The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
July 17, 2007

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at University Center, Santa Barbara campus.

Members present: Regents Allen, Bugay, Dynes, Hopkinson, and Kozberg; Advisory members Shewmake and Brown

In attendance: Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Hume, Executive Vice President Lapp, Chancellor Vanderhoef, Acting Chancellor Blumenthal, Laboratory Director Chu, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 11:05 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Committee Chair Kozberg conducted a public comment period for the purpose of hearing from those who wished to comment on University-related matters and matters on the Committee's agenda. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the item noted.

A. Ms. Suzanne Duckett spoke about the continued need to ensure the proper functioning and continuity of the 4H program. She believed that 4H should be better funded and should reach all socioeconomic groups.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 15, 2007 were approved.

3. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF 2006 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the Environmental Impact Report, The Regents:

A. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the LBNL 2006 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final EIR.

C. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations included in the Findings.

D. Adopt the Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

E. Adopt the 2006 Long Range Development Plan, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations, Findings, and 2006 Long Range Development Plan were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Laboratory Director Chu recalled that the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is a multi-program scientific research campus operated by the University of California for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). The Laboratory conducts unclassified research to carry out its mission of reaching a deeper understanding of our world and delivering science-based solutions to problems of national significance. LBNL is one of ten national laboratories sponsored by DOE's Office of Science to perform research and development that is not well suited to a university or private sector setting because of its scope, infrastructure requirements, or multidisciplinary nature.

LBNL's main site, the primary location of its scientific, administrative, and support operations, is located on a 202-acre parcel of UC Regents' land in the lower- and mid-elevations of the Berkeley/Oakland hills above the main UC Berkeley campus. The site affords tremendous views and gives rise to LBNL's distinguishing hillside development pattern. LBNL is bordered by urban development to the west and predominantly open space to the south, east, and north.

The LBNL 2006 LRDP is a policy and land use plan to guide the physical development of the LBNL main site. Based upon the Laboratory's scientific vision, the 2006 LRDP identifies institutional and development objectives, delineates land uses, and estimates the new building space needed to support a population of 5,375 through the planning horizon year 2025. The 2006 LRDP updates the previous plan, adopted by The Regents in 1987.

Status of 1987 LRDP

Physical development at LBNL has been governed by the 1987 LBNL LRDP for the past twenty years. The 1987 LRDP projected an increase in population from 3,595 to 4,750. The year 2006 LBNL population was 4,515. The 1987 LRDP also projected an increase in building space at the main site from 1,591,000 gross square feet (gsf) to 1,996,200 gsf. Facilities constructed under the 1987 LRDP

include Buildings 2, 6 (Advanced Light Source), 67 (Molecular Foundry), 84, and 85. In 2006, the LBNL main site's building space totaled 1,808,000 gsf. Parking spaces at LBNL were projected to increase from 1,581 to 2,410. In 2006 there were 2,300 parking spaces. Changes in the scientific programs, anticipated increases in federal research initiatives, and changes in related space requirements have necessitated an update to the 1987 LRDP.

Since LBNL's facilities were developed for an earlier era of scientific endeavor, they have become less able to meet the demands of current research programs. Only 51 percent of the Laboratory's buildings have been assessed as suitable for current use. Sixty-two percent of LBNL's buildings are over 40 years old. The aging facilities stock presents three specific challenges to the continued successful operation of the Laboratory:

- Meeting current seismic restraint requirements to provide a safe workplace.
- Maintaining the reliability of building support systems to effectively and efficiently support the scientific mission.
- Modernizing building functionality to be suitable for the needs of future research equipment and methods.

Summary of the 2006 LRDP

The 2006 LRDP provides a framework for land use and site development to meet the scientific vision and objectives of LBNL through the year 2025. It provides guidance to ensure that each new project contributes to a cohesive development of the site to form a safer, more efficient and campus-like research environment. The Plan provides the flexibility necessary to accommodate both known and unforeseen programmatic needs, while placing an emphasis on the qualitative aspects of the site's natural and built environment, open space, and landscape.

The 2006 LRDP for LBNL reflects an evolutionary process and is not a dramatic departure from the previously adopted plan. All of the basic concepts embodied in the 1987 LRDP are retained and strengthened or adjusted to reflect existing site conditions and the Laboratory's current scientific vision and goals. The nature of the development described in the 2006 LRDP reflects current and projected national scientific priorities. The evolution of these priorities over time will drive actual development and implementation of the 2006 LRDP.

Scientific Vision

The Laboratory has a rich history of scientific achievement and is committed to continuously delivering innovations in science and technology that address significant problems facing humankind and the environment. LBNL's scientific goals address energy supply and use, models of living systems, and the nature of the universe. Discoveries across this broad range of scientific disciplines promise

to advance human knowledge and improve health, environmental protection, and the economy.

The replacement of existing facilities and construction of additional facilities will be required to meet the demands of the next generation of scientific endeavors. A comprehensive renewal of the main site, facilities, and infrastructure that is sufficient for the achievement of LBNL's scientific vision and goals will require a modest increase in building space and population. The Laboratory's approach to achieve this renewal is the basis of the 2006 LRDP growth projections and underpins the basic planning principles of the Plan:

- Strengthen and expand existing research programs to sustain and increase LBNL's role as a national research institution.
- Expand partnerships and collaborations to enhance LBNL's scientific and technical base.
- Provide flexibility to return staff from its off-site facilities leased in Berkeley and Oakland to the main site in order to enhance collaboration, productivity, and efficiency.
- Expand the capacity of existing high-demand advanced facilities and provide broader functionality.
- Rehabilitate facilities that have outlived their intended purpose and can be cost-effectively adapted for use in new regions of scientific discovery.
- Replace single-purpose facilities with new facilities programmed to accommodate multiple disciplines with advanced infrastructure suitable for future scientific endeavors.
- Construct new scientific facilities to support future research initiatives and continued growth in existing programs.

The Site and Facilities Vision

New development identified in the 2006 LRDP offers an opportunity to preserve and enhance LBNL's valued environmental assets while making improvements to functional and experiential qualities of the Laboratory's main site. The 2006 LRDP will realize this opportunity by applying four principles inspired by the special qualities of the Laboratory setting to the future physical development identified in this Plan:

- Preserve and enhance the environmental qualities of the site as a model of resource conservation and environmental stewardship.
- Build a safe, efficient, and cost-effective scientific infrastructure capable of long-term support to evolving scientific missions.
- Build a more campus-like research environment.
- Improve access and connections to enhance scientific and academic collaboration and interaction.

Population

Under the 2006 LRDP, population growth is projected to continue, although at a slower pace than in the past twenty years. LBNL's population in all of the facilities it occupies is projected to grow from 4,515 in 2006 and to 5,375 by 2025. This population increase of 860 represents an average annual growth rate of 0.9 percent over that time period.

LBNL uses Adjusted Daily Population to describe the actual population associated with the laboratory on workdays. It is calculated as the full-time equivalent employees plus 40 percent of the registered guests which takes into account travel, vacation, part-time employees, and the periodic nature of guests actually entering the Laboratory.

Space

Under the 2006 LRDP, the projected net increase in building area on the main site is 612,000 gsf, from 1,808,000 gsf in 2006 to 2,420,000 gsf. These net growth factors take into account the demolition of 272,000 gsf of building space that is unsafe or is beyond its useful life. The projected annual space growth rate of 1.5 percent is higher than the projected population growth rate, reflecting greater investment in large scale equipment and the construction of facilities for the return of existing employees from leased facilities to the main site.

Land Use

The 2006 LRDP includes a Land Use Plan to guide future planning decisions and the siting of new development; it has been configured to manifest four strategies that derive from an appreciation of the site's existing assets and constraints, the Laboratory's scientific vision and goals, and the planning principles that underlie this LRDP:

- Protect and enhance the site's natural and visual resources, including native habitats, riparian areas, and mature tree stands by focusing future development primarily within the already developed areas of the site.
- Provide flexibility in the identification of land uses and in the siting of future facilities to accommodate the continually evolving scientific endeavor.
- Configure and consolidate uses to improve operational efficiencies, adjacencies, and ease of access.
- Minimize the visibility of development from neighboring areas.

The 2006 LRDP Land Use Plan defines four land use zones that will guide the location of all new buildings and site improvements. These zones have been designed to strengthen existing functional adjacencies and promote an overall density of development that is appropriate to the main site.

- *Research and Academic*: A 121-acre zone that encompasses the majority of the Laboratory's developable area and largely corresponds with, or is adjacent to, the already developed portions of LBNL.
- *Central Commons Zone*: This is centered around LBNL's Cafeteria and outdoor gathering areas where shared amenities draw Laboratory personnel together in an environment conducive to interaction.
- *Support Services Zone*: Provides a centralized location for LBNL's plant operations and support activities.
- *Perimeter Open Space Zone*: Comprises 56 acres or over one-quarter of the main site where future development would be avoided to the extent feasible.

Development Framework

LBNL has a long history of constructing facilities on an as-needed basis in response to national scientific priorities. Across LBNL, rustic landscape surrounds clusters of research buildings constructed with the most appropriate and cost-effective methods available at the time under a design framework that emphasized function. The 2006 LRDP includes a Development Framework, which defines the rationale for where and how new development should occur within the four Land Use zones and provides the following six implementation strategies:

- Increase development densities within areas corresponding to existing clusters of development to preserve open space and enhance operational efficiencies and access.
- Site new projects to replace existing outdated facilities to ensure the best use of limited land resources.
- Site new projects adjacent to existing development where existing utility and access infrastructure may be used.
- Create a more "collegial" environment that encourages and facilitates interaction among the variety of LBNL employees and guests.
- Site and design new facilities in accordance with UC Policy for Sustainable Practices to minimize energy, water, and material consumption and provide improved occupant health, comfort, and productivity.
- Exhibit the best practices of modern sustainable development in new projects as a way to foster a greater appreciation of sustainable practices at LBNL.

Vehicle Access, Circulation, and Parking

Vehicular access to LBNL occurs primarily along two routes: Hearst Avenue, which borders the north side of the UC Berkeley campus and becomes Cyclotron Road, and Centennial Drive which extends from Memorial Stadium through Strawberry Canyon. Off of these two main routes lie three primary entry gates:

Blackberry Canyon Gate on Cyclotron Road, Strawberry Canyon, and Grizzly Peak Gates on Centennial Drive. A series of strategies are included in the 2006 LRDP that are designed to improve transit, access, circulation, parking, and safety at LBNL:

- Increase use of alternate modes of transit through improvements to the Laboratory's shuttle bus service.
- Promote transportation demand management strategies such as vanpools and employee ride share programs.
- Improve efficiency and security of Laboratory access through improvements to existing gates and the creation of new gates.
- Create a better linkage between parking, shuttle stops, and pedestrian circulation on site.
- Provide separated routes of travel wherever possible for pedestrians and vehicles.
- Promote use of bicycles by providing additional bicycle storage racks and shower facilities.
- Eliminate parking from the sides of major roadways, thereby improving safety and allowing one-way roads to be converted to two-way traffic.
- Maintain or reduce the percentage of parking spaces relative to the adjusted daily population.
- Consolidate parking into larger lots and/or parking structures and locate these facilities near Laboratory entrances to reduce traffic within the main site.
- Remove parking from areas targeted for outdoor social spaces and service areas.
- Consolidate service functions wherever possible in the Corporation Yard.

The 2006 LRDP projects that 500 net new parking spaces being added within Berkeley Lab over the next two decades. With the population growth projected over this time frame, the percentage of parking spaces will be maintained at approximately 50 percent adjusted daily population.

Pedestrian Circulation

Good pedestrian access to and within LBNL is important to ensure efficient operations and support Transportation Demand Management strategies which minimize vehicle use. Pedestrians enter LBNL from surrounding neighborhoods via the primary vehicle access gates as well as through a handful of pedestrian gates that are fed by surrounding trails and accessed using a card key system. The 2006 LRDP's Pedestrian Circulation Framework incorporates the following strategies:

- Use pedestrian routes to connect the various developed terraces of the site which host the central and research clusters.

- Improve the pedestrian spaces at the heart of the research clusters and adjacent to research facilities so as to support interaction among Laboratory users.
- Separate pedestrians and vehicles access whenever possible.
- Retain and improve walkways as appropriate throughout the open space portions of the site, carefully integrating these pathways to minimize intrusion in the natural environment.
- Improve pedestrian access and safety throughout the Laboratory site by developing new routes and enhancing existing routes.
- Improve way findings through a comprehensive and coordinated signage system and through the naming of buildings and research clusters.
- Improve the path providing access to and from the UC Berkeley campus.

Open Space and Landscape

The LBNL main site open space consists of steep slopes and a rustic landscape of grasslands, chaparral, forests, and occasional riparian areas that surround the site's developed areas. The open space within the developed clusters is generally a vehicular and service-oriented setting. Open spaces specifically designed and maintained for pedestrian use provide a valuable amenity within the developed clusters. Stands of mature redwood, eucalyptus, pine, and oak trees within each of these open space areas provide a visual screen for views of the Laboratory from the urban areas to the west. The 2006 LRDP's Open Space and Landscape Framework is based on strategies that aim to preserve the environmental quality and enhance the overall experience of LBNL main site:

- Preserve and enhance the native rustic landscape and protect sensitive habitats.
- Develop new campus-like outdoor spaces, such as plazas within clusters of facilities, and improve those that already exist.
- Maintain and enhance tree stands to reduce the visibility of Laboratory buildings from significant public areas in neighboring communities.
- Improve the overall appearance and experience of the Laboratory through improvements to the main entry gates and the landscape areas associated with roadways, parking lots, and pedestrian pathways.
- Continue to use sustainable practices in selection of plant materials and maintenance procedures.
- Develop all new landscape improvements in accordance with the Laboratory's vegetation management program to minimize the threat of wildland fire damage to facilities and personnel.
- Use native, drought-tolerant plant materials to reduce water consumption; focus shade trees and ornamental plantings at special outdoor use areas.
- Minimize impervious surfaces to reduce storm water run-off and provide landscape elements and planting to stabilize slopes and reduce erosion and sedimentation.

Utilities and Infrastructure

LBNL owns and maintains a utility infrastructure that enables the safe, efficient, and reliable operation of its scientific and support facilities. LBNL will continue to upgrade and replace utilities throughout the life of the 2006 LRDP to maintain reliability and meet increased demand. New distribution lines and related facilities will be constructed within the overall framework of the following Utilities and Infrastructure Strategies:

- Maintain a safe and reliable utility infrastructure capable of sustaining the Laboratory's scientific endeavors.
- Consolidate utility distribution into centralized utility corridors that generally coincide with major roadways.
- Ensure that utility infrastructure improvements accommodate future facility expansion and alterations in the most cost effective means possible.
- Design infrastructure improvements to embody sustainable practices.

Environmental Sustainability

Environmental sustainability considerations are prominent in the planning of the LBNL site and facilities to ensure appropriate measures to conserve natural resources. The 2006 LRDP integrates the sustainability principles of energy efficiency, waste minimization, high quality, lowest lifecycle cost, stimulating architecture, and open space preservation with the functional aspects of facilities, infrastructure, and alternative transportation.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the 2006 LRDP. The Draft EIR consists of two volumes: the first volume is a project description and a program-level analysis of the 2006 LRDP; the second includes technical appendices in support of Volume 1. The LRDP EIR provides a basis for the subsequent environmental review of individual projects as they are proposed at LBNL.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible and trustee agencies, and other interested parties on October 12, 2000, and a public scoping meeting was held on October 26, 2000. A revised NOP and an Initial Study were issued on October 28, 2003, due to refinements in the project description and the relatively long period of time that had elapsed since circulation of the initial NOP. The revised NOP served to notify the public and agencies of the preparation of a Draft EIR, describe its proposed scope, and solicit scoping comments. LBNL held a scoping meeting on

November 17, 2003, at which the public was invited to comment on the scope of the EIR. The transcript is included in the Draft EIR appendices.

While the LRDP's baseline is 2006, consistent with the issuance of the revised NOP in 2003, the LRDP EIR uses 2003 as its baseline year for evaluating the project's impacts on its environmental setting. To provide a conservative analysis, the EIR also selectively uses more recent post-2003 data, where appropriate.

Prior to circulation of the Draft EIR, considerable outreach was conducted with the City of Berkeley. A conceptual LRDP presentation and discussion was held between City planning staff and LBNL staff on January 25, 2006. A workshop between City planning and engineering staff and LBNL staff was held March 15, 2006, at LBNL to review utilities and stormwater issues. A September 26, 2006, meeting was held between City and LBNL staff to discuss LRDP and EIR issues. Several meetings were held from September 2006 through January 2007 between LBNL and City staff to discuss transportation and parking issues. LBNL staff presented a preview of the Draft EIR to the City of Berkeley on January 19, 2007, in advance of publication. Finally, as described in the EIR p. I-6, LBNL responded prior to completion of the LRDP Draft EIR to concerns expressed by the City of Berkeley regarding proposed new levels of growth by reducing the 2006 LRDP proposed growth in building space, population, and traffic by approximately 20 percent.

The Draft EIR was circulated on January 22, 2007, for a 61-day comment period ending March 23, 2007. Copies of the Draft EIR and/or compact disks were sent along with the LRDP to the California State Clearinghouse, 45 agencies, and groups and individuals who requested them. Notices of availability were sent to 425 agencies, groups, neighbors, and members of the public. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available in the City of Berkeley and LBNL libraries. The LRDP and Draft EIR were posted in their entirety on the LBNL website.

A public hearing was held on February 26, 2007, at which time oral comments were taken and recorded from 14 speakers. Written comments on the Draft EIR were received from 3 regional and local agencies and 14 organizations and individuals. No written comments were received from federal or State agencies. The comment letters and public hearing transcripts, as well as LBNL's responses to all substantive comments, are contained in the Final EIR.

Organization of the Final EIR

The Final EIR is comprised of three volumes: the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR appendices, and a Final EIR volume that includes all comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to comments, a summary of changes to the Draft EIR, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

Implementation of the 2006 LRDP would have the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A summary table of these impacts is included in Chapter 2 of the 2006 LRDP EIR. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of proposed Mitigation Measures; however, six significant and unavoidable impacts would remain even after mitigation:

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

- The proposed project could alter views of the LBNL site and could result in a substantial adverse effect to a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources.
- The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the Laboratory site and could substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

Air Quality

- Even though cumulative emissions of toxic air contaminants would decrease, implementation of the LBNL 2006 LRDP, in combination with other potential contributing projects, would contribute to cumulative emissions of toxic air contaminants that result in an excess cancer risk that exceeds, and would continue to exceed, 10 in one million.

Cultural Resources

- Implementation of the 2006 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, including historical resources that have not yet been identified.

Noise

- Development under the proposed LRDP would result in temporary noise impacts related to construction and demolition activities.

Traffic

- Increased traffic due to implementation of the 2006 LRDP would degrade level of service at three local intersections: Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way; Durant Avenue/ Piedmont Avenue; and Hearst Avenue/Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue.

Impacts at the Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way and Durant Avenue/Piedmont Avenue intersections would be potentially mitigable to a less-than-significant level with measures identified in the 2006 LRDP EIR, but there is not yet a plan in place to implement these measures and construction of the required improvements would have to be carried out by the City of Berkeley. These Mitigation Measures include TRANS-1a, TRANS-1b, and TRANS-8, which commit LBNL to funding on a fair-share basis a periodic signal warrant check and, when warranted, signal installation.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c commits LBNL to a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that includes a study to reevaluate the feasibility of mitigation at the Hearst Avenue/Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue intersection, and to provide funding on a fair share basis for any mitigation that is determined to be feasible. The 2006 LRDP EIR has evaluated the feasibility of all mitigation measures suggested to date for the Hearst Avenue/Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue intersection and concludes that feasible mitigation for impacts at that intersection have not yet been identified. Based on further consultation with the City of Berkeley, the City believes that further evaluation may demonstrate that the suggested measures are feasible or that it can identify other feasible mitigation, although the City has not specified additional mitigation yet. LBNL will accordingly conduct the study to reevaluate the feasibility of such mitigation.

Because feasible mitigation has not yet been confirmed for the Hearst Avenue/Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue intersection, and because a plan to implement the measures at all three intersections is not yet in place, the 2006 LRDP EIR takes a cautious approach and concludes that the impacts are significant and unavoidable, but LBNL''s commitment to fund the Hearst Avenue/Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue intersection study and to contribute funding on a fair share basis at all three intersections remains a binding mitigation commitment.

Key Public Concerns

Several topics of concern regarding implementation of the 2006 LRDP were raised by the City of Berkeley and/or by numerous other commenters. Key issues are summarized here, and responses to all comments are included in the Final EIR.

Justification for growth: The City of Berkeley and several commenters questioned the justification and need for the 20-year growth program proposed in the 2006 LRDP. The Final EIR cites the LRDP objectives and other scientific initiative and funding drivers that support the LRDP's proposed (maximum) growth projections.

Development near seismic fault, slopes, and wildland fire area: Several commenters questioned the location of new development in an area near the Hayward Fault and Loma Prieta Seismic Safety zone, near East Bay hills woodlands that historically have been subject to wildland fires, and on a site that has limited access and egress. The Final EIR responds by citing appropriate analyses and conclusions reached in the Draft EIR Geology, Hazards, and Public Services sections. Development under the 2006 LRDP would comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and safety standards and would be expected to create a safer working environment at the LBNL hill site.

Development in Strawberry Canyon: Several commenters raised concerns about the potential siting of new buildings on or encroaching on the northern slopes of Strawberry Canyon. The Final EIR responds by citing appropriate analyses and conclusions, including visual simulations, in the Draft EIR Aesthetic, Cultural Resources, and Biological Resources sections, which demonstrate that development in the portion of LBNL near Strawberry Canyon would not cause a significant, unavoidable impact.

Impacts on City services and infrastructure: The City of Berkeley and some Berkeley residents cited impacts on the City's services and infrastructure, including impacts to the Berkeley Fire Department, roads and sewer lines. The Final EIR responds by citing appropriate analyses and conclusions in the Draft EIR Public Services, Utilities, and Hazards sections. These Draft EIR citations demonstrate that LBNL is a net provider of fire services to UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, that road wear-and-tear impacts would be less than significant, and that potentially significant sanitary sewer impacts would be mitigated by implementation of measures by Berkeley Lab to avoid using constrained areas of the City of Berkeley's infrastructure.

Cumulative Impacts: Several commenters expressed concern or dissatisfaction with the cumulative growth proposed under LBNL's 2006 LRDP and nearby UC Berkeley projects (2020 LRDP EIR program and SCIP program). Some commenters questioned the appropriateness of separate LBNL and UC Berkeley CEQA processes for projects occurring on UC Regents' lands with Regental approval. The Final EIR responds by explaining the relationship and differences between UC Berkeley and LBNL, and thus their need for separate planning processes, and by citing supporting evidence in the Draft EIR that demonstrates that a fully adequate cumulative impacts assessment was conducted.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

LBNL would be responsible for: (1) implementing all mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents to implement, and (2) continuing campus programs and procedures identified in the EIR that serve to reduce environmental impacts. To assure that all measures, programs, and procedures are implemented in accordance with CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared and is submitted along with the Final EIR to The Regents for approval. The MMRP 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 impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR for the 2006 LRDP in conformance with CEQA. The Findings also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the

project in light of its unavoidable significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and traffic.

Regent Allen inquired about several letters received, including those from the Sierra Club and the City of Berkeley, indicating that the Final EIR was released without notification to interested parties and what steps would be taken to address concerns. Legal Counsel Ware responded that, in reference to the July 13, 2007 letter from the City of Berkeley, UC had previously given extensive Responses to Comments to a similar letter from the City, which are included in the Final EIR. UC has disclosed fully all impacts and has worked extensively with the City on each issue raised. Senior Planner Philliber also pointed out that there was an error in the letter in reference to when Final EIR materials were received. To clarify, the Final EIR was mailed Friday July 6, and the requirement under CEQA is that agencies are allowed 10 days to review; this met the legal time frame given that the Regents' meeting was scheduled for July 17. Mr. Philliber stated that while it is possible the City did not receive the mailed copies of the Final EIR until the following week, the information was made available to agencies via the website on July 5 and July 6. In response to a question from Committee Chair Kozberg, Ms. Ware stated that the laboratory has worked extensively with the City of Berkeley regarding these concerns; the letter asserting that the City was not informed of any of the impacts came as a surprise to the laboratory given the extensive outreach and discussion conducted with the City of Berkeley regarding these issues. Mr. Philliber pointed out that at least nine meetings were held with various City departments, including the Mayor's office.

Regent Hopkinson noted that it appears that the Final EIR substantially addresses and answers issues raised by the City of Berkeley, but questioned whether changes were actually made in response to their concerns. She inquired as to future projects that are dependent upon the passing of the Final EIR. Mr. Philliber responded that draft EIRs are currently being prepared for the Computational Research Facility and the Helios project; these would be delayed by two months if the Final EIR for LBNL was not approved until the September meeting.

In response to a question from Regent Bugay regarding concerns expressed from other parties, Mr. Chu stated that a small group of citizens are opposing the demolition of the Bevetron accelerator, which was decommissioned 20 years ago, because they want it declared a historical landmark. He explained that the Bevetron is situated in an area where the laboratory plans to construct a new light source.

In response to a question posed by Committee Chair Kozberg, General Counsel Robinson stated that the letter from the City of Berkeley has been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel, that he is comfortable that the Final EIR addresses all the issues referenced in the letter, and that the process complied with the law.

Regent Hopkinson inquired as to whether the Sierra Club received notification of the Final EIR being issued, as was claimed in their letter. Mr. Philliber stated that, because the Sierra Club was one of the commenters, as a matter of course they would have received notification. He stated that he would verify that notification had been given.

Committee Chair Kozberg stressed that continued communication must occur with the City of Berkeley regarding the issues between the City and LBNL.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, with Regent Allen voting no, and voted to present it to the Board.

4. **APPROVAL OF AMENDED STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET CONSISTENT WITH THE FINAL 2007-08 BUDGET ACT**

The President recommended that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to The Regents that the State Capital Improvements Budget for 2007-08 be amended as follows:

A. Delete $625,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the Davis campus, Seismic Corrections Thurman Laboratory project.

B. Add $5,700,000 for construction for the Merced campus, Social Sciences and Management Building project.

C. Delete $11,980,000 for construction for the Riverside campus, Environmental Health and Safety project.

D. Delete $29,100,000 for construction and equipment for the San Francisco campus, Telemedicine and PRIME-US Education Facilities;

Executive Vice President Lapp explained that the 2007-08 State-funded capital improvements budget approved by The Regents in November 2006 was adjusted during discussions between the University and the Department of Finance. The Budget Conference Committee at this time has taken action on all items of the UC capital budget on its agenda. It was proposed that The Regents amend the 2007-08 State-funded Capital Improvements Budget to reflect those changes made in the legislative committees and the Budget Conference Committee. Total State funding of approximately $520 million includes $440 million of General Obligation Bond funds, $70 million of State Lease Revenue Bond funding for the Helios Energy Research Facility, and up to $10 million for a facility at the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science contingent upon agreements establishing a joint nursing program. Any further changes made in the final 2007 State Budget Act approved by the Governor will be brought back to The Regents.

The 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements included $625,000 in State general funds for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the Seismic Corrections Thurman Laboratory project at the Davis campus. The project would correct seismic deficiencies and improve the lateral-load-resisting system of the building to address life safety hazards. The facility houses diagnostic laboratories and support space, and office and conference space that are managed by the campus for the California Department of Food and Agriculture, which is the reason the University requested that the project be funded with State general funds rather than from Proposition 1D general obligation bond funds designated for the University. Given the limited availability of State general funds, this project was not included in the Governor's 2007-08 budget. This project remains a priority for the campus and the University, and is planned to be re-submitted for consideration in the 2008-09 budget.

State bond funding of $37,255,000 for construction for the Social Sciences and Management Building at the Merced campus was included in the 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements. In response to cost estimates received during schematic design that exceeded the previously approved budget, the campus implemented a variety of strategies to manage the project overage including changing the design of the building to obtain more efficiencies and simplify the building systems. It was determined, however, that the budget overage could not be solved solely through design and value engineering measures. Both the campus and the Office of the President were reluctant to reduce the scope of the facility, as the space is urgently needed to support growth of the academic program. The campus requested an increase in funding for construction of $5,700,000 and a reduction of the future equipment budget by $2,000,000, resulting in a net increase of $3,700,000. The updated construction funding in the 2007 State Budget Act is $42,955,000; this results in a revised total project budget of $47,522,000. The campus will continue efforts to contain costs and support the program. The request for design and environmental approval is in a separate item (Adoption of Findings and Approval of Design, Social Sciences and Management Building, Merced Campus) for action by the Committee on Grounds and Buildings.

State funding of $11,980,000 was included for construction for the Environmental Health and Safety Expansion project at the Riverside campus. Time delays associated with environmental review requirements prevented the campus from being able to proceed to bid in FY 2007-08; therefore, the campus requested that the construction funding be removed from the 2007 budget request. The project remains a priority for the campus and the request for funding is expected to be included in the 2008-09 budget.

State funding of $35,000,000 was included for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the Telemedicine and PRIME – US Education Facilities at the San Francisco campus. The Legislature has allocated

this funding similar to other State bond funded projects on a project-by-project basis. As a result, the San Francisco campus reduced its funding request for 2007-08 to $5,900,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and a first component of equipment. The remaining $29,100,000 for construction and the second component of equipment will be requested for 2008-09.

The 2007 Budget Act includes up to $10,000,000 of State general obligation bond funds for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the Life Sciences Research and Nursing Education Building on the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science. This facility would support a joint nursing program between the University of California and Drew University. Use of the State funds requires a matching commitment of $10,000,000 from non-State sources. In addition, these funds will not be available until formal agreements are signed between The Regents of the University of California and Drew University pertaining to the ownership and occupancy of the facility and the operation of a joint program in nursing. This project will be presented to The Regents for approval once the joint program and scope and budget of the project are defined. The provisional language expected to be included in the 2007 Budget Act for this appropriation was provided.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson regarding how projects were selected for postponement, Director Aull stated that the Thurman Laboratory project is the only project in UC's capital budget that depends upon State general funds, which are not being allocated at this time by the Department of Finance and the Governor's office. In reference to the San Francisco PRIME/Telemedicine project, Mr. Aull explained that the Legislature has determined that each project will be approached in a phased manner, rather than as a block allocation, relative to the schedule for implementation. Most campuses elected to proceed with their projects on a streamlined basis, which retained combined phases of design, construction, and equipment appropriation. The San Francisco campus elected to allow the PRIME/Telemedicine project to be split into phases, with the design phase to be included in this year's budget and the construction and equipment phases included in the following year's budget.

In response to Regent Hopkinson's question regarding funding for Drew University, Mr. Aull stated that Drew University has been looking to expand its programs in collaboration with Los Angeles legislators, with the idea to establish a joint program with the University of California. He noted that this has primarily been a legislative initiative, but due to the need for a nursing program in the area, UC has been responsive. Several issues must be resolved, however, before the project can be implemented.

Committee Chair Kozberg inquired about how programmatic agreements will be made for a joint program in nursing with Drew University, with the concern that the nurses will be trained in a credible facility. Ms. Lapp stated that the project is conditional on The Regents' and Drew University's reaching an agreement

detailing specific issues, such as those expressed by Committee Chair Kozberg. In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson regarding the $10 million required for the project, Mr. Aull stated that Drew University asserts that it has $3 million in cash, additional funds from a National Institute of Health grant, and would finance the remaining funds. Ms. Lapp assured The Regents that the $10 million would not come from the UC budget. Regent Hopkinson requested that this be recorded in the agreement.

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

5. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL FINANCING FOR THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES EXPANSION PROJECT, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Davis: Physical Sciences Expansion – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – $49,721,000, to be funded from State funds ($48,515,000) and campus funds ($1,206,000).

To: Davis: Physical Sciences Expansion – preliminary plans, working drawings and construction – to be funded from State funds ($48,515,000), campus funds ($1,206,000), and external financing ($15,762,000).

B. The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed $15,762,000 for the Physical Sciences Expansion project, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.

(2) Repayment of the external financing shall be from the Davis campus share of University Opportunity Funds.

(3) The general credit of The Regents shall not be pledged.

C. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to provide certification to the lender that interest paid by The Regents is excluded from gross income for purposes of federal income taxation under existing law.

D. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

The Davis campus requested approval of an augmentation of $15,762,000 for the Physical Sciences Expansion project, to be funded with external financing, increasing the total budget to $65,483,000.

Chancellor Vanderhoef recalled that in November 2003, The Regents approved the 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements, which included the Physical Sciences Expansion project at a total project budget of $47,273,000 (at CCCI 4100) to be funded with State and campus funds. In November 2004, The Regents approved the 2005-06 Budget for Capital Improvements which included inflationary adjustments that increased the total project budget to $49,721,000 (at CCCI 4328).

The Regents' Committee on Grounds and Buildings approved the environmental documents for this project at its March 2005 meeting and approved the design of the project with the condition that the campus return to discuss the impact of the building on a proposed new quad. The campus provided the additional design information to the Committee at the May 2005 meeting.

Continually throughout the design phase, the campus worked with its design team and consultants to manage costs. In December 2006, the campus received a pre-bid estimate that exceeded the approved budget by $8,925,000 (18 percent). This overage was attributed to increases in cost of various materials and energy costs, and the current adverse bidding climate. In December 2006, the campus advised the Office of the President that it was requesting an increase of $8,925,000 in the campus-funded portion of the project to fund the project adequately, based on the most recent cost estimate. The campus proceeded to bid with the commitment that the campus would fund the overage and request approval of the augmentation if actual bid results exceeded the approved budget.

Construction bids were opened on May 31, 2007. The lowest responsible bid among the two bids received was $52,199,000 compared to the approved construction budget of $38,963,000, resulting in a 34 percent increase in the construction cost. (This is an additional increase of 13 percent over the pre-bid estimate.)

Prior to bidding the project, the campus undertook efforts to attract as many bidders as possible through outreach and communications efforts to the contracting community. With many capable contractors preferring negotiated fees over lump sum bids, the campus pre-qualified general contractors in an effort to attract and encourage capable bidders for the project. Five general contractors were pre-qualified; however, one dropped out early and another two dropped out later in the process.

During the bid process, the participating bidders indicated difficulty in getting participation from mechanical contractors; the campus assisted by increasing outreach efforts to mechanical contractors to encourage their participation.

The campus' analysis of the low bid compared to the pre-bid estimate indicates that the overage was due primarily to the mechanical portion of the bid. Both general contractors have indicated that they each received only one mechanical subcontractor bid, from the same mechanical firm, and that bid was significantly higher than the amount estimated for the mechanical scope of work.

Construction market conditions have been a concern from the start of the project. The high volume of work in the construction market has had a significant impact on the local contractor and labor pool. This has resulted in fewer bidders on large projects and less than optimal competition. The Executive Architect and several independent cost consultants believe that the bid price overrun is attributable to the current volatile bidding climate.

After receipt of the bids, the campus contacted other general contractors to determine the level of interest in participating in a possible re-bid situation. Of those that expressed interest, most reported having similar difficulty engaging mechanical subcontractors to bid comparable public projects. According to industry sources, few mechanical subcontractors can bond this scale of project, and most have enough current work and are not actively pursuing lump sum public sector work. In addition, mechanical contractors from the Bay Area and Southern California have expressed concern about work in the Davis area, where prevailing wages are lower and the contractors would have to pay travel stipends to workers. The local mechanical contractors report a shortage of labor in the union halls, during a period of high demand from medical and other public clients. Due to these factors, it is unlikely that a re-bid would have a different bid outcome.

In summary, the bid overrun on this project appears to reflect the current volatile and adverse bidding climate. Contractors and subcontractors are busy and thus highly selective about which projects to bid. Many do not need to pursue complex and challenging public bid projects and are compelled to increase their bid amount to cover their exposure on unknown and uncontrollable future materials price increases.

The campus evaluated possible options for revising the project to reduce costs to within budget. One option considered included a complete redesign of the facility to reduce the scope to match available funds. Redesign would require significant additional time to accomplish. This option is not recommended because under a reduced scope, the project would not provide sufficient space to replace inadequate and obsolete class laboratories that is a core objective of this project. In addition, further delay would create additional exposure to cost escalation, which would tend to reduce any cost savings achieved through redesign.

Another option considered was to change the organic chemistry teaching laboratories to dry lab teaching laboratory space. This option would not provide modern class laboratory space needed to replace existing obsolete and unsafe organic chemistry laboratories.

Since this project was approved under the streamlined provisions for approvals of State projects, both options would have required re-submittal to the State as part of the 2008-09 Budget process, causing further delay.

In consideration of the important academic needs that this project will address and the limited likelihood of a successful re-bid strategy, the campus proposes to proceed with the project and use campus resources to cover the over-bid amount. The requested augmentation of $15,762,000 includes the $13,236,000 increase in the construction budget and an additional $2,526,000 associated with additional construction contingency, surveys and tests during construction, and fees associated with value engineering.

Project Description

The Physical Sciences Expansion (PSE) project would provide 53,629 asf of urgently needed facilities for the Departments of Geology, Chemistry, and Physics. The space would consist of instructional and research laboratories, faculty and departmental offices, and support space. The teaching laboratories included in the Physical Sciences Expansion project would provide modern and safe facilities primarily for the Physics 7 and Organic Chemistry 8 and 118 course series. These courses serve as a gateway to other lower and upper division courses in the physical sciences, biological sciences, and engineering and their timely completion is critical to allow the students to proceed with the curriculum required in their degree programs. Currently they are taught in inadequate, inefficient, and obsolete spaces scattered over the campus in six different buildings. Enrollment growth has substantially increased the need for these gateway courses, but the shortage of adequate laboratory space seriously limits the number of students that can enroll.

Use of the existing laboratories also is affected by fire and life safety concerns, and operational inefficiencies. The Organic Chemistry laboratories are particularly utility intensive and require large numbers of fume hoods, and the building would provide the mechanical system capacity required to safely support the teaching of these Chemistry and other courses.

The project is located in the central core of the UC Davis campus. The new building site is on the southwest portion of the current Facilities Services site. The PSE project is the first phase of the development of the new academic quad that will provide a link to the Arboretum. The PSE building forms the west edge of this future quad and is bordered on the west by California Avenue and the

Academic Surge and Mathematical Sciences Buildings, and on the south by the Arboretum and Putah Creek.

Construction of this project is scheduled to begin in August 2007, with occupancy by August 2009.

Policy on Sustainable Practices

This project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will adopt principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. Specific information regarding energy efficiency and sustainability was provided when the project was presented for design approval.

CEQA Classification

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the University of California Procedures for the Implementation of CEQA, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to analyze the potential environmental effects of the Physical Sciences Expansion Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by The Regents in conjunction with the project design approval.

Funding Plan

Funding for this project is proposed from State funds ($48,515,000), campus funds ($1,206,000), and external financing ($15,762,000) to be repaid from the Davis campus' share of the University Opportunity Fund.

Based on long-term debt of $15,762,000 amortized over 30 years at 5.75 percent, the estimated average annual debt service of $1,115,000 would be repaid from the Davis campus' share of the University Opportunity Fund. The campus has pledged its share of the University Opportunity Fund as a source of repayment. The University Opportunity Fund Debt Repayment Policy requires that campuses meet two financial tests: (1) that the amount pledged for debt payments shall not exceed 65 percent of the campus's total Opportunity Funds allocated each year, and (2) that no more than 33 percent of the campus's total Opportunity Funds allocated each year are used for debt service payment. The Davis campus meets both tests. In FY 2011-12, the second full year of occupancy and first full year of principal and interest for the project, 65 percent of the campus's total Opportunity Funds allocated would be pledged for debt service.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the project was originally budgeted and approved in 2003; she inquired about what can be done to expedite projects. Vice Chancellor Meyer responded that this situation stems, in part, from the five-year State capital planning process, as well as to the difficulties in anticipating the extent of price

escalation. In an effort to mitigate these issues, the campus is planning heightened outreach to the mechanical industry to increase the number of bidders. The campus has also announced a reorganization plan to combine capital space planning and maintenance in one unit. Mr. Meyer noted that campus-financed projects that use external financing are able to be delivered in less time than State-financed ones. Committee Chair Kozberg stated that it will be a priority of the Committee to work with the campuses to improve the process.

Regent Bugay asked about the cost savings that are likely to be realized when comparing the 5.75 percent planning rate for the debt service and the actual rate that will be issued, which is likely to be much lower. Mr. Meyer stated that the Office of the President and the campuses undertake an annual process to refresh campus capacity for external financing using detailed debt templates. President Dynes recalled that Vice President Broome is continually looking for new ways to refinance and bundle debt, which translates into less debt service for each of the campuses. Regent Bugay inquired as to whether The Regents receive notice of actual debt service paid, since it is likely to be considerably different from what is approved at the time the project is presented. Committee Chair Kozberg asked for follow-up to Regent Bugay's inquiry.

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

6. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR DIGITAL ARTS FACILITY, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The 2007-08 Budget for State Capital Improvements and the State Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Santa Cruz: Digital Arts Facility – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $23,013,000 to be funded from State funds.

To: Santa Cruz: Digital Arts Facility – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $35,453,000, to be funded from State funds ($23,013,000) and campus funds ($12,440,000).

B. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

The Santa Cruz campus requested approval to augment the Digital Arts Facility budget by $12,440,000 from campus funds to accommodate increases in

construction costs due to local and regional market conditions that were unanticipated at the time the project was originally budgeted. This augmentation would allow the campus to award construction bids and proceed with construction in a timely manner.

Since the advent of personal computing, artists, performers, and musicians have embraced digital technologies because they provide the tools to improve productivity and, more importantly, the means to create entirely new and previously unimagined art forms and associated technologies. UCSC was the first university in the State to create a pioneering, fully networked "render farm," dedicated to the needs of multi-media artists and engineers, some of whom went on to invent, among other things, peer-to-peer music file-sharing technology. UCSC has steadily excelled in the field of digital media, establishing graduate as well as undergraduate programs that attract the highest caliber of faculty members and students. The multi-disciplinary Digital Arts and New Media graduate research program draws its faculty and students not only from the arts, but also from engineering, mathematics, biology, anthropology, and many other disciplines. Continued success, however, is dependent upon the Digital Arts Facility to support the technically complex requirements for acoustics, natural and artificial lighting, and data and communications infrastructure. The new facility will add teaching and research space and academic offices that are critically needed to address existing space shortages and growth needs for the Arts Division.

Acting Chancellor Blumenthal recalled that in November 2003, The Regents approved the 2004-05 Budget for State Capital Improvements, which included the Digital Arts Facility project, at a total project budget of $20,671,000 (at CCCI 4100), to be funded with State funds. The 2005-06 Budget for State Capital Improvements approved by The Regents in November 2004 included an inflationary adjustment for construction, increasing the total budget to $21,699,000 (at CCCI 4328). The 2006-07 Budget for State Capital Improvements approved by The Regents in November 2005 included another inflationary adjustment for construction increasing the total budget to $23,006,000 (at CCCI 4632). In November 2006, The Regents approved the 2007-08 Budget for State Capital Improvements that included an inflationary adjustment for equipment, resulting in a total project budget of $23,013,000 (at EPI 2744).

The initial program and budget for the project was established in June 2003, at a time when construction cost inflation was considered stable. By the time schematic design began in July 2004, however, that scenario had changed. Volatile construction market conditions in California have increased costs dramatically over the last few years, and the Santa Cruz area has been especially affected.

As early as schematic design, the campus undertook severe and continual cost cutting and value engineering efforts in order to reconcile the program and budget. Implemented cost savings measures included reducing the building footprint and volume, simplifying the building organization, selecting less costly materials, and eliminating major site development and landscaping elements. Nevertheless, significant cost problems remained. Given the competing needs for limited State capital funds, the campus decided to continue to work with the project to find ways of meeting the primary scope objective within the funds as budgeted.

The stripped-down project design was reviewed and approved by The Regents in September 2005. The original project scope included a small (1,140 asf) Theater Arts Addition, an expansion of the existing Experimental Theater to provide a back-of-theater suite with a dressing room, shower, and green room. At the time of Regental design approval, the campus proposed to delete construction of this addition in order to reconcile project scope and budget. This reduced scope was approved by The Regents and subsequently by the State Public Works Board at the time of the approval of Preliminary Plans on August 18, 2006. Based on the 100 percent design development cost estimate, the Preliminary Plans Submittal included a campus commitment of $1,916,000 to supplement the construction contract, if needed, at bid time.

During the design development and construction documents phases, the campus continued its ongoing estimating and value engineering efforts. The footprint of the building was adjusted to the extent possible in an effort to minimize the impacts of difficult subsurface foundation and conditions. Proposed building systems and materials were reevaluated for cost-effectiveness, and further reductions and simplifications of project elements were considered. As an example, the wet (i.e., chemical-process based) photo laboratory originally included in the program was revised to a digital photo lab as a way to reduce costs, but with significant programmatic compromise: wet-process photography could no longer be taught in the new building. (The wet photo laboratory was included in the bid documents as an additive alternate.) Before proceeding to each subsequent project phase, the campus scrupulously monitored the cost estimates provided by the executive architect and the construction manager. Construction documents were revised to incorporate accepted cost reduction measures, extending the project's schedule and adding to escalation-driven cost increases. Based on the 100 percent construction documents cost estimate, the working drawings submittal to the State included a campus commitment of $3,842,000 to supplement the estimated construction contract ($21,975,000), if needed, at bid time.

Need for Augmentation

The bid process for this project included extensive outreach to subcontractors; 89 were deemed eligible to bid. Concerns over adequate subcontract bid coverage

led the campus and construction manager to extend the bid period by two weeks. Despite these efforts, bid response was disappointing. By the time subcontract bids were received in April 2007, a number of subcontractors had dropped out of the bidding process, and some major bid packages had only one or two bidders. For six bid packages, including elevator installation, there were no bidders at all.

In comparing the low construction base bids received to the estimated construction budget, it was determined that more than half of the construction bid overage was associated with four subcontract trades: concrete, steel, miscellaneous metals, and glazing, the latter of which bid at nearly two-and-one-half times the estimated cost. Two pre-qualified concrete subcontractors chose not to submit bids, and the sole remaining bidder was 36 percent above the estimated amount. Even more competitive trades had unfavorable results; gypsum board, for example, had three tightly clustered bids and still came in 31 percent over the estimate. Overall, the construction contract bids exceeded the prebid construction cost estimate by 33 percent.

Post-bid analysis with the construction manager and cost estimators confirmed that the current adverse bidding climate is the result of an overheated construction market in which demand for contractors is extremely high. As a result, subcontractors can be highly selective in choosing their work. The relative isolation of the Santa Cruz campus – State Highway 17, which runs over the mountains separating Santa Cruz from the San Jose metropolitan area, and is a significant geographical barrier – is a further disincentive for competitive bids from many Bay Area subcontractors. This is compounded by an extremely volatile construction materials market, driven significantly by international demand. The result has been continuously increasing construction costs.

In evaluating its options, the campus considered redesigning and then rebidding the project. Given that the project had already been drastically simplified, and that the time it would take to redesign and rebid would only worsen the effects of escalating costs, it is extremely unlikely that doing so would result in significant savings without further major reductions to the program.

Instead, the campus and construction manager developed a rebidding strategy for several key trades where bid coverage was not adequate and where there seemed to be strong potential for cost savings. Additional outreach to trade contractors was undertaken, more on-site construction staging and contractor parking space was identified, and bidding instructions were clarified. Fifteen bid packages, including five that did not receive any bids originally, were recombined into ten in order to make them more attractive to bidders.

The final total of all the bid packages planned for acceptance resulted in a total construction budget of $29,329,000, an increase of $11,196,000 over the previously approved budget. In addition, increased costs associated with additional construction contingency, surveys and tests during construction, and

fees associated with value engineering total $1,244,000. A total budget augmentation of $12,440,000 (54 percent) is required for contract award and a timely construction start.

Project Description

The Digital Arts Facility will provide approximately 24,500 assignable square feet of teaching, research, and office space for the growing Division of Arts. The programs to be housed in the building, particularly the campus's new Digital Arts and New Media M.F.A. program, rely heavily on appropriately designed spaces, with technically complex requirements for acoustics, natural and artificial lighting, varied ceiling heights, and data and communications infrastructure. The campus simply does not have any current space meeting those requirements, and the proposed project will help address severe space deficiencies in the Arts Division.

Construction of the building is scheduled to begin in August 2007, with completion anticipated by summer 2009.

Policy on Sustainable Practices

Although this project was approved before the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices* took effect, the building has been designed to outperform California Energy Code Title 24 by 20 percent, and the campus is participating in the Savings by Design program for this project. Major sustainability features, including exterior solar screening at the south and west elevations, remain despite continuous cost-cutting. The project has adopted the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements.

CEQA Classification

In accordance with University of California guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the project design was approved, and an Environmental Impact Report was certified at the September 2005 Regents' meeting.

Financial Feasibility

The total project cost is $35,453,000, to be funded from State funds ($23,013,000) and campus funds ($12,440,000).

In compliance with Regents' policy, all funds necessary to complete construction will be in hand prior to award of construction contracts.

Regent Hopkinson questioned the time delay from the original budget approval in 2003. Associate Vice Chancellor Zwart responded that inherent in the process is a seven to eight month delay between budget approval and when design funds become available for expenditure. Further delays in this project resulted from consultation regarding cost-saving alternatives and redesign to bring the project into alignment with the budget. Overall, the campus is delayed 10 months in the project. Regent Hopkinson stressed that the University's process is in need of serious overhaul, pointing out that in the private sector there is typically only one year between the design and construction phases.

Committee Chair Kozberg asked Assistant Vice Chancellor Bocchicchio to work with the campus leadership on finance as well as architectural planning and design in order to discuss ways to change UC's capital planning process.

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

7. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, NORTHWEST CAMPUS STUDENT HOUSING INFILL, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include preliminary plans funding for the following project:

Los Angeles: Northwest Campus Student Housing Infill – preliminary plans – $9 million, to be funded from the Los Angeles campus' share of the University of California Housing System (UCHS) Net Revenue Fund Reserves.

This action would authorize the use of $9 million for preliminary plans for an infill housing project associated with the Northwest Campus Undergraduate Student Housing Plan to be funded with the Los Angeles campus' share of the University of California Housing System (UCHS) Net Revenue Fund Reserves. The project would construct approximately 500,000 gsf to 550,000 gsf of space to accommodate approximately 1,350 to 1,500 undergraduate bed spaces and a commons/dining facility in the northwest quadrant of the campus. Approval of this action item would allow the campus to engage executive architects and planning consultants to refine the project scope, develop cost estimates and a comprehensive financial plan, and complete schematic design. The preliminary plans phase would include studies of utilities distribution and capacity requirements, and vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

Vice Chancellor Olsen recalled that in March 2002, The Regents approved preliminary plan funding for a group of capital projects associated with the Northwest Campus Undergraduate Student Housing Plan, totaling $10,782,000

and funded from $10,100,000 in housing reserves and $682,000 in parking reserves. These projects encompassed building approximately 2,000 new undergraduate bed spaces adjacent to Hedrick and Rieber Halls, renovating the first floors of Hedrick and Rieber as community support space for the new residents, renovating the first floor of Sproul Hall as replacement housing administration space, and constructing a parking structure adjacent to Dykstra Hall. These projects were designed to meet the goals and objectives outlined in the UCLA Student Housing Master Plan (SHMP) 2000-10, provide linkages between housing programs and the campus' academic mission, and support the institutional objective of transforming UCLA from what was a predominantly commuter campus to a residential university. The housing component of these projects resulted in the construction of 1,986 bed spaces in 540,000 gsf and resulted in the expenditure of approximately $169.1 million, funded from $163.8 million in external financing and $5.3 million in housing reserves. An 86,000 gsf parking structure accommodates approximately 294 vehicles and was funded from $7.1 million in parking reserves. These projects are now complete.

The campus housing environment has continued to evolve since approval of the Student Housing Master Plan (SHMP) in 2001. At that time, it was anticipated that the addition of 2,000 beds would allow the campus to offer a four-year guarantee of housing to all new first year undergraduate students and a two-year guarantee for all new transfer students, while reducing the number of triple accommodations to actual demand. In spite of the addition of 1,986 bed spaces, however, the campus can only offer three years of housing to new freshmen and one year to transfer students.

During the 2006-07 academic year, approximately 82 percent of the first year class (3,716 students) was assigned to triple rooms due to a shortfall of bed spaces. This magnitude of triple-room accommodations compromises the quality of the residential experience and places considerable strain on the facilities. In order for the campus to achieve the guarantees of the SHMP, additional accommodations for fourth-year undergraduates and second-year transfer students are needed as well as conversion of triple rooms back to two-bed rooms as designed.

Analysis of Undergraduate Student Housing Needs – Cumulative Supply and Demand Projections

Existing demand for undergraduate accommodations is linked to the goals of the UCLA Student Housing Master Plan 2000-10 (SHMP) to provide 1) guaranteed housing to all freshmen who desire such housing for four consecutive years, and 2) guaranteed housing for two years to all new transfer students. The campus currently does not have sufficient housing facilities to fulfill these goals.

The 2000-10 SHMP identified an inventory of 10,040 undergraduate beds for 2010-11 and a need pursuant to the goals noted above for 10,390 undergraduate

bed spaces in 2010-11. Increased demand for undergraduate student housing, beyond the SHMP 2010-11 projections, has been created by significantly higher acceptance rates for both freshman and transfer admissions and housing offers. This has generated a need of approximately 11,583 beds by 2010-11 and potentially as many as 12,544 beds by 2013-2014.

The increased housing take rates are anticipated to continue through the next decade. In order to meet this continuing demand, the campus converted 1,746 double-occupancy rooms to three-person accommodations (or 1,746 triple rooms housing 5,238 undergraduate and transfer students in 2006-07). In comparison, the SHMP indicates a demand for triple room accommodations for approximately 1,800 students. Current conditions have resulted in the need to accommodate 5,283 students in triple rooms, including 3,716 first year students. The projections for 2007-08 indicate that approximately 5,400 students would need to be accommodated in triples, including 3,763, or 85 percent, of first year students. Accommodating students in this manner is not an acceptable long-term solution for housing undergraduate students. In addition, this excess of demand over supply will be exacerbated further for the next several years with the renovation of the older existing high-rise residence halls. These renovations will remove approximately 836 beds from the inventory each year until these projects are completed. The Sproul Repairs and Refurbishment project is currently under construction, and the Rieber Repairs and Refurbishment project is in working drawings. These projects were originally approved by The Regents in December 2005 and March 2007, respectively. Future Regental approvals will be requested for the repair and refurbishment of the Hedrick and Dykstra residence halls.

It is estimated that an additional 2,500 beds could be needed to fulfill the goals of the SHMP, based on current take rates and projections for housing demand. A 1,500 bed infill project would reduce the projected shortfall to approximately 1,000 beds. A first phase of approximately 1,350 beds is proposed to partially fulfill this need based on the results of preliminary massing studies of potential infill sites adjacent to the existing residence halls.

The potential sites will undergo additional study during the preliminary plan phase to ascertain whether they can accommodate the full 1,500 beds without increasing building densities to unacceptable levels and compromising the quality of life for resident students. Proposals for an additional 1,000 to 1,150 beds in other northwest campus locations would be evaluated following completion of this first phase if it is determined that an unmet need still exists.

Project Description

UCLA proposed the development of preliminary plans for construction of additional undergraduate housing in the northwest quadrant of the campus, consisting of approximately 1,350 beds, a commons/dining facility, and related site development. Targeted for completion by 2013, the project would comprise

approximately 500,000 to 550,000 gsf consisting of a group of mid- to high-rise residence hall buildings in the areas immediately adjacent to the existing Sproul, Rieber, and DeNeve housing residence hall facilities.

The preliminary plan phase would include continued evaluation of options for siting and configuration of the new residence halls with a goal of accommodating 1,500 new beds. Approximately 400,000 to 450,000 gsf would be allocated for housing and 100,000 gsf for the commons/dining facility that would also include related administrative support facilities. Planning would include studies of utilities distribution and capacity requirements, and vehicle and pedestrian circulation.

Policy on Sustainable Practices

This project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will adopt the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. Specific information regarding energy efficiency and sustainability will be provided when the project is presented for design approval.

CEQA Classification

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the University Procedures for implementation of CEQA, the potential environmental effects of proposed additional undergraduate student housing would be analyzed in a project specific Environmental Impact Report that would also to involve an Amendment to the 2002 Long Range Development Plan.

Funding Plan

The total cost to develop preliminary plans for the new housing and commons/dining project is $9 million, to be funded from the Los Angeles campus' share of the University of California Housing System Net Revenue Fund Reserves.

The initial estimates of total project cost range between $325 million and $375 million. Of this total, the estimated cost ranges are between $255 million and $295 million for the housing component and between $70 million and $80 million for the commons/dining and related administrative support component.

The project would be funded by external financing. Preliminary plan expenditures would be included in the request for approval of the external financing. Repayment of the portion of the debt related to housing would be from net revenues of the UCHS, generated by student housing fees on the Los Angeles

campus. These fees would be established at a level sufficient to meet the requirements of the UCHS indenture. The financial model underlying this proposal, which indicates that the increased debt associated with this project could be accommodated within an affordable residential rate structure, will be validated during the preliminary planning phase.

Future Regental Actions

Following the conclusion of the preliminary design phase, the campus would return to The Regents to request an amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program for the total project cost, approval of project financing and design approval.

Vice Chancellor Morabito showed slides to illustrate the campus' overall housing plans and the siting of this building.

Regent Hopkinson inquired about the cost of the project, comparing an earlier UCLA project that cost approximately $85,000 per bed with the current project that is estimated to cost $250,000 per bed. Mr. Olsen explained that, in order to estimate costs for the current project, the campus increased the cost per bed of the previous housing project to current levels, and augmented those figures with an 8 percent per year escalation. He added that this project includes building a commons area, food-service facilities, and programmatic space. Regent Hopkinson noted that private sector construction would provide much more for the same cost.

Regent Allen affirmed the importance of building housing on a campus-wide basis, and inquired about parking and sustainability features associated with the project. Mr. Olsen responded that housing at UCLA is a mitigator of traffic and that UCLA has a policy preventing students from parking on campus if they live on campus, with only rare exceptions. No parking will be built for this project; exceptions will be accommodated using existing parking facilities. Mr. Morabito responded that, with reference to sustainability, the current project will fall under new energy guidelines and will seek higher energy efficiency, adding to costs.

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

8. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL FINANCING FOR COGENERATION PLANT EXPANSION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The 2007-2008 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include the following project:

San Diego: Cogeneration Plant Expansion – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – $26,580,000 to be funded from external financing.

B. The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed $26,580,000 for the Cogeneration Plant Expansion project, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.

(2) Repayment of financing shall be from the San Diego campus' share of federal indirect cost recovery deposited to Fund 19933, which shall be in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related financing requirements.

(3) The general credit of The Regents shall not be pledged.

C. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to provide certification that interest paid by The Regents is excluded from gross income for purposes of federal income taxation under existing law.

D. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

The San Diego campus proposed expanding both the cogeneration operations at its Central Utilities Plant and the electrical distribution system at the North Campus Switching Station to meet the campus' projected demand for electricity and steam generated power and cooling in 2010-11. The campus estimates it would realize life cycle cost savings of approximately $48 million over the first ten years of operation and $157 million over the next 30 years in comparison to what the campus would be expected to expend on purchased utilities without the additional cogeneration capacity. This projection of savings is based on an annual 6 percent discount rate and assumes a 2.5 percent annual increase in natural gas costs and a 4 percent increase in electricity costs. By reducing dependence on power purchased from the grid, this project would reduce the risk of service disruptions and increased costs of service over time. The project would also increase the campus' overall energy efficiency and advance sustainability goals set forth in University policy.

It was recalled that cogeneration is a proven technology for generating electricity and steam simultaneously using natural gas, at a net savings in cost. This technology uses expanding gases from the rapid combustion under pressure to

drive turbine blades that, in turn, produce electricity via a generator. The intense waste heat from the combustion process is then used to convert water into steam, a secondary use of the same natural gas.

The San Diego campus received approval from The Regents in 1999 to construct a cogeneration addition at the Central Utilities Plant. This project was completed in 2001 and included the installation of two 13.5 Megawatt (MW) combustion turbine generators. A 3 MW steam turbine generator was added in 2005. In its six years of operation, the existing cogeneration plant has proven to be an economical and environmentally sound investment. This is evidenced by UCSD's receiving an award for "Special Achievement in Energy by a Government or Institution" from the San Diego Regional Energy Office in 2005. The award recognized the fact that the campus experienced a 10 percent increase in operating efficiency and a 25 percent reduction in steam required for cooling, principally as a result of the addition of the cogeneration facility. Also, in 2002, UCSD received the "Clean Air Award" from the Air Pollution Control District for the original cogeneration plant's design and emissions control performance.

Increasing Capacity Requirements

Since the current cogeneration plant came on line in June 2001, enrollment and academic programs have grown, and the campus physical plant has expanded by nearly 1.5 million gsf, resulting in increased power usage. As the campus has grown and existing cogeneration capacity has met less and less of the campus' power needs, the campus has become increasingly dependent on more expensive power purchased from the grid. The addition of a small 3 MW steam turbine generator in 2005 partially reduced the amount of purchased electricity needed by the campus. Without the proposed expanded capacity and given the trajectory of campus growth, the amount of campus power provided by existing cogeneration will diminish from 76 percent in 2005-06 to an estimated 64 percent in 2010-11. The proposed project will add sufficient cogeneration capacity to meet nearly all campus power needs in 2010-11.

Over the next five years, it is anticipated that the campus will experience an 84,000 Megawatt-hours (MWh) electrical load growth. New construction will account for half of this growth; the San Diego Supercomputer Center will account for most of the rest, as the Center plans to install in the near future additional energy-intensive, large mainframe super computers to ensure the Center's continued international standing. This increased power demand will result in significant increases in purchased grid power unless the campus expands its cogeneration capacity.

Purchased Utility Costs vs. Cogeneration Costs

In 2002-03, the electricity and natural gas purchased for State facilities cost $15.4 million. State facilities account for 75 percent of campus power needs. By

2005-06, those costs with cogeneration increased to $22.5 million, but would have been $28 to 30 million without the cogeneration system installation. Currently, purchased power costs 50 percent more per Kwh (or a 4 cents per Kwh premium) than power provided through campus cogeneration and waste heat recovery. This premium incorporates debt service, operating and other expenses associated with the campus cogeneration facility.

Project Cost and Projected Savings

Over the three-year period from 2003-04 through 2005-06, the existing cogeneration facility resulted in net campus savings of approximately $20 million relative to the costs that would have been borne had the campus relied entirely on purchased power from the University's direct access supplier contract with APS Energy Services. Total annual first year savings of $2,286,055 would be realized with the implementation of the proposed project, yielding an expected simple payback period of 11.6 years.

Assessing Financial Feasibility and Risk Mitigation

Evaluation of the economic feasibility of the proposed expansion of the campus' existing cogeneration plant focused on both the short-term and long-term changes in electricity and natural gas prices and on sizing of the proposed expansion. The project's primary economic exposure stems from the prospect of natural gas prices being steadier than electricity costs. If natural gas prices go up and electricity prices go down, the project becomes less feasible. In contrast, if electricity prices go up and natural gas prices go down, the project becomes more economically feasible.

Two factors reduce the financial risk of the project over the long term. First, while short-term divergence in pricing between electricity and gas is possible, it is reasonable to assume that, over the long term, future gas and electricity commodity prices will remain more or less in tandem unless the supply of either outpaces the other. The reason for this is that natural gas generating plants produce about 40 percent of the electricity used in the State and almost all of the major additions to in-state capacity are natural gas generating plants, thus closely tying the price of electricity to natural gas. Short-term pricing variations should have little economic impact on the overall long-term viability of the project. Second, onsite cogeneration, with its waste heat recovery, offers a significant thermal energy efficiency advantage over combustion turbine power plants. This efficiency advantage serves as a buffer against some pricing volatility in the market.

To mitigate further the risk of natural gas prices and to contain those costs associated with cogeneration, the San Diego campus has implemented a strategy to pre-purchase a percentage of its natural gas needs to mitigate the impact of price volatility in the future. Since 2005, UCSD has pre-purchased the majority

of our natural gas to fix the price over five year periods. This strategy has worked well to minimize risk of future gas costs. Generally more stable long-term natural gas prices are projected for southern California due to new liquid natural gas facilities under construction and planned in Baja California which will increase supplies. New developments in western United States gas fields are adding supply to the area as well.

Project Description

This project comprises two components: the expansion of the cogeneration operations at the Central Utilities Plant on campus, including a waste heat recovery system, and the expansion of the electrical distribution system for the North Campus Switching Station.

Cogeneration Plant Expansion

To determine the optimum expansion of the on-campus cogeneration capability, analysis was carried out on several sizes of increased capacity. Against a no-project, business-as-usual case, the economic feasibility of increasing capacity by 7.5 MW and 15 MW was evaluated. The minimum expansion option, a 7.5 MW expansion, would meet the campus' current cogeneration shortfall and accommodate the demands for new campus buildings. The 15 MW expansion was considered as an upper end proposal and would provide the campus with sufficient new capacity to meet the current cogeneration shortfall, planned campus growth, the anticipated increased power needs of the Supercomputer Center, as well as ancillary power demands to address the support of new file server rooms for Academic and Administrative data centers. With consideration given to future power requirements of the campus, optimizing economies of scale of combustion turbine systems, and available sizing options of equipment, the analysis determined that the most economically beneficial option for the campus over the long term was to add a 15 MW combustion turbine generator system (with all auxiliaries) to complement the two existing units provided under the original cogeneration project. A 60,000 pound per hour heat recovery steam generator would be added for use with campus chillers (for cooling), heating and the existing steam turbine generator. In addition, a fuel gas compressor, a paralleling 15 Kilovolt (KV) switchgear system and associated protective devices, an expanded plant control system, and support system extensions to accommodate the new unit will be implemented with this project.

To ensure environmentally acceptable air quality standards, integral selective catalytic reduction systems for emissions control and a continuous emissions monitoring system would be provided. Furthermore, the proposed expansion would have a 75 percent thermal energy performance efficiency (versus a 42 percent combustion turbine power plant without waste heat recovery), reducing natural gas consumption from grid-purchased power, as well as Nitrogen Oxide emission within the State.

The proposed project includes approximately 5,000 gsf of new building construction, approximately 3,800 gsf of which to house the new combustion turbine generator and the waste heat recovery steam generator, and approximately 1,200 gsf for a two-story building expansion of the existing electrical room.

North Campus Switching Station Expansion

The second component of the project is the expansion of the electrical distribution system for the North Campus Switching Station that was completed in 2005-06. This work is necessary to handle future loads in the north campus area including North Campus Housing–Phase 2, new apartments at Muir College, the Torrey Pines Center South and North administrative buildings that are currently receiving power from San Diego Gas & Electric, other future development in the north campus and University Center neighborhoods, and the San Diego Supercomputer Center. The San Diego Supercomputer Center operations currently account for 30 percent of the North Campus Switching Station's current capacity and are expected to use 50 percent of the increased capacity provided by the proposed expansion.

This expansion will double the current capacity to approximately 20 Megavolt-ampere. The scope of work includes distribution improvements from the East Campus Substation (where power is received from the Central Utilities Plant and San Diego Gas & Electric and distributed throughout the campus) to the North Campus Switching Station and new feeder circuits from that station to distributed points for future building connections.

Policy on Sustainable Practices

This project would comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability would be adopted to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. Specific information regarding energy efficiency and sustainability will be provided when the project is presented for design approval.

CEQA Classification

In accordance with University of California guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, environmental documentation would be prepared to support the design approval for consideration by the University.

Financial Feasibility

The total project cost is estimated at $26,580,000, including $1,867,000 of interest during construction, to be funded with external financing. The campus would pledge a portion of its share of federal indirect cost recoveries deposited to Fund

19933 (University General Funds) as the repayment source for the external financing. The projected annual debt service is estimated to be $1,879,000, calculated at an interest rate of 5.75 percent for 30 years. Total projected annual debt service from Fund 19933, including debt service for other approved San Diego campus projects, would be $3,742,000, resulting in a debt service coverage of 4.09 times.

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

9. **ACADEMIC HEALTH FACILITIES RECONSTRUCTION PLAN, PHASE II, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Olsen provided an update on UCLA's overall strategy for remediating seismic deficiencies associated with the Center for the Health Sciences complex buildings. The presentation discussed the implications of the Phase II plan for the 2008-09 allocation of State capital funding. Mr. Olsen sought to strengthen The Regents' appreciation of the scale and complexity of the seismic safety issues that are facing UCLA's health sciences facilities.

Mr. Olsen reported that the total investment by UCLA to replace and repair seismically deficient structures on the campus as a whole has amounted to over $1.8 billion over a 20-year period, consisting of $450 million in State funds, over $600 million in federal funds, and nearly $800 million in campus funds. The remaining seismic problems at UCLA are concentrated in the Center for the Health Sciences. The UCLA campus is nearing completion of Phase I of its Academic Health Facilities Reconstruction Plan. This first phase included the Westwood Replacement Hospital Project, the Seismic Replacement Building No. 1 project, the Seismic Replacement Building No. 2 project, and the J. V. Luck-Orthopaedic Hospital Research Building project.

Mr. Olsen explained that as of May 2006, 2.1 million gsf in the health sciences complex had a UC seismic rating of "Poor" or worse. Recently completed engineering analyses of these buildings concluded that the rating of four of the buildings should be changed from "Poor" to "Fair," meaning that no seismic repair is necessary under UC policy. This reduced the occupied seismically deficient space to 1.7 million gsf. The remaining deficient space includes all of the major structures housing the School of Medicine.

It was explained that the objective of Phase II is to provide seismically safe space for all of the functions associated with the School of Medicine Medical Education Program; the School of Medicine wet laboratory research space; the School of Medicine dry laboratories, offices, and support space; and all the functions of the School of Public Health. In May 2006, the campus reported to The Regents that completion of Phase II would require 12 to 15 years of work with an investment of approximately $1.7 billion in escalated project costs over the period. The

overall program faces a substantial risk of project delay, and associated increased costs, caused by the lack of State funding at the time projects are ready to proceed.

Projects ready to proceed next year, for which UCLA will seek approval and funding in 2008-09, include the following: 1) electrical and fire protection upgrades needed to allow interim occupancy of the complex, pending completion of the seismic repairs in subsequent phases; 2) renovation of currently vacant research space to house and support medical education needs arising under the Programs in Medical Education; 3) interior demolition and hazardous materials abatement in Cardinal Health Systems (CHS) South Tower, upon the move into the Westwood Replacement Hospital; and 4) seismic renovation and modernization of Hershey Hall, which will allow the Life Sciences building to be fully vacated upon completion of the Life Sciences Replacement building.

Mr. Olsen reported that a second set of buildings are needed to gain access to the CHS South Tower, including relocating the pathology laboratories on the A level directly beneath the CHS South Tower. These laboratories and their associated programs need technically complex and contiguous space proximate to the new medical center. The campus has concluded that there is no feasible staging solution for the facilities, and that new permanent facilities are required. Several site alternatives are being studied, including the corner of Galey and La Conte Avenues. Additionally, the renovation of the outpatient tower would take advantage of the construction period of the pathology laboratories to increase the inventory of seismically safe space. The seismic renovation of the CHS South Tower would follow the relocation of the pathology laboratories.

The concept costs for the initial projects, referred to as Phase II–A, is approximately $500 million. Of this amount, approximately $330 million is potentially State-supportable. UCLA's strategy for financing its facility needs has been to align the seismic repair and infrastructure replacement elements of the projects with State monies, and to reserve campus funds for the fit out of the space, program decompression expansion, and costs associated with non-State supportable space. At present, UCLA's allocation of State monies over the next five years, ending in FY 2012-13, is $180 million, $150 million short of the amount needed. Subsequent phases beyond Phase II-A will provide a new medical education building, the fit out of wet laboratories in the upper floors of CHS South Tower, the renovation of the Life Sciences building, and the repair of the remaining deficient CHS towers. At the level of funding that is currently provided by the State, the campus is concerned about the substantial risk that key elements of the overall strategy could be delayed.

Mr. Olsen concluded that while the seismic issues facing UCLA are daunting, the campus believes that addressing them is not impossible; a strategy has been devised and a team has been assembled to execute the strategy, but Mr. Olsen stressed that the project must begin soon.

Vice Chancellor Levey echoed the importance of these projects, stating that the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and its research, educational, and clinical programs are among the crown jewels of the UC system. Modern and safe facilities must be provided for students, trainees, faculty, and staff. Falling short in the project would negatively affect the future of the School of Medicine, which is currently ranked eleventh by the *US News and World Report*, particularly in the School's ability to attract students and retain top scientists. Dr. Levey explained that public-private relationships are being explored to construct the new buildings necessary to begin Phase II-A, and he expressed his hope that The Regents would be supportive of such endeavors, as they hold promise for reduced cost and faster construction. UCLA also needs an appropriation from the State to assist with reconstruction and seismic remediation; the project cannot be accomplished using capital dollars routinely provided to the campus. Dr. Levey suggested that The Regents may want to assemble a broader request on behalf of UCSF, UC Berkeley, and UCLA, all of which has been damaged by earthquakes in recent years. UCLA recognizes the need for private fundraising; however, external fundraising, both private and State, will not be sufficient to cover costs and debt will have to be incurred by the School of Medicine. Dr. Levey stated that at an appropriate time he will request that the campus and the Office of the President return indirect costs from UCLA research grants in order to provide dollars for debt repayment.

Regent Hopkinson requested that the Office of the President work with the UCLA campus to come forward with a plan as to how UCLA's fiscal needs can be met. Mr. Olsen stated that the campus has been working with the Office of the President, which has been supportive and helpful in fashioning an overall strategy and understanding the implications of the next steps required.

Executive Vice President Lapp stated that, after the Office of the President received the presentation from UCLA regarding this project, preliminary conversations began with State officials to sensitize them to the needs, both those that UCLA has expressed and the overall demands that will be had on UC's medical and nursing schools for increased enrollments. Ms. Lapp stated that more State funding will be solicited for next year for these needs, as well as through future bond measures, in order to deal with health science demands. Ms. Lapp stated that reports will be provided to The Regents over the next month regarding conversations between the Office of the President and the State. Regent Hopkinson asked for a more formalized approach to how funds will be identified, both for UCLA and for other major facilities, with the intent that The Regents should agree to that priority. Ms. Lapp stated that this can be provided to The Regents, possibly before the September meeting.

Committee Chair Kozberg stated that the Committee members will retain open minds and be willing to try new approaches, realizing that the extent of the problem is beyond the University's current fiscal capacity.

10. **ADOPTION OF INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, BERKELEY LAB GUEST HOUSE, LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Berkeley Lab Guest House, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

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

Deputy of Facilities O'Hearn recalled that the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is on property owned by the University of California. As such, its projects are brought to The Regents for design approval. In November 2006, The Chairman of the Board of Regents, the Chairman of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and the President approved the inclusion of the project in the 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2006-10 Capital Improvement Program, and authorized external financing at total project cost of $10,937,000 at CCCI 5054. The project will be funded from external financing ($9,993,000), the Howard Hughes Medical Institute Grant ($747,000), and funds available to LBNL ($197,000).

In May 2007, the Office of the President approved the appointment of MacDonald Architects, as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Site

The proposed project site is a 0.9-acre University-owned parcel with frontage on Lawrence Road in the interior "Old Town" or "Laboratory Commons" area of the LBNL. The project is consistent with LBNL's 1987 LRDP land use designation for this site, "Light Source Research and Engineering Area" (also known as "Old Town"). Furthermore, the project is also consistent with LBNL's proposed new 2006 LRDP land use designation for the site, "Laboratory Commons" (LBNL's 2006 LRDP was the subject of a concurrent action).

The Guest House will be located at LBNL's main circulation hub where several parking areas exist, shuttle services are provided, and food services are within

walking distance. Other nearby uses include Building 2 (offices and dry lab) and the Advanced Light Source accelerator.

Project Design

The project will construct on-site housing for LBNL guests and will include construction of a facility of 73 beds in sixty hotel-style rooms and suites. The facility's capacity could be expanded to provide 47 additional beds to accommodate approximately 120 guests within the proposed room count in the future, subject to additional California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.

The site is sloped and is surrounded by existing buildings and roads. The building has been configured to minimize the site costs by conforming to the existing site contours. The Guest House will be three stories with a double-loaded corridor, one elevator, and exit stairwells at each end of the corridor. The construction will consist of a wood or metal framed structure, stucco, and lap board siding with a standing seam metal roof.

The facility will offer three different room configurations to accommodate individual guest's needs; it will also provide exercise facilities, guest laundry, and a common meeting area adjacent to the Lobby. The Guest House will provide accommodations to LBNL's visiting guests, researchers, and scientists who need close-by and around-the-clock access to LBNL's user facilities such as the Advanced Light Source.

A design build delivery method will be used. Construction of the project is scheduled to begin in December 2007 and be completed in March 2009.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*, with the principals of energy efficiency and sustainability adopted to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. At a minimum, the project will comply with a LEED equivalency "Certified" rating, but achievement of a "Silver" rating will be pursued through the completion of the design and documentation phases.

Green building elements include the use of high performance glazing and sun shading devices, local and regional materials, products with high-recycled content and water-saving plumbing fixtures. The design also will exceed the new Title 24 energy requirements by more than 20 percent. A third-party structural review will occur during the Design Build phase as required by UC policy. The Berkeley Lab Facilities Division will manage the project and outside consultants, inspection, and testing agencies will be utilized as necessary.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and the University procedures for implementation of the CEQA, LBNL prepared an Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) to determine whether any potential environmental effects are associated with the proposed project. The IS/ND was tiered from LBNL's 1987 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR), as amended.

The Draft IS/ND was circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day public review period from May 2, 2007 to May 31, 2007. Copies of the Draft IS/ND were made available at several libraries, information repositories, and at LBNL. A copy was posted on the LBNL web site and hard copies were mailed to all people who requested them. In addition to a communication from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research acknowledging submittal and circulation of the Initial Study, written comments from two public agencies, three organizations, and four individuals were received during the public review period. The letters do not raise any new environmental impacts that have not already been addressed in the IS/ND. The comments and responses to all comments are contained in the Final IS/ND.

Pursuant to CEQA requirements, the IS/ND evaluates potential project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts in 16 environmental issue areas: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biology resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities, and service systems.

The IS/ND found that the proposed project, with implementation of measures set forth in the 1987 LRDP EIR as amended, would not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts not adequately addressed in the 1987 LRDP EIR, as amended.

Findings

The Findings discuss the Project's impacts, 1987 LRDP EIR mitigation measures included in the Project Description, and conclusions regarding approval of the IS/ND for this project in conformance with CEQA.

Regent Hopkinson questioned the high cost of the project. Mr. O'Hearn stated that the laboratory is very concerned about construction costs; a contractor was used to estimate costs and the design build method selected to assure the submission of cost-effective bids. Difficulty accessing the site, steep topography, and seismic sensitivity add approximately 15 percent to the cost of the project.

Regents Bugay and Allen inquired about local concerns regarding the project, citing a letter from the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association. Senior

Planner Philliber stated that the letter was received as a comment to the IS/ND and that it was fully addressed, reprinted, and responded to in the Final IS/ND.

Committee Chair Kozberg commented that the project is badly needed and that she hopes that it will add to academic opportunities and collaboration. She requested that a business plan for the facility be presented at a subsequent date.

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

11. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN OF VETERINARY MEDICINE 3B, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project as indicated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee and Grounds and Buildings:

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

B. Approve the Findings.

C. Approve the design of Veterinary Medicine 3B, Davis Campus.

[The Environmental Impact Report and Findings were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

It was recalled that in November 2005, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Veterinary Medicine 3B, Davis campus in the 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements, and the 2006-07 Capital Improvement Program, at a total project cost of $89,950,000 at CCCI 4632. In May 2007, the State Public Works Board approved modification of scope to address a potential budget deficit due to reduced gift funding and continued volatility in the construction market. The revised total project cost of $89,032,000 at CCCI 4890 would be funded from a combination of state funds $68,976,000 and gift funds $20,056,000.

In March 2007, the appointment of Hellmuth Obata + Kassabaum Architects as Executive Architect for this project was approved.

Project Site

The site for the proposed facility is located in the Health Sciences District directly to the east of the Veterinary Medicine Instructional Facility. The site use is in accordance with the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Project Design

Veterinary Medicine 3B is designed to contain 77,142 assignable square feet (asf) of space within a total area of 118,935 gross square feet (gsf) serving the research needs of the School of Veterinary Medicine. The building will include a small rodent vivarium and a small Biosafety Level 3 Suite.

The building will consist of a block of laboratory space, a block of office space joined by a connecting volume containing vertical circulation, restrooms, and conference and support space. The four-story structure is approximately 90 feet by 300 feet in an east-west orientation. The steel-framed building will have braced frames to resist wind and seismic forces and will be clad with a combination of pre-cast concrete panels, formed metal siding, and glass curtain wall. The pre-cast concrete color and texture will be complimentary to the color palette used in adjacent buildings.

The design of the Veterinary Medicine has been reviewed in accordance with University Policy by an independent design consultant and value engineering team. This project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will implement the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. The building is designed to incorporate day lighting as the primary light source, includes operable windows for natural ventilation in the office area and will use an efficient active chilled beam mechanical system to reduce energy use to at least 30 percent below that of a standard Title 24 compliant lab building. The building will contain a significant amount of locally manufactured materials and materials containing a high recycled material content. In addition, the project will benefit from campus-wide sustainable features such as the arboretum waterway to slow and filter storm-water, the natural gas fueled bus fleet, and the Russell Ranch reserve to provide habitat mitigation. The building's energy efficiency and material selection will combine with the campuswide features to enable the project to achieve LEED Silver certification with the potential to reach LEED Gold (45 – 50 points).

UC Davis Architects and Engineers Department will manage the project with assistance from the executive design professional's project team, with outside consultants and testing agencies as necessary. The Campus Architect will perform project oversight. Construction will commence in October 2008, and completion is anticipated for October 2010.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Focused Tiered Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report (Focused Tiered IS/EIR) was prepared for the

proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project to analyze potential environmental effects associated with the project.

The Initial Study (IS) was tiered from the 2003 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The IS evaluated potential environmental effects of the proposed project, identified which issues were adequately addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and identified issues which required further analysis. Based on the Tiered IS, UC Davis prepared a Focused Tiered Draft EIR to evaluate five potential impacts in three resource areas (Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Hydrology) that the 2003 LRDP EIR identified as significant and unavoidable to which the proposed project may contribute. The Initial Study and Notice of Preparation were circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day scoping period from March 23, 2007 to April 23, 2007.

The Focused Tiered EIR re-evaluated the five potential impacts to determine whether there were any additional project-specific mitigations or alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate or reduce the project's contribution to those impacts. Based on the Tiered IS and the Focused Tiered EIR prepared for the proposed project, it has been determined that the project, with mitigation, would not result in any new potentially significant impacts or impacts that were not sufficiently addressed and mitigated to the extent feasible by the 2003 LRDP EIR. No new project specific mitigation measures or alternatives were identified. The Focused Tiered EIR was circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 45-day review period from May 7, 2007 to June 21, 2007. No comments were received.

Based on the impact assessment in the EIR, it has been determined that while the proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts identified and addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, but would not result in project-specific significant impacts beyond the identified impacts and associated mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Where possible, the cumulative impacts of the campus growth identified in the LRDP, including this project, would be mitigated by the LRDP EIR mitigations currently being implemented. In accordance with CEQA's mitigation monitoring requirements, measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are monitored under the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental review process, the relation of the project to the LRDP EIR, cumulative impacts and mitigation measures addressed in the context of the Tiered IS and Focused Tiered EIR, and conclusions regarding approval of the Focused Tiered EIR for this project in conformance with CEQA.

Regent Hopkinson asked about the exterior colors and how they conform to the campus palette. Interim Campus Architect Halliday stated that there are two shades of the pre-cast concrete; the upper floors' color will match the colors of Veterinary Medicine Building 3A and the Valley Hall building, and the lower shade will match that used on the adjacent Genome and Biomedical Sciences building. The grey metallic siding will match the metal used on Veterinary Medicine Building 3A. The colors match those used in the campus' health sciences district.

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

12. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, IRVINE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITY – 4, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to The Regents that:

A. The 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include the following project:

Irvine: Irvine Biomedical Research Facility 4 (IBRF-4) – preliminary plans – $1,882,000, to be funded from campus ground lease revenues.

B. Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, The Regents:

(1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Approve the design of the Irvine Biomedical Research Facility 4 (IBRF-4), Irvine Campus.

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

The Irvine campus requested authorization to proceed with the preliminary plans phase for the proposed Irvine Biomedical Research Facility (IBRF-4) project at a

cost of $1,882,000, to be funded from campus ground lease revenues. The proposed project, which would be implemented as a design-build competition, would construct a 52,300 asf (81,575 ogsf) facility designed to house stem cell research. Approval of this action item would allow the campus to complete and issue a Request for Proposal from pre-qualified design-build teams who will develop and submit preliminary plans and costs as part of the design-build competition.

It was recalled that in November 2004, California voters passed Proposition 71, the California Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative. The initiative amended the California Constitution to establish the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) and authorized an average of $295 million per year for a 10-year period to fund stem cell research, to be funded from State general obligation bonds. A maximum of 10 percent of the total may be allocated to grants to build scientific and medical research facilities. Until recently, lawsuits challenging the constitutionality of the California Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative have prevented the release of CIRM funds.

It is now anticipated that CIRM funding for major capital facility projects will be available in 2008. Although final criteria for review and award of major capital facilities grants from CIRM have not yet been developed, Proposition 71 directs that priority will be given to applications that provide facilities that will be available to research no more than two years after the grant award. As a result, the Irvine campus proposes to move forward as expeditiously as possible by completing bid documents and bidding this project as a design-build competition, with award of the construction contract contingent on approval of CIRM funds.

UCI's Stem Cell Research Center is well positioned to make a major impact on stem cell research, through both basic science and derivation of potential therapeutic interventions. The Center builds upon the campus's long-standing strengths in neuroscience, developmental biology, and pharmacology, and collaborations with several Organized Research Units and Centers such as the Reeve-Irvine Research Center, the Center for Mitochondrial Medicine, the Developmental Biology Center, and the Institute for Genomics and Bioinformatics. These partnerships bring expertise, techniques, and alternative perspectives that provide a strong foundation for the new Center.

Faculty associated with the Center have a depth of expertise in the field of stem cell research – the Center co-directors are pioneers in the field who have been working with human embryonic stem cells (hESC) for ten years, and UCI faculty have published over 400 articles on stem cells in the past six years. An important focus of the Center is support of the clinical translation of discoveries at the bench into therapies at the bedside through collaborative projects among researchers, clinicians, and the biotechnology sector. Toward this end, UCI researchers are exploring potential therapeutics to address a variety of diseases and conditions, including macular degeneration, diabetes, stroke, and bone regeneration. The

campus has already been awarded $17.5 million in CIRM grant funds for research, training, and a shared laboratory.

The Stem Cell Research Center currently occupies leased space in the University Research Park adjacent to the campus. This space includes a non-federally-funded Stem Cell Core research facility that is intended to be a regional resource for other academic institutions and for the private sector.

The proposed IBRF-4 building would build upon current efforts by providing on-campus stand-alone space for the Stem Cell Core laboratory, research laboratories, clinical research space, and training facilities that would serve as a centralized hub for hESC research at UCI.

Project Description and Design

The proposed IBRF-4 building would consist of a 52,300 asf (81,575 ogsf) wet laboratory building for stem cell research that would allow the campus to avoid potential conflicts with federally funded research. The campus plan is to duplicate the design of an existing research building, Hewitt Hall, which is located directly across from the site of the proposed IRBF-4 project, thereby reducing costs and accelerating the schedule for the proposed project. Approximately 15 principal researchers and their teams would be accommodated in the building. Also included will be core facilities that would be available to researchers campuswide and to visiting investigators from other institutions and the private sector.

The proposed project would include the following:

- **Wet laboratory space**: The project would include approximately 15,000 asf of flexible wet laboratory space and 10,500 asf of associated enclosed laboratory support spaces, including tissue culture rooms, cold rooms, glasswash/sterilizer rooms. and equipment rooms. An additional 3,500 asf of laboratory space would be provided for cell biology and pharmacology core facilities.
- **General Clinical Research Center**: Approximately 2,000 asf of outpatient clinical space would be provided to accommodate clinical trials of the safety and efficacy of new cell-based treatments.
- **Vivarium**: Approximately 12,500 asf of vivarium space would be provided to support stem cell research campuswide. This facility would include animal holding and procedure rooms, cage washing facilities, and associated support spaces.
- **Office and dry research space**: Academic and research offices, conference/meeting space, and library space would total approximately 4,500 asf.
- **Administrative space**: Approximately 4,000 asf of administrative space for Center staff and support functions would also be included.

The project is planned as a four-story building, with three floors above grade and a basement, which would house the vivarium. The overall building efficiency of asf/ogsf would be 64 percent. The project would include six fume hoods per floor, with additional infrastructure capacity to add two additional fume hoods per floor in the future. The building vibration criteria of 2,200 micro inches per second would support bench research using imaging and microscopy. Laboratory utilities would include domestic hot and cold water, natural gas, vacuum, and purified water system.

Because research programs change over time, the building would be designed efficiently to accommodate these changes. Accordingly, the planning of the laboratory space is based upon an open laboratory module that can accommodate a variety of research activities. In addition, the arrangement of the laboratory, office, and support spaces within the building is intended to promote productive dialogue among the scientists, graduate students, and administrative staff.

The proposed project site is in the Health Sciences sector of the campus, east of Hewitt Hall and south of Gillespie Neurosciences Research Facility. This site is in conformance with UC Irvine's 1989 Long Range Development Plan.

A key planning and design parameter is to site the building to establish a defined edge. This defined edge will reinforce the existing pedestrian "mall" now bordered by Sprague Hall, Gillespie Neurosciences Facility, and Hewitt Hall. The building would have a recognizable and public entry fronting this pedestrian "mall." The "mall" would also serve as the fire access to the building. IBRF–4 would be sized to continue the human scale in keeping with the adjacent structures.

Building renovations would mirror those of Hewitt Hall located directly across the mall so as to provide the aesthetic continuity and create a vital urban space. The building's structure would be comprised of cast-in-place concrete shear wall elements with exterior shear walls serving as both structure and building cladding.

This project would be constructed using the design-build competition delivery method for construction. The design-build teams (bidders) will be provided with a detailed Request for Proposal, which includes the Detailed Project Program, campus design standards, the mitigation measures required in the 1989 LRDP EIR and IBRF-4 Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the project design parameters. The proposals submitted will be reviewed and scored based on program compliance; functional, economical, and aesthetically distinctive design; understanding of the scheduling and coordination of the design process and its integration with the construction activities; mobilization, demobilization and closeout plan; and experience of the design and construction team. Design approval is requested prior to bidding the project because the design-build teams would be required to duplicate the exterior design of the adjacent Hewitt Hall.

The project would be bid in fall 2007, based on the expectation that CIRM will award facilities grants in spring 2008. The project would be completed approximately 20 months after the construction contract is awarded.

Policy on Sustainable Practices

This project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability will be adopted to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. The Request for Proposal requires that the project design and LEED points comply with requirements for LEED Certified; the design-build team will bear all costs for LEED design and LEED certification. Additionally, a bid alternate is requested to specify the additional cost associated with obtaining a LEED Silver certification for this project.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the proposed IBRF-4 project to determine any potential environmental effects associated with the project. The Initial Study was tiered from the 1989 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR) and the 1995 LRDP Circulation and Open Space Amendment EIR. The Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration identified potentially significant environmental impacts from the project but concluded that implementation of LRDP EIR mitigation measures in combination with project-specific mitigation measures for Air Quality would reduce all potential impacts to below a level of significance.

A draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day review period from September 29, 2005 to October 31, 2005. Comment letters were received from the California Department of Transportation, Orange County Fire Authority, Southern California Association of Governments, Irvine Ranch Water District, County of Orange Planning and Development Department, County of Orange Clerk-Recorder, and the State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit. None of the comment letters raised any new potentially significant environmental impacts that had not already been adequately addressed in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or the LRDP EIR as amended.

Pursuant to Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, UCI further evaluated whether there has been any change in circumstances that would require that that Mitigated Negative Declaration be substantially revised and re-circulated due to the existence of any new, unavoidable significant effect. No such circumstances

were determined to exist, and no new unavoidable significant effect would occur. UCI prepared an Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration substantiating its conclusions, which is included as an attachment to the Tiered Initial Study.

Based on the impact assessment in the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, it has been determined that the proposed project, as mitigated, would not result in any significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts beyond those evaluated in the 1989 LRDP EIR as amended. Implementation of LRDP EIR mitigation measures is an ongoing program previously adopted by The Regents; implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures would be monitored in accordance with the IBRF-4 Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

Findings

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

Funding Plan

The total cost of preliminary plans is $1,882,000, which would be funded from campus ground lease revenues. The total cost of this project is estimated to be $73 million, including Groups 2 and 3 equipment. The project would be supported by gift funds and campus funds, and an application would be made for capital facilities funding from CIRM. As required by Proposition 71, applicants for CIRM grants will be required to provide a minimum of 20 percent in matching funds from other sources. The campus will satisfy this requirement with gift and campus funds. The campus would assume the risk of expending ground lease revenues for preliminary plans and not receiving a CIRM facilities grant.

Future Regental Action

Vice Chancellor Brase explained that the campus would return to The Regents to request amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program for approval of the complete budget preliminary plans (working drawings, construction and equipment) and the project funding plan.

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

13. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, TELEMEDICINE/PRIME-LC FACILITIES, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

(1) Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Approve the Design, Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities, Irvine campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2006, The Regents approved the 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements, which included the Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities project at a sum of $40,000,000, at CCCI 4890, comprised of preliminary plans ($1,993,000), working drawings ($675,000), construction ($33,782,000), and equipment ($3,550,000).

The Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities project will support new initiatives and technologies in teaching and health-care delivery by constructing a new facility of approximately 30,000 asf to house the School of Medicine's Program in Medical Education–Latino Community (PRIME-LC) and telemedicine activities, and by renovating space on campus and at the UCI Medical Center to provide telemedicine clinical space. The School of Medicine's PRIME-LC program and telemedicine initiatives are intended to increase access and improve medical care for California's underserved populations, including the Latino community and rural or remote populations. Space assignments at the School of Medicine are already at maximum capacity and additional space is needed to accommodate these new programs. No State-funded space has been provided on the main campus for the School of Medicine in nearly 30 years, and though three new research buildings in the Health Sciences sector have been completed in recent years with funding from non-State sources, the School is now facing critical instructional space shortages.

Project Site

The 0.5 acre project site is located in the existing Irvine Hall Plaza area directly south of Irvine Hall in the Health Sciences sector. The site is a relatively flat paved plaza area with landscaping at the perimeter. There are no existing structures on this site. Service access to the project site is provided via an existing service road located between Irvine Hall and Sprague Hall which ultimately connects to Bison Avenue. The project is sited in accordance with the 1989 Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The 31,000 asf (51,500 gsf) Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities is a two-part project consisting of a new building of 30,000 asf on the UCI Campus, and renovation of 1,000 asf on the main campus and at the UCI Medical Center to provide telemedicine clinical space. The new building would provide space for PRIME-LC and telemedicine, and include 16,500 asf for instructional and telemedicine facilities, 5,900 asf for research offices and computational laboratories, and 7,600 asf for academic and administrative offices. These facilities will support new initiatives and technologies in teaching and healthcare delivery.

The project is immediately adjacent to Irvine Hall and will create a defined edge to reinforce the existing pedestrian mall now bordered by Sprague, Gillespie, and Hewitt Halls. The building will have a recognizable and public entry fronting this pedestrian mall. The mall will also serve as the fire access to the building. The Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities project will continue the human scale of the adjacent structures. The project will have a footprint of approximately 17,000 square feet and will consist of approximately four floors and a partial basement. Project construction activities would involve demolition of the existing plaza improvements, site grading, utilities, site improvements, building construction, and landscaping.

This project uses the Design-Build Competition delivery method for construction of the Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities. The Design-Build Teams (bidders) are provided a detailed Request for Proposal which includes the Project Planning Guide, the Detailed Project Program, campus design standards, the mitigation measures required in the EIR which is part of the 1989 LRDP, and the project's general design. The submitted proposals will be reviewed and scored based on program compliance, functional/economical/design, understanding of the scheduling and coordination of the design process and its integration with the construction activities, mobilization/demobilization/closeout plan, and experience of the construction and design team.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will adopt the principals of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. The Request for Proposal requires the project design and LEED points to comply with requirements for LEED Certified and the Design Build Team to bear all cost for LEED design, and LEED certification. Additionally, a bid alternate is requested for the additional cost to provide the design and construction required to obtain a LEED Silver certification.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared for the proposed Telemedicine/ PRIME-LC Facilities to determine any potential environmental effects associated with the project.

The IS/MND analyzed all potential environmental impacts associated with the Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities project and identified potentially significant impacts in the following issue areas: Air Quality (potential construction related impacts) and Cultural Resources (inspections of excavations and fossil salvage). Mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND would reduce these potential impacts to below a level of significance.

A draft IS/MND was prepared and circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day review period from May 22, 2007 to June 20, 2007. Comment letters were received from the California Department of Transportation, Southern California Association of Governments, and the State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit. None of the comment letters raised any new potentially significant environmental impacts that had not already been adequately addressed in the IS/MND, and no changes were made to the IS/MND as a result of public comments.

Based on the impact assessment in the Final IS/MND, it has been determined that the proposed project, as mitigated, will not result in any significant direct, indirect, or cumulative environmental impacts. In accordance with CEQA's mitigation monitoring requirements, the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND will be monitored in accordance with the Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

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

Regent Hopkinson inquired as to the palette of the building in relation to the campus. Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson showed slides to illustrate the palette of existing buildings, which use glass and metal panels. The proposed building will have a similar façade to Sprague Hall and Gillespie Neurosciences Research Facility, which are opposite the site. The glass will have a slight green tint, the same as surrounding buildings.

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

14. **APPROVAL OF DESIGN, POLICE STATION REPLACEMENT BUILDING, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as described herein, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:

A. Find that the Police Station Replacement Building project to be Categorically Exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

B. Approve the design of the Police Station Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus.

Vice Chancellor Olsen recalled that in May 2007, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Police Station Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus in the 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements at a total project cost of $20,160,000. The total project cost will be funded from external financing.

In May 2007, the appointment of Studios Architecture of Los Angeles as executive architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

Campus Architect Averill explained that site for the proposed facility is located on the current site of the existing seismically deficient and obsolete Police Station Building, a two-story 9,261 asf (11,617 gsf) structure built in 1958. It is centrally located with respect to the general academic core campus, to on-campus student housing, to the medical center and emergency room facilities, and the campus' emergency operations command center. The site is prominently located along Westwood Boulevard at the northwest corner of the intersection with Charles Young Drive. The project is consistent with the site, planning principles, and development allocation articulated in the 2002 Long Range Development Plan. The project would use approximately 8,948 square feet of the remaining 20,000 square foot development allocation for the Campus Services zone.

Project Design

The Police Station Replacement Building is designed to contain 14,874 asf within a total area of 23,822 gsf, providing two stories of office, conference, locker/shower, telecommunications, and related support space to accommodate patrol field operations, detective and crime investigation, suspect detention,

emergency medical response, community safety assistance, and emergency communications functions. In addition, the ground floor will include covered, unenclosed parking for patrol vehicles and ambulances. Efficiency of the building stands at approximately 65 percent; if the parking is removed, the building is equivalent to 76 percent efficiency.

The building's structure is composed of steel columns and girders with wood truss joist floor structure, plywood diaphragms with concrete topping, and eccentric steel brace frames. The exterior is consistent with UCLA architectural guidelines and vision plan, using UCLA blend brick, buff-colored metal siding and buff-tone window mullions and sunshades. The building is kept to two stories to maintain airflow to the intake to the two turbine engines in the adjacent Cogeneration Plant. Parking for emergency vehicles is tucked under the second floor to provide good access and vehicular circulation. The building's entrance and eastern façade are designed to project a welcoming appearance in an expression of the department's philosophy.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will implement the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. In addition to meeting LEED equivalent policy standards, the project will seek a LEED Silver rating with an anticipated range of 33-38 points through the completion of the design and documentation phases. Green building elements include the use of high performance glazing and sun shading devices, local and regional materials, products with high-recycled content, and water saving plumbing fixtures. The design also will exceed the new Title 24 energy requirements by more than 20 percent.

The campus has conducted a peer design review, peer structural review and an independent cost review of the building design. UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Vice Chancellor for Finance, Budget, and Capital Programs will perform project oversight. Construction is scheduled to begin in March 2008 and be completed by November 2009. Separate contracts would be bid and awarded for demolition/abatement and construction of the building.

Environmental Impact Summary

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is Categorical Exempt under Class 2 CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (a) Replacement or Reconstruction, and Class 1 Section 15301 (e)(2) Existing Facilities. The project is categorically exempt pursuant to section 15302 because it involves replacement of an existing facility where the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity as the structure replaced. The replacement is needed

to provide an earthquake resistant structure for the UCLA Police Department, an essential service facility. In addition, CEQA Section 15301 exempts additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet if the project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the Long Range Development Plan. In this regard, the existing Police Station building (approximately 11,617 gsf) and adjacent surface parking area would be demolished to clear the site for construction of a new replacement Police Station of approximately 20,565 gsf with a covered and unenclosed driveway and parking area for police and emergency vehicles of approximately 3,257 gsf. The increase in square footage of the new replacement facility (not including the covered and unenclosed parking/driveway area) compared with the existing facility to be demolished, is approximately 8,948 gsf, which falls within the 10,000 gsf increase allowed under of CEQA Section 15301(e)(2).

The Police Department will not expand as a result of this project. The purpose and capacity of the facility remains the same even though the replacement building would be approximately 8,948 gsf larger in order to address the significant overcrowding and code and program deficiencies in the existing structure. The existing structure, constructed in 1958, has not received any structural upgrades since it was constructed. It has a UC seismic rating of "Poor." The replacement building would have a somewhat larger footprint but would be compatible with the adjacent structures in design, massing and set-back from the sidewalks.

The project is designed to achieve certification under the UC-equivalent LEED criteria, is consistent with the provisions of CEQA, and would not result in any potentially significant impacts on the environment. The project site is not located in an environmentally sensitive area. The project construction specifications would include standard measures to reduce air quality, noise, and traffic effects from construction activities for this relatively small project, and replace all mature trees removed. Finally, none of the Exceptions to the Exemptions articulated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply.

In February 2007, UCLA conducted a community leader meeting to present the proposed Police Station Replacement project. One community member expressed concern over the loss of a small existing landscaped area (between the sidewalk and the current Police Station building) that would result from the proposed project. In accordance with the 2002 LRDP, however, this project is consistent with planning principles concerning land use and aesthetics, and the benefits of the project (to upgrade this campus essential service facility) far outweigh removal of this small landscaped area. Removal of the landscaping would not constitute a significant environmental effect. Furthermore, in accordance with the 2002 LRDP and Campus Green Building practices, existing green space comprising substantial portions of the campus continue to be maintained and

enhanced with exceptional spatial quality for the use of the entire campus community.

Regent Hopkinson was not supportive of the design of the building, particularly given its visible location on Westwood Boulevard. She stated that the building did not communicate the same quality of design as other UCLA buildings.

Committee Chair Kozberg requested that Regent Hopkinson work with the campus architect to review the design, with the goal of assessing possible changes.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson regarding the high cost of the building, Mr. Averill stated that several features contribute to the high cost including 1) requirements that essential services buildings resist lateral loads substantially greater than ordinary buildings; 2) the siting of the building in a congested area; 3) the limitations of the height of the building due to the adjacent cogeneration plant, which has an effect on the building's efficiency; 4) substantial rerouting of communications cabling; and 5) the specialized interior.

In response to a question posed by Regent Bugay, Mr. Olsen assured the Regents that there would be no interruptions or compromises in safety during the 18 months of construction.

Upon motion duly made and seconded the Committee approved the President's recommendation, with Regent Hopkinson abstaining.

15. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SPIEKER AQUATIC CENTER, LOS ANGELES 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 on Grounds and Buildings:

A. Adopt the Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Spieker Aquatic Center, Los Angeles campus.

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

It was recalled that in March 2007, the Chairman of the Board of Regents, the Chair of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and the President approved the inclusion of the Spieker Aquatic Center, Los Angeles campus in the 2006-07

Budget for Capital Improvements at a total project cost of $11.5 million. The total project cost will be funded from gift funds ($11.5 million). At the same time, standby financing of $4,215,000 was also approved.

In April 2007, the appointment of Bauer and Wiley Architects of Newport Beach, as executive architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The proposed project is located within the Sunset Canyon Recreation Center in the northwest quadrant of the campus. This recreation area is accessed from DeNeve Drive to the east, and provides a park-like environment that contributes significantly to the quality of life on the Los Angeles campus. The swimming pool will be constructed on the site of four existing tennis courts, and the adjacent tennis court bleachers will be retained and renovated to provide spectator seating for the new competition swimming pool. The proposed project is consistent with the 2002 Long Range Development Plan site, land use planning principles, and square footage allocation for the Northwest campus zone.

Project Design

The Spieker Aquatic Center is designed to support the swimming, water polo, and diving programs for the Departments of Intercollegiate Athletics and Cultural and Recreational Affairs. The new specialty deep-water pool would measure 52 meters by 25 yards and include a 10-meter diving tower. The facility would accommodate fixed seating for approximately 400 spectators. A one-story support building of 2,000 asf (4,160 gsf) will accommodate locker/showers, operations, lifeguard, laundry, and mechanical space for pool equipment. Supplemental locker/shower capacity of an additional 1,250 asf (1,800 gsf) will be bid as an additive alternate.

Design of the pool facility will be integrated with the existing spectator seating structure, constructed of exposed concrete and wood. This seating structure will be renovated to provide an entrance for events. The support building will flank the opposite side of the pool and enclose it with concrete masonry unit and wood walls which will be covered with vines. The side walls will complete the pool enclosure and will provide security, a landscaped screen wall, internal walls for scoreboard mounting, and athletic graphic displays. The exterior will be consistent with the verdant character of Sunset Canyon and will incorporate UCLA blend brick at entrance marker piers in the landscape.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability will be implemented to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. The project

will achieve at minimum a LEED equivalency Certified rating with approximately 30 points, but the campus will strive to achieve a Silver rating through the completion of the design and documentation phases.

The campus has conducted a peer design review, peer structural review, and an independent cost review of the building design. UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Vice Chancellor for Finance, Budget, and Capital Programs will provide project oversight. Construction would commence in February 2008, with completion by January 2009.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the potential environmental effects of the proposed Spieker Aquatic Center were analyzed in an Initial Study (SCH#2007031020), dated March 2007. The Initial Study is tiered from the 2002 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (2002 LRDP EIR), certified by The Regents in February 2003.

On October 9, 2006, UCLA conducted an information meeting for community leaders to present the proposed Spieker Aquatic Center project and solicit input on the scope of environmental analysis. Primary concerns raised at that meeting involved the proposed outdoor lighting, amplified sound generated by aquatic activities and events, and the removal of mature trees. These issues were addressed in the project design and analyzed in the Initial Study. Based on the evaluation in the Initial Study, all potential impacts associated with the proposed project were found to have been adequately addressed in the 2002 LRDP EIR. Through incorporation of relevant 2002 LRDP EIR mitigation measures and continuing adherence to adopted campus practices and procedures, the project would not result in any potentially significant impacts. No additional project specific mitigation measures are required, and the project qualifies for a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA.

The Draft Initial Study was circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day public review period that concluded on April 2, 2007. The Initial Study was provided to approximately 40 interested agencies and individuals, and was available on the UCLA Capital Programs website and at two on-campus libraries. Notices were posted at the project site, and at locations proposed to accommodate mini-basketball courts proposed to replace the displaced recreation facilities. Several meetings with campus constituents concerned with the availability of tennis and basketball facilities and the impact of the relocated basketball activities on adjacent housing uses were conducted. Changes in the project were made to address student concerns related to noise, aesthetics, parking, and safety of the proposed basketball relocation. One e-mail comment letter was received during the public review period from an on-campus

housing council group requesting, among other things, that double-paned windows be installed on the housing units facing the proposed basketball location on a portion of Parking Lot 13. Given the efforts the campus has taken to minimize noise by use restrictions and proposed setbacks, provision of double panes windows would not be contemplated at the time. In the event that noise does lead to considerable interference for those units located in proximity to the proposed mini-basketball courts, further use restrictions would be implemented if necessary to mitigate noise impacts on student occupied rooms. University responses to comments are contained in the Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's less than significant impacts resulting from the project and applicable 2002 LRDP EIR mitigation measures and campus practices and procedures to further reduce those impacts.

Campus Architect Averill played an animation to illustrate the project.

In response to questions posed from Regent Allen, Mr. Averill explained that eight tennis courts and two basketball courts are currently in use in the area. The basketball courts will be relocated to two other sites, one of which is a surface parking lot. Two tennis courts will be removed from this location, but court time at this location and at the Los Angeles Tennis Center will be extended, which has the effect of increasing the overall court time available for recreation.

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

16. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SOCIAL SCIENCES AND MANAGEMENT BUILDING PROJECT, MERCED CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the UC Merced 2002 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:

A. Adopt the Findings

B. Approve the design of the Social Sciences and Management Building Project, Merced campus.

[The Findings were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

It was recalled that the Regents approved the 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements and 2006-11 Capital Improvement Program to include the project with a total project cost of $41,831,000 at CCCI 4632. In July 2006, the project received a budget inflation adjustment of the State funding to a total project cost of $43,822,000 at CCCI 4890. In the 2007-08 State budget, the project received a budget augmentation from the State of $3,700,000, along with an approval to shift $2,000,000 in equipment funds to construction funds in order to address estimated construction cost escalation over and above the adjustment indexed to the CCCI, for a revised total project cost of $47,522,000. The request for approval to augment the project budget, including the increase in State funding and the shift of equipment funding for construction, is part of a concurrent item – Approval of Amended State Capital Improvements Budget Consistent with the Final 2007-08 Budget Act.

In April 2007, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Studios Architecture, San Francisco, as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Site

The 1.5-acre site for the proposed facility is located in the campus core, bounded by Scholars Lane and Ansel Adams Road, to the southeast of the Le Grand Canal and to the northeast of the Science and Engineering Building. The site is also near the Classroom and Office Building where the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts currently has most of its space. The project is consistent with the campus 2002 Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The Social Sciences and Management Building Project is designed to contain 60,000 asf within a total area of 101,900 gsf and will include three general space types: teaching space (classrooms and class laboratories), offices, and dry research laboratories.

The three-story building is sprinklered with a cast-in-place concrete structural frame and shear walls to resist lateral forces. The exterior consists of architectural concrete, exterior cement plaster, glass, and metal. Windows will have energy efficient, "low-e" glazing with sunshades where needed. The cement plaster areas on the exterior of the Social Sciences and Management Building will be compatible in color with the nearby Science and Engineering and Classroom and Office buildings. The roof will be flat, with a parapet and an eave line that will be similar in height to, and visually compatible with, the campus' existing academic buildings.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. In addition to meeting LEED equivalent policy standards, the project will seek a LEED Silver rating of at least 33 points, and may be able to achieve a

Gold rating with 39 or 40 points. The building will take advantage of the high efficiencies of the campus Central Plant for heating and cooling, and will comply with all of the campus-wide prototype credits, which include parking limits, water-efficient landscaping, storm water handling, alternative transportation strategies, light pollution reduction, and maximizing open space. In addition, using recycled materials and locally produced materials in the construction, diverting construction waste from landfills, implementing interior air quality standards, commissioning the building systems, and using the building as a teaching tool will contribute to the LEED rating and sustainability goals.

The campus has conducted a peer design review and independent cost and structural engineering reviews of the Social Sciences and Management Building Project. The Physical Planning/Design and Construction Office, with the oversight of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, will manage this project. Construction of the project is scheduled to begin in September 2008, and completed in April 2010.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and the University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed Social Sciences and Management Building Project was analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the UC Merced Long Range Development (LRDP). The UC Merced LRDP EIR was certified by The Regents in January 2002 (State Clearinghouse # 2001021065). Volume 1 of the LRDP EIR assessed the potential environmental effects of implementation of the LRDP, identified means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the LRDP. Volume 2 of the Draft EIR analyzed the project-level environmental impacts associated with the first phase of development on the UC Merced campus (2004-05 through 2007-08 academic year), referred to as the Phase 1 Campus, which included the proposed project.

As a component of the Phase 1 Campus, the LRDP EIR analyzed the potential environmental effects of constructing a Social Science and Management Building at the proposed location and in a size consistent with the proposed project. The proposed project, as analyzed in the LRDP EIR (Volume 2, Sections 2.6.4 and 2.6.8), includes research offices for faculty and graduate students, a large lecture hall, conference and scholarly activity space (case study and team room), open class labs, department administrative and administrative support space, and a large auditorium.

As described in the LRDP EIR, implementation of the Phase 1 Campus, including the proposed project, has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. Impacts in the areas of biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils/seismicity, recreation, and traffic would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. However, even with the

implementation of mitigation measures, impacts in the following issue areas would be significant and unavoidable: aesthetics, air quality, and noise. In conjunction with certification of the LRDP EIR, The Regents adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The LRDP EIR identified the relevant mitigation measures to be implemented in connection with construction and operation of the Social Science and Management Building as part of the Phase 1 Campus. These mitigation measures will be implemented in conjunction with development of the proposed project and monitored as part of the LRDP EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the Project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding adoption of a Statement of Overriding Consideration and approval of the project in conformance with CEQA.

Associate Vice Chancellor Lollini showed slides to illustrate the building. He stated that the campus is developing one building at a time; this building will add 20 percent to the campus academic space inventory. The campus is using several key design principles to create a specific identity for the campus. The principles include the use of utilitarian architectural forms; industrial materials of concrete, metal, and glass; and simple applications for industrial buildings. He noted that the central plant, which neighbors the proposed building, has won three design awards and achieved a LEED Gold certification. In the academic core, bolder architectural compositions are being used, looking for skyline identity in some instances, as well as similar industrial materials but with more expressive applications. Spaces are being developed to mediate between the interior and exterior environments with each of the campus' projects, in part to attain a higher degree of environmental sustainability. Projects also contain multiple entries; the ground floors typically house public or semi-public functions, entered via arcades and porches along the face of the buildings. Regarding sustainability principles, the campus aims for a minimum of LEED Silver ratings; uses shaded circulation, high performing glass, and light colors; and aims for extensive natural lighting. With respect to landscaping, the campus is seeking to achieve a riparian corridor by using plantings native to the Central Valley and native landscapes along the land's edge. Groves are also planted in the large quads in order to shade the ground plane and achieve a cooler campus. The building is the first to be built along the canal, and is also situated along Main Street; it will be part of a district that focuses on the canal as distinct from the current district that focuses around the main quad.

Regent Hopkinson inquired about the color palette and how it relates to the campus palette. Mr. Lollini stated that the basic palette for Merced's academic buildings is concrete, aluminum, steel, and glass. The initial palette included terra

cotta colors; the proposed building takes this color to a deeper, darker color. Yellow will be used in the interior arcades.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the elevation labeled "North Elevation" is not as attractive as the others, and she asked that the campus put more work into the design.

Regent Hopkinson's questioned the efficiency of 59 percent asf, and wondered if it was calculated according to UC's standard practices. Committee Chair Kozberg asked Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio to work with the campus on the design and on the asf calculation, and include The Regents in the discussion.

In response to questions from Regent Allen, Mr. Lollini stated that the campus is aiming to have the building occupied by fall 2009, and that students were involved with both the design and sustainability objectives.

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

17. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION REPORT, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ENGINEERING II LIFE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND ADDITION, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to The Regents that the 2007-08 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Santa Barbara: Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $10 million, to be funded from State funds ($5 million), gift funds ($3.8 million), and campus funds ($1.2 million).

To: Santa Barbara: Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $15,375,000, to be funded from State funds ($5,000,000), gift funds ($9,175,000), and campus funds ($1,200,000).

B. Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration Report, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:

(1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Amend the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

(4) Approve the design of the Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition, Santa Barbara Campus.

[The Mitigated Negative Declaration, Findings, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and Long Range Development Plan were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

The Santa Barbara campus requested approval of an increase in the project budget of $5,375,000, to be funded with gift funds, for a total project budget of $15,375,000. The additional funding would be used to increase the size of the building addition by approximately 5,060 assignable square feet (asf) to further support the Solid State Lighting and Display Program and to address higher construction costs identified during design.

It was recalled that in November 2006, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition Project, Santa Barbara campus, in the 2007-2008 Budget for State Capital Improvements at a total project cost of $10,000,000 (at CCCI 4890) to be funded by State, gift, and campus funds.

In February 2007, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Studios Architecture of Los Angeles as the Executive Architect for this project.

The Engineering II building, constructed in 1986, is a three-story instructional and research building that houses portions of four departments of the College of Engineering. A major component of the project involves life safety. The existing fire alarms are deficient and must be upgraded. Installation of sprinklers throughout the building also is required to accommodate the rapid increase in research requiring highly flammable material. The project would install a new integrated fire alarm and sprinkler system in the Engineering II building.

As part of the project, an addition to the Engineering II building would be constructed to support the growing needs of the Solid State Lighting and Display Program (SSLD). Led by Professor Shuji Nakamura, the 2006 Millennium Technology Prize Winner, the program has become an industry leader and is recognized for discoveries involving solid-state lighting and light-emitting diodes. The focus of the program is on advancement of new semiconductor-based energy-efficient lighting and display technology through industry partnerships.

The project as approved in November 2006 would provide an addition to the Engineering II building of approximately 8,400 asf of space, including research laboratory and office space, academic and administrative office and support space, and limited renovations and the upgrade of existing building fire safety systems.

Opportunity for Increased Funding and Project Scope

In January 2007, Mr. Nakamura and his colleagues in the SSLD program announced a major research breakthrough and, in February, they demonstrated the world's first nonpolar blue-violet laser diodes. The nonpolar blue-violet laser diodes have numerous commercial applications, including high-density optical data storage for high definition displays and video, optical sensing, and medical applications. Because of the shorter wavelength of emission in these devices, they can accommodate higher densities of optical storage than conventional red-laser based systems.

The mounting successes of the SSLD program have resulted in increased availability of gift funding that would allow the campus to enlarge the size of the proposed addition to the Engineering II building, providing much-needed additional new space for the expanding research program. The original proposal for 8,400 asf of new construction was defined by the available budget and supported a limited expansion and consolidation of the SSLD operations; however, it was not expected to meet completely the space needs for the rapidly growing research program. With the additional gift funding, the new construction could be increased by approximately 5,060 asf of space, for a total of 13,460 asf.

Increasing the amount of new construction would provide the following benefits:

- The SSLD program would obtain an additional 3,975 asf of research laboratory and office space, and academic office and support space.

- A classroom (1,085 asf) located on the third floor of the existing building would be relocated to the first floor addition, providing modernized teaching space that is more easily accessible to students.

- The space released in the existing building by the classroom would be reconfigured to accommodate offices that would be impacted and displaced with the creation of the building connections between the existing building and the new addition. During the schematic design phase, the campus discovered that the work to make the building connections would be more intrusive than originally anticipated. Based on pre-design studies, it was expected that approximately 1,800 gross square feet (gsf) of the existing building would be renovated in order to provide these connections, including construction of new fire-rated corridors and walls. After more detailed analysis and design, it became clear that

additional assignable space in the existing building would be affected – specifically the third-floor classroom and offices on the second and third floors. Approximately 1,640 asf of existing space must be renovated in order to relocate the offices; this will be funded by the additional gifts.

- The larger space program provides for a more efficient building design and maximizes the site.

- The availability of additional gift funds also is an opportunity for the campus to address additional project costs that were identified during the schematic design phase.

- The life-safety component of the project remains unchanged; however, with completion of more detailed studies during design, it was discovered that the density of the existing ceilings and plenum for pipe and conduit routes was greater than anticipated, making the installation of the new integrated fire alarm and sprinkler system more complicated.

- A site-specific soils report for the new construction area indicated weaker soil conditions than anticipated, which will result in additional costs for the building structural system for the new building addition.

Additional gift funds of $5,375,000 are available that would be used to increase the square footage of the addition, renovate additional space in the existing building, address market condition impacts, and fund other increases in costs that were identified during design. There is no change in the amount of State funding.

Financial Feasibility

The total project cost is $15,375,000 (at CCCI 4890) to be funded from State funds ($5,000,000), gift funds ($9,175,000), and campus funds ($1,200,000). As of June 28, 2007, the receipt of gifts was as follows:

Gifts in Hand:	$7,350,000
Gifts Pledged:	$1,825,000
Gifts to be Raised:	$ 0
Total Gifts:	$9,175,000

In compliance with Regents' policy, all funds necessary to complete construction will be in hand prior to issuing the project for bid. The campus will backstop the gift funds as necessary.

Project Site

The site for the proposed addition is located in the northeast corner of the main campus. The site is bounded on the north by the Engineering Science Building; to

the east by Parking Structure Lot 10 and Kohn Hall; and to the south by a service road and bike path which form the site boundary (beyond which is the Materials Research Laboratory). The Campus Green open space forms the western site boundary. The Addition is located in the southwest corner of the existing Engineering II Building.

Project Design

The Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition project provides a total 15,100 asf within a total gross area of 21,707 gsf in a three-story structure. Approximately 2,680 gsf of existing Engineering II space, including 1,640 asf, will be renovated to convert vacated classroom space into office space and to provide the necessary building connections to the addition. The program includes classroom space, research laboratory and office space, and academic and administrative office and support space for the SSLD program.

The Life Safety Improvement component of the project consists of installing an integrated fire alarm and fire sprinkler system in the existing Engineering II building to meet current California Building and Fire Codes.

The addition fills in the southwest corner of the existing Engineering II building, and will establish internal connections between the existing building and the addition. The first floor consists of classroom and office space. The second and third floors contain the SSLD research laboratories and academic and administrative office and support space. The foundation system is comprised of drilled piles with grade beams under a reinforced concrete slab on grade floor. The vertical structure is steel columns with steel braced frames to provide lateral support for the building. Exterior finish materials include sandstone, cemetitious plaster, glass curtain wall, and windows with low-e glass. The building will provide views of the Campus Green to the west and some ocean views to the east.

The project will comply with the *University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices*. As required by this policy, the project will implement the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. In addition to meeting LEED equivalent policy standards, the project will seek a LEED Silver rating of at least 33 points.

Green building elements include protected punched window openings to allow users maximum opportunity for natural light and view while simultaneously controlling solar heat gain, especially important from the south and the west. The solar shades at the window openings will help to bring indirect natural lighting into the offices. Generally, all lighting will be indirect fluorescent lighting. Rooms will be equipped with occupancy sensors to help minimize energy waste and light pollution. Recycled content, regional located, and low-emitting materials are being reviewed for use as interior finishes. The vegetation around

the building is being chosen for water efficiency (no irrigation needed) as well as aesthetics. Lastly, an erosion and sedimentation control plan will be implemented during the construction phase and a percentage of demolition debris from the site will be diverted from landfills and incinerators.

The design of the Engineering II Addition has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by the campus Design Review Committee and an independent design review team, including cost consultant Davis Langdon Adamson. Independent structural review is being conducted at each stage of project development by Degenkolb Structural Engineers.

The campus Office of Design and 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. Project oversight will be performed by the Director of Design and Construction Services. Construction will begin in April 2008 and completion is anticipated for September 2009.

LRDP Amendment

The proposed project is in conformance with the land use designation in the 1990 LRDP; however, an LRDP amendment is required by the California Coastal Commission to revise LRDP Figure 16 and Table D. The amendment is to allow further construction on the site; the construction will result in a transfer of 7,200 square feet of site area and 13,500 asf from potential building location number 23 to create potential building location number 40 for the building addition.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the campus prepared a Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), to consider potential environmental effects due to construction of the Engineering II Life Safety Improvements and Addition project and LRDP Amendment.

The Draft IS/MND concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of proposed mitigation measures: air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise. The other impact areas were all found to have less than significant impacts or no impacts.

A Draft IS/MND was circulated for a 30-day public review period from May 11, 2007 to June 9, 2007, in accordance with CEQA and for a six week public review period ending on June 23, 2007, in accordance with the California Coastal Act §13515 for LRDP amendments and subsequent California Coastal Commission review. Copies of the Draft IS/MND were made available at one on-campus and

two community libraries, and were distributed to interested agencies, groups, and individuals. Three comment letters were received on the Draft IS/MND. The comment letters received and responses are included in the Final IS/MND. The comments addressed the following: potential Native American cultural resources and process for consultation; air pollution concerns form Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control district; and compensation for fire and life safety services from the Santa Barbara Fire Department.

All impacts following mitigation would be reduced to a less than significant level. While the proposed project is consistent with the land use designations identified in the LRDP, an amendment to LRDP Figure 16 and Table D is required, as discussed above.

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 IS/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

In response to a question posed by Regent Hopkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher stated that the sunshade on the windows is being used both to shade the glass below, which is clear, and to act as a light shelf to bounce light into the building.

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

18. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, J. CRAIG VENTER INSTITUTE, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.

C. Approve the design of the J. Craig Venter Institute, San Diego campus.

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

It was recalled that at the March 2006 meeting of the Committee on Finance, the San Diego campus briefed The Regents about its plans to affiliate with and to ground lease a campus site to the J. Craig Venter Institute (JCVI).

The JCVI proposes to construct, own, occupy, and operate, under a proposed long-term ground lease, a 45,000 gsf facility on Parcel 4 of the Scripps Upper Mesa, a UCSD Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) neighborhood identified in the UCSD Master Plan Study as part of the Marine Sciences academic corridor. The site is designated for academic use in the 2004 Long Range Development Plan.

The Venter Institute is a private, not-for-profit research institute dedicated to the advancement of the science of genomics, and its research activities are consistent with the programmatic vision established for this neighborhood.

Specific terms of the ground lease will be submitted to the Committee on Finance for the November 2007 meeting. Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration with approval of design will also support the Ground Lease action by the Committee on Finance.

Project Site

The specific site was selected because of the strong collaborative relationships between JCVI and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Cal IT2), and the UCSD Cancer Center. The Scripps Upper Mesa is a portion of the UCSD SIO and consists of four parcels totaling 7.9 acres bounded by Torrey Pines Road on the east, the campus' Park Ecological Reserve on the west, North Torrey Pines Road on the north, and a City of San Diego owned soccer field on the south.

The site for the proposed facility consists of approximately 1.8 acres located on the southernmost side of the Scripps Upper Mesa. The site can accommodate the proposed project without compromising the view corridors, setbacks, or the building design guidelines that were developed in the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Upper Mesa neighborhood planning study. Selection of the southernmost site for this project would allow the campus to build on the remaining three, contiguous parcels without being separated by a ground-leased facility.

Project Design

The proposed building is envisioned to have approximately 27,000 asf and 45,000 gsf and consists of two wings. The south wing would be one story above a parking garage and would contain the research and digital laboratories with a mechanical mezzanine above. The north wing would consist of three stories on the east, terraced down to one story on the west, all above the garage. The north wing would contain offices and meeting spaces. A partial below-grade, naturally ventilated parking garage for 112 parking spaces would be constructed at the lowest levels.

The structure would consist of a heavy timber frame with concrete decks. The exterior skin would be composed of certified wood cladding, glass curtain wall, and architectural concrete. Photovoltaic panels would form a continuous south facing canopy/roof over the laboratory wing and the open courtyard.

The building is planned to reflect JCVI's leadership in sustainable design, and as such, is being designed with the target of achieving a Platinum Plus LEED Rating (more than 69 points) along with the goal of being the first carbon neutral laboratory building in the world. JCVI plans to achieve zero energy consumption from the city power grid and utilize photovoltaic panels and a small wind turbine, both of which will be incorporated into the architecture of the building. To protect the adjacent ecological reserve from runoff and to minimize the use of city water, the project design incorporates rain water retention and collection along with treatment of waste water.

In accordance with the University's policy, the UCSD Design Review Board has reviewed and approved the design. The University will provide inspection services in conjunction with the State Fire Marshall. The Office of Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project for the campus. Independent testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction, will perform oversight during construction. Construction is proposed to begin in January 2008 and be completed in August 2009.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared for the J. Craig Venter Institute project. The proposed IS/MND is tiered from the San Diego Campus 2004 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR). The proposed IS/MND was prepared and circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day public review from May 10, 2007 and ending June 8, 2007. Fourteen comment letters were received during public review. Issues raised included: site access and traffic conflict on Torrey Pines Road,

neighborhood compatibility of an institutional use near residential use, adequacy of parking, hydrology (use of rainwater for building use vs. maintaining water source for downstream ecological area), Native American monitoring of excavation and curation of artifacts from previous excavations, biological monitoring, and the compatibility of the use with the LRDP land use designation. Responses to Comments are in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration. Based on the IS/MND, the University concluded that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. A summary of the project impacts and mitigation requirements is included in the Findings. Based on the information contained in the record, including the IS/MND and the 2004 LRDP EIR, there is no substantial evidence that the project as mitigated will have a significant effect on the environment.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts and associated mitigation measures.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor Hellmann stated that Craig Venter was one of the co-discoverers of the mapping of the human genome, and a UCSD graduate. The building will be the first of four buildings constructed on the site.

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

19. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, UNIVERSITY HOUSE MEETING CENTER AND CHANCELLOR RESIDENCE, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio reviewed the San Diego campus' proposal to demolish the 57-year-old University House, which has been vacated due to significant facility and code deficiencies, and construct a new 10,800 gsf University House Meeting Center and Chancellor Residence on the existing site.

It was recalled that in July 2006, an amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program was approved at a total of $7,852,000 at CCCI 4907 with a construction cost of $342 per gsf. In December 2006, the appointment of the San Diego firm of Wallace E. Cunningham, Inc. was approved within the Office of the President.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hellmann presented the preliminary design for the proposed University House Meeting Center and Chancellor Residence scheduled to be submitted for design approval at the Committee's September 2007 meeting. The project would provide public space that would be used to host a variety of University academic and community outreach and development activities, and

provide private living quarters for the Chancellor. Slides were shown to illustrate the project.

Mr. Hellmann explained that the campus is facing two issues with regards to the project. The first involves an archaeological issue; the site is a known Indian burial ground, and the campus is being sensitive to those issues. The campus is trying to set the house within the confines of the existing residence, so that the disturbances made to the site relative to any archaeological issues are minimized. The second issue is the historic aspect of the existing University house, and the La Jolla Historical Society has made an application to list it on the State register. Part of the deconstructed adobe walls of the previous residence would be used as garden walls for a series of outdoor gardens and terraces.

The campus hopes to attain a LEED Silver rating on the project.

Regent Bugay noted his concern about the archeological issues associated with the site. He inquired as to what effect the listing of the building on the State Historical Register would have on the project. Mr. Hellmann explained that, under the State Historic Designation, the campus would have to go through specific procedures and processes in order to alter the facility. It could include, for example, a thorough historic evaluation of the property with photographic and video documentation; it does not necessarily prevent its demolition.

Regent Hopkinson inquired about what will be done to prevent the deterioration of the wooden beams that project outside the building. Mr. Hellman stated that the intent is to flash the beams with metal to prevent entraining and water collection.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff