found these buildings to be cold, flat, and not in keeping with the warm, soft image of Santa Barbara. Regent Kozberg observed that the project will be establishing a vocabulary for a whole section of the campus. In response, Mr. Fisher pointed out that, unlike Santa Barbara itself, the context of Isla Vista is fairly modern, most of its having been built in the 1960s. He believed the project was not inconsistent with its immediate area.

Committee Chair Marcus commented that the massing and layout seemed extremely complicated for what should be a relatively simple structure. He agreed that there was an opportunity to create a vernacular there that is more in keeping with the Santa Barbara vernacular.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the architect that the campus has chosen for the project will never design in what is considered the Santa Barbara vernacular. Committee Chair Marcus believed that it may be timely to introduce the idea of establishing vernaculars as part of the long range development plans for the campuses.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary