

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**

January 15, 2008

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at Covell Commons, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Allen, Bugay, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Ruiz, and Schilling; Advisory members Croughan and Shewmake

In attendance: Regent-designate Scorza, Faculty Representative Brown, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Hume, Executive Vice President Lapp, Vice President Sakaki, Chancellors Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, and Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 11:20 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2007 were approved.

2. **CONSENT ITEM**

A. *Amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program, Tercero South Student Housing, Phase II, Davis campus*

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

Davis: Tercero South Student Housing, Phase II – preliminary plans – \$1.6 million to be funded from housing reserves.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

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

3. **ANNUAL REPORT ON SUSTAINABILITY POLICY**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Kozberg thanked the students for their advocacy campaign for sustainability, which has made the University look stellar in this field.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio began his presentation of the fourth annual report on the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices with a definition of sustainability from the June 2003 Regents meeting: “Sustainability refers to the physical development and institutional operating practices that meet the needs of present users without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs...” Mr. Bocchicchio outlined the development of the UC Sustainability Policy, beginning in December 2002, when students brought the matter to the University’s attention, and to the Regents’ attention through the Student Regent. The Policy was developed and guidelines were made public in June 2004. Since then the Policy has been expanded.

Mr. Bocchicchio then turned to accomplishments for 2007. He first observed that, while the University has made tremendous progress in a short period of time, the UC sustainability program is still in its infancy. The University is a national leader, but to maintain this leadership position, it needs to push its programs forward quickly.

Mr. Bocchicchio discussed UC green building projects. Sixty-five new construction projects are under way under the Policy; of these, 36 have a Silver or higher rating. Of 15 renovation projects under the Policy, six have a Silver or higher rating. Forty-seven new construction projects which were approved before the Policy was instituted have voluntarily adopted green building goals; of these, 14 have a Silver or higher rating.

The Policy goal for energy efficiency in new buildings is to outperform the State Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings by 20 percent. Mr. Bocchicchio described this as a very ambitious goal. The University is helped in this effort by the California Savings by Design program. In this program, investor-owned utilities will assist designers and campuses with whole building analysis and life cycle costing. During building design, attention to energy efficiency enters into every decision that is made. Thus far, 180 projects, about 15 million square feet, have been processed through this program. The University and its consultants have received \$5.1 million in projected incentives from the utilities for participating in this program. The projected savings from the program will be \$6 million annually.

In order to improve energy efficiency in existing buildings, the University, along with the California State University (CSU), applied for grant money from the

Public Utilities Commission through its investor-owned utilities and has received \$16 million in two grants for campus energy retrofit projects. This effort has yielded additional savings of \$7 million annually. A systemwide strategic energy plan is now in progress. Each campus is developing its own energy plan to identify even more retrofit projects. The goal is to identify at least \$500 million in additional energy retrofit projects. The Policy goal is to reduce energy consumption in existing buildings by 10 percent over the next decade. The investor-owned utilities have tentatively agreed to increase the grant level, to fund up to about 60 percent of the cost of these projects. The University will make its submittals for these projects in late spring. In addition, the California Energy Commission has renewed a \$3 million grant for demonstrating new technologies.

Next Mr. Bocchicchio turned to onsite generation and procurement of renewable energy. The Policy goal is to establish ten megawatts of renewable projects at the campuses in the next decade and to meet the State's renewable portfolio goal of 20 percent green power by 2010. The University's electricity contract now includes 18 percent in renewable energy sources. At UCSC, 100 percent of the campus' electricity is supplied from renewable energy. The development of solar power is moving more slowly, since it is still at the margin of economic viability, but UC is proceeding with solar power projects. Mr. Bocchicchio cited projects at UCB, UCSF, and UCSD. At UCSF, a parking structure will be fitted with photovoltaic panels, and small systems are being installed at UCSD. Requests for Proposals continue to be issued.

Addressing the significant concern about climate change, Mr. Bocchicchio informed the Committee that eight campuses have joined the California Climate Action Registry, a third party that monitors greenhouse gas emissions of companies and organizations. UCB has completed a climate action plan with the goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2014; Mr. Bocchicchio commended the Berkeley campus for pursuing this target, which is more ambitious than that set by UC policy.

The Policy has been expanded to include sustainable transportation practices. Carbon dioxide emissions from the UC fleet have been reduced by four percent. A business case analysis for parking structures has been drafted to consider the impact of these structures on the environment. In 2007, the Irvine campus received Best Practice Awards, awarded by UC in conjunction with CSU, for its 100 percent biodiesel shuttle bus fleet and increased ridership. Other notable efforts include the UCSC car share program and the UCLA campus-airport bus shuttle.

Another area of effort is sustainable operations of the University's physical plant. By July 2008, all campuses are to submit at least one building for certification through the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) for Existing Buildings program. UCSB and the Office of the President (UCOP) have both already received LEED Existing Building Silver ratings for their operations and

maintenance. UCSB plans to certify 25 buildings through this process over the next five years; UCM plans to certify all its buildings.

In the area of recycling and waste management, one of the University's goals, in accordance with state law, is to divert waste from landfills by 50 percent by 2008, and by 75 percent by 2012. Mr. Bocchicchio pointed out the differing diversion rates by campus. He expressed confidence that the University's administrative structure provides oversight and enables communication among campuses to ensure implementation and achievement of the 75 percent diversion goal by 2012.

Another new area included in the Policy is procurement. Vendors are required to track UC sustainable product purchases. Sustainability training and education are offered at vendor fairs. Sustainable product offerings are now available in 17 strategically sourced contract areas. All office equipment must now be ENERGY STAR certified. Mr. Bocchicchio called attention to the fact that 30-percent recycled content paper is now cheaper than virgin paper through the University's procurement processes.

Mr. Bocchicchio pointed out that UC's sustainability program is remarkable for its quick success. He attributed this success to the concerted involvement and commitment of many stakeholders; students, faculty, staff, industry, and government. There are now sustainability committees at all ten campuses. The Berkeley campus is funding 25 student interns working on sustainability projects. UCB students passed a fee referendum to support sustainability projects. Mr. Bocchicchio cited the efforts of UCSC students, faculty, and staff to transform the campus dining services as another example of how cooperation is advancing this program.

The Policy also includes training and development. Mr. Bocchicchio noted the success of the sixth annual sustainability conference, involving UC, CSU, and the community colleges. The conference at Santa Barbara had over 850 attendees and was the largest higher education conference on sustainability ever. Best Practice Awards are granted at these conferences in order to spread knowledge. At UCOP, the Project Management Institute offered 20 energy efficiency training sessions last year, training over 250 staff participants.

The University has received significant external recognition for its efforts. During the last year, UC sustainability initiatives were mentioned in 75 news stories, including articles in national news media. The University won 14 sustainability awards in 2007 and was recognized as a leader in all higher education sustainability rankings.

Looking to the future, Mr. Bocchicchio affirmed the University's commitment to meeting its goals in all seven Policy sections and to maintaining its leadership position. He noted that UC will consider raising its green building target from Silver to Gold and its minimum standard requirement from Certified to Silver.

These higher standards might be made possible by improvements in technology, and by the fact that engineers and architects are becoming more familiar with the design of sustainable buildings. During the next year, the University will also develop a proposal for guidelines on sustainable food systems, thus adding to the Policy.

Mr. Bocchicchio ended his presentation with a quote from Bob Sipchen, *Sierra Magazine* editor-in-chief: “When such a large and important educational institution takes such significant, systemic steps toward addressing global warming, it can’t help but influence the thinking of many tens of thousands of students. If students carry these strong environmental values back to their communities and into their careers, UC’s initiative will reverberate globally.” Mr. Bocchicchio invited questions and introduced Sustainability Manager Matthew St. Clair.

Committee Chair Kozberg called upon Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths to read a statement by Regent Garamendi:

“I regret that due to conflicts in my schedule, I am unable to attend today’s presentation of the annual sustainability report.

I want to reiterate my strong support for the UCOP’s commitment to creating a truly sustainable UC system. I commend the dedicated staff members who have made sustainability a high priority in UC’s operations, and have moved forward in making that priority a reality. In my view the mission of the University demands that we lead in this area.

While we take pride in what we have already accomplished, UC can and should do more. That means accelerating our efforts and strengthening and expanding our policies and practices. As you consider the report presented today, I respectfully request your consideration of the following:

- While UC has made significant strides in green design, we must do better by adopting LEED Silver as the minimum standard for new and refurbished buildings. Adopting such standards is an essential first step in considering full life cycle costs for all projects the University undertakes. Additionally, certification through the U.S. Green Building Council is critical to maintaining UC’s credibility in sustainable leadership.
- I would urge UC to adopt ambitious energy conservation goals and hold Chancellors responsible for meeting these goals at their respective campuses. Such an accountability structure will serve to hasten the difficult work of appropriately metering and accounting for energy consumption at various parts of the system. As you all know, Governor Schwarzenegger in 2004 directed state agencies to “reduce grid-based energy purchases for state-owned buildings by 20 percent by 2015.” In light of this goal, UC’s goal to

reduce *growth-adjusted* energy consumption from 2000 levels by 10 percent by 2014 seems less ambitious.

- Renewed focus on procuring renewable energy is warranted. Currently, I believe without Santa Cruz's leadership in purchasing credits, our profile and progress toward our goals would appear less impressive.
- I am confident that UC will be quick to comply with the new California Air Resources Board rules for reporting greenhouse gas emissions.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to UC's continued leadership in sustainability and environmental responsibility.

Sincerely,

John Garamendi  
Lieutenant Governor."

Regent Ruiz expressed enthusiasm and support for UC's sustainability efforts, but asked about the cost of sustainability to the UC system. He asked what percentage of the overall UC budget is devoted to the sustainability program and expressed concern about the return on the University's investment in sustainability, suggesting that there should be a better way to measure efficiencies and savings. He acknowledged that this is a complex task, but emphasized that, as the cost of sustainability programs increases, there must be a corresponding increase in the savings to UC. He noted the higher cost of organic foods, around 30 percent, and asked who is paying this cost. He emphasized that UC's sustainability program must be practical and benefit everyone, and that the University needs a better method of measuring performance.

Regent Ruiz also noted the grants received by UC from utility companies and observed that these companies do not make the same effort to encourage efficiencies in private residences or businesses. He asked why the University is receiving a better return on this investment than business and the private sector.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that the additional cost for new green construction is difficult to determine. Based on the best information available, he estimated that moving from the Certified to Silver rating represents a cost of between zero and one percent; a move from Certified to Gold represents an increase of two to four percent in cost, while moving to Platinum certification might involve an increase of seven or eight percent. He stressed that these are moving targets due to changes in technology and design proficiency. The University has been proceeding cautiously and is considering raising its standards another notch this year. This caution is based on the fact that even a fraction of a percent of UC's \$7.6 billion capital program is a significant amount of money. Mr. Bocchicchio opined that time and technology are working in the University's favor. He stated

that the University is monitoring its energy costs, comparing investment in retrofit against yield, and conducting similar tracking in many areas. Some areas will perform better economically than others; some areas are experimental. He observed that students have been willing to increase their fees slightly to pay for green power. He assured the Committee that the University has moved very cautiously with a balanced approach that considers both economics and the intention of the program.

Regent Allen expressed the hope that more public and press attention could be drawn to the University's leadership role in sustainability. He recalled the Focus the Nation educational events being held at UC campuses and invited the Regents to attend. Mr. Allen observed that UC's leadership role will become ever more necessary as energy costs rise. He opined that investment in climate action will benefit UC both financially and morally. Noting the potential savings in green building design, he requested that the project proposals submitted to the Regents contain more information on cost issues related to energy, and that this information be highlighted. Mr. Allen expressed support for an additional Policy section on sustainable food systems and looked forward to updates on that topic. He observed that climate change presents unique issues for each campus, but that all must progress toward agreed-upon systemwide goals. He applauded UCB's efforts and expressed concern that only two campuses, UCB and UCSC are forming high level climate action steering committees. He asked which other campuses are on course to meet the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) deadlines to assemble campus steering committees.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that the campuses have signed on to this agreement. Mr. St. Clair added that five of the campuses have submitted reports to ACUPCC on the institutional structure they have or are establishing to develop climate action plans. There is a systemwide climate change working group, and the Berkeley campus has been sharing its plan and experiences.

Regent Allen commended the University's move toward higher green building standards and described administrative streamlining at UCSB and UCM in collaboration with the U.S. Green Building Council, which includes use of a prototype to standardize the LEED certification process for all new construction and to cut administrative and other costs. He asked why the University is not using the Council to certify projects, when doing so would have a positive influence on government and public relations.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that UC does use the U.S. Green Building Council. There are a number of projects that go directly to the Council for LEED certification. When the program started, due to cost and efficiency considerations and to facilitate implementation of the program, campuses were offered two means of certification, through UC or through the U.S. Green Building Council. He observed that the U.S. Green Building Council program has changed; it was

not previously as attuned to campus building projects as it was to other types of buildings. UC wished to establish baseline points to simplify the process, taking advantage of features found on every campus. Thus a campus may have 20 or 22 baseline points which do not have to be established for each new project. Mr. Bocchicchio observed that the U.S. Green Building Council is now following the University's lead, and that, in the future, more campuses may choose to pursue certification through the U.S. Green Building Council rather than through UC. He noted that the first audit of a new building completed under UC's equivalency program will take place during the next month and establish the certification of that building. He anticipated that more projects will be certified by the U.S. Green Building Council as it becomes more cost effective and efficient to do so.

Mr. St. Clair informed the Committee that 11 buildings have been LEED certified through the U.S. Green Building Council, two of those at the Platinum level, and three at the Gold level. Of the 80 projects complying with the Policy, 14 are to be submitted to the U.S. Green Building Council. Of the 48 projects which were approved before the Policy was instituted, 24 plan to be or have been certified by the U.S. Green Building Council.

Regent Allen asked which campuses have begun efforts to develop pilot projects under the LEED Existing Building program.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that all campuses have a project in progress, but that the campuses are at different stages. UCOP is facilitating the process through sharing best practices with all campuses. The projects are being monitored, and there is a deadline.

Regent Allen noted that he may prepare a resolution for the next Regents meeting in response to this report.

Faculty Representative Croughan observed that the sustainability program includes several areas of activity: recycling, transportation, green building, and energy use. She pointed out the variability among the campuses, in that each campus performs well in some areas, but not in others. She asked about the ranking or prioritization of the different elements of UC's sustainability program.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that the University is attempting to move forward in all areas; there is no ranking or perceived order. Within reasonable limits, every area is being pursued on every campus.

Regent Schilling expressed concern that funds spent on green building projects might result in neglect of necessary seismic work on campus buildings.

Mr. Bocchicchio stressed that the seismic safety program has been one of the University's highest priorities since 1975. He noted significant progress since



that time in correcting seismically deficient buildings and added that seismic safety is an ongoing part of the capital program for the next five years. He emphasized that seismic safety is a very high priority for UC; the sustainability programs are not competing per se with the seismic safety program.

Regent-designate Scorza cited projects that will allow savings in energy consumption. He asked if there are adjustment measures that take future growth and increased energy consumption into account, and expressed concern that UC's sustainability projects might not be ambitious enough.

Mr. St. Clair explained that the University measures the amount of energy it uses on a gross square foot basis to benchmark buildings and compare performance. UC also measures its overall spending on buildings. As there is a utility budget deficit, UC has a strong motivation to reduce energy costs. The University's climate protection policy goals are not growth-adjusted, but goals related to energy use in buildings are. The University recognizes that it must reduce overall energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions even as it grows and expands.

Regent-designate Scorza asked if prioritizing these projects would result in additional savings. Mr. St. Clair responded in the affirmative, adding that, if the University succeeds in implementing the \$500 million energy efficiency program with funding by investor-owned utilities, it can keep energy costs stable or even reduce them.

Regent Bugay cited cost considerations as an impediment to greater use of solar energy, but noted the 18-kilowatt solar project at UCSD and proposed solar projects on other campuses of up to one megawatt or more, a substantial increase. He identified the cost issue as essential in the implementation of solar projects and referred to a likely future tipping point or shift in cost, when the estimated future cost of current energy sources will be higher than alternatives. He asked about the current state of this process, citing the tremendous promise of solar energy for the state, country, and University. Mr. Bugay expressed concern that the development of solar energy and self-sufficiency is not a greater part of UC's sustainability agenda.

Mr. Bocchicchio responded that use of solar energy is still marginal in many cases. The University continues to solicit proposals and monitors each project to see if projects are becoming more cost-effective. The University is actively testing the marketplace through the current projects. Mr. Bocchicchio anticipated that solar technology will justify itself and that the situation will change as the cost of energy rises. He acknowledged that solar energy development was lagging somewhat behind other sustainability programs, but affirmed that the University is moving in the right direction.

4. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR LAW BUILDING INFILL AND SCHOOL OF LAW PLANNING OVERVIEW, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

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

Berkeley: Law Building Infill – preliminary plans – \$2.6 million to be funded from funds available to the Dean of the UC Berkeley School of Law.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice Chancellor Denton explained that the presentation was a request for Preliminary plan (P) phase funding for the Infill Project at Boalt Hall on the Berkeley campus. He introduced Dean Christopher Edley, of the UC Berkeley School of Law, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Project Management Robert Gayle.

Dean Edley began the presentation by explaining the specific campus location of the proposed building and its overall structure, with one floor above ground and two floors underground. Mr. Edley observed that facilities at the law school are remarkably substandard relative to other law schools in the U.S. This view is shared by students, faculty, and accreditation committees that have visited the campus. One of his priorities as dean is to address this deficiency and strengthen the law school by increasing its physical space.

Mr. Edley noted that the law school’s strategic plan includes a mission and a number of specific investment items. Most of the school’s key investment items require additional space, in particular the goal of improving the student-faculty ratio. Mr. Edley informed the Committee that the school is more than half way toward its target of a 40-percent increase in core faculty. This increase will bring the school to the median of student-faculty ratios for the top fifteen law schools, as of five years ago. When Mr. Edley came to Berkeley three-and-a-half years ago, the student-faculty ratio had declined to 128<sup>th</sup> among the 200 American Bar Association (ABA)-accredited law schools in the U.S. Faculty expansion is a critical need. The school’s interdisciplinary research centers also require more space. These centers are an important part of the school’s strategy for ensuring its leadership in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, expressing its uniquely public mission, and demonstrating its value.

Mr. Edley emphasized the importance of improving the quality of the student and faculty experience. Renovation projects already under way have improved

substandard conditions. Some classrooms have been fixed after 35 years of neglect; similarly, the ventilation system had not been fixed for 50 years. These renovation activities have produced value for students in the near term and are appreciated.

The Infill Project is not in fact the school's first choice. The first preference, previously brought before the Regents in conjunction with the southeast campus improvement plan for Berkeley, would have been to construct a substantial building in the parking lot behind Boalt Hall together with the Haas School of Business; this building would serve as a physical and intellectual bridge linking the two schools. This option was investigated and a model produced for it. However, the British Petroleum award to the campus last year for the Energy Biosciences Institute includes a commitment to use Calvin Laboratory, which makes the site unavailable until the laboratory is dismantled.

Given the urgency of the need for space, the school wishes to act now and build on the parking lot at a later time; it is not abandoning the vision of the proposed joint building, but making a change in the sequence of planned projects. Other options have been considered, including construction along Piedmont Avenue or Gayley Road across from Memorial Stadium. This would involve tearing down one of older buildings on the site. Environmental, preservation, and legal issues make the site too problematic to be considered. Mr. Edley suggested that the site might become important to the campus and the law school in a more distant future.

The law school's preferred solution for financing the Infill Project would be to find a generous donor. The school continues to search for donors and solicits suggestions. In the meantime the project must proceed. Given the escalating cost of construction, waiting until significant funding for the building is available would inflate the project cost by millions of dollars. As an alternative, the project can be funded from professional degree fees. The school will continue to raise money to fund the building and use this money to pay down the debt, or invest it in a fund functioning as an endowment to take advantage of the greater return. Mr. Edley described this financing strategy as economically sensible and prudent from a business perspective.

Next Mr. Edley presented an overview of the law school's integrated financial plan, with the investment items needed to realize the school's overall goals and the corresponding required investment amounts, expressed either as endowments or as annual cash flow. As an example, the strategy envisions an expansion of financial aid equivalent to an endowment of approximately \$96 million or an annual increase in expenditure of \$3.85 million. The total budget target is either to raise \$590 million in new endowments, or to raise \$27 million annually in additional cash flow, or some combination of the two. The cost of new building construction is estimated at \$90 million in project cost or \$7 million in annual

cash flow. The school proposes to finance this annual \$7 million with professional degree fees.

Mr. Edley pointed out the school's strategy for funding each investment item with a different combination of professional degree fees, alumni fundraising, and campus 19900 funds. He affirmed the school's view that this proposal does not use too much of the professional degree fee increase, \$7 million of a \$14.8 million total, for the Infill Project. In the benchmark fiscal year 2013, servicing the project debt will require less than one quarter of the professional degree fee revenues; in the same year, it will require less than 50 percent of the marginal professional degree fee increase approved by the Regents at the September 2007 meeting. Thus the school is pledging half of its professional fee increases toward this project.

Mr. Edley then discussed the law school's current energetic fundraising efforts. The number of major gift officer FTEs working for the school has increased from one-and-a-half to seven during his tenure. The school has launched a capital campaign to raise \$125 million, and after two-and-a-half years, almost \$50 million have been raised toward this goal. The campaign is underachieving in regard to major gifts of over \$5 million. He attributed this to the fact that alumni are only slowly realizing their obligation to assist the school in its financing efforts, but cited progress during the first two quarters of this year, when the school raised as much as it did during its entire last capital campaign. He noted that alumni are interested in making contributions for programmatic activity and financial aid, but not for building projects.

Mr. Edley expressed his concern that the school's reliance on student fees be understood correctly. He requested that the Regents ask the Office of the President to develop guidelines about the appropriate use of student fees for capital projects. He stressed that the law school's use of fees is part of an overall financial plan which considers all sources of revenue and investment items, a complex strategic approach in which revenue flows are designed to maximize donor interest. Mr. Edley stated that he would welcome an opportunity to work with the Office of the President on the development of relevant guidelines.

Mr. Edley pointed out the high cost of construction, \$915 per gross square foot, but added that there would be opportunities to reduce the cost. He emphasized that the Infill Project is only one step of a multi-step effort to renovate a 55-year-old building and address critical needs in a space-constrained environment. Mr. Edley described the overall cost per gross square foot for all renovation and construction activity, for current renovation activities (Steps 1-3) together with the Infill Project, as quite moderate. Looking beyond the Infill Project, the school is also considering a Step 5 project which would convert a large amount of library stack space into research center and office space at a comparatively low cost per gross square foot. Mr. Edley stressed that, while the Infill Project might be expensive per square foot, it is still comparable to other projects in the UC

system. In view of the possibilities the project creates for Boalt Hall, he described the project as a good deal for the University.

Associate Vice Chancellor Gayle reiterated that the current item seeks Preliminary plan (P) approval, not full project approval, to allow further exploration of the concept. He noted that alternative projects other than the current item were considered. The option being proposed was subjected to severe questioning because of its cost. While the alternative projects would be less expensive, they would not transform the existing buildings or achieve the same progress in rationalizing the circulation pattern within the overall law school complex. Mr. Gayle then briefly described an opportunity to reduce costs by not constructing two proposed underground tunnel areas, but instead pursuing vertical circulation, which might be achieved through a modest expansion into the courtyard. This represents a search for alternatives to connect the space in an architecturally appropriate way.

Regent Hopkinson referred to the series of steps and projects and requested clarification of the difference between building and project costs. She observed that the project cost for Step 3 is approximately 75 percent higher than the building cost; for the Infill Project, the project cost is approximately 60 percent higher. Mr. Gayle responded that Sub-category 1, Building Construction, one of four categories provided for quantification of hard costs in the Capital Improvement Budget, and represented in the table, excludes site development and exterior utilities. The figures in the table are normalized around square footage, not ancillary costs. The proportionality of soft costs is overstated in the table.

Regent Hopkinson underscored her concern about how the University undertakes projects and the very high costs involved. She found the soft costs in this case to be exorbitant and difficult to absorb. She expressed strong support for proceeding with the project but stressed the necessity of reducing soft costs. She opined that, in the private sector, building projects with comparable soft costs would not be built. Mr. Gayle responded that the budget for these renovation projects, particularly Step 3 and the Infill Project, as non-State-funded projects, includes a Contingency category which appears here as soft costs greater than the five percent normally allowed.

Regent Hopkinson expressed the hope that the project, as it becomes better defined for presentation at a future meeting, will be undertaken in a way to minimize soft costs.

Regent Ruiz noted both the prominence of the UC Berkeley School of Law and the significant dollar cost of the project. He asked if enrollment is expected to grow and if the school would be able to accommodate growth or increased demand in the future. He opined that the possible use of student fees for construction needs to be better understood, and requested clarification of this issue, stating that if the Regents raise fees, it must be for the right reasons.

Mr. Edley responded that the building project is not extravagant, although the construction of underground levels is challenging. He stated that the building will be cost-effective in providing new classrooms and an appropriate classroom inventory for a changed curriculum with many smaller classes than in the past, closer to the model of other graduate schools. In Steps 1, 2, and 3, the school improved office space and classrooms. In the Step 3 project last summer, outdated plastic molded chairs in the large lecture halls were replaced, an improvement appreciated by the students.

Mr. Edley reported that the school does not intend to increase the size of its student body. He noted a marginal increase in enrollment of foreign students in the Master of Laws (LL.M.) program, a fee-funded, privatized program which is an important revenue source for assuring the competitiveness of faculty salaries. There might be an increase in the number of foreign graduate students, but this is not part of the school's core planning.

From his perspective as a manager, Mr. Edley cited the importance of stimulating the excitement of donors so that they will invest in the school. If donors wish to invest in financial aid, faculty chairs, or research projects, it is in the interest of the institution to work with that enthusiasm, especially at this stage in the institution's life, when the school is still engaged in efforts to make alumni aware of the importance of donations. At a future point, when fundraising has matured, it may become easier to interest donors in the school's own priorities.

Mr. Edley noted that law school professional fees can be used in a fungible way, to compensate for areas that alumni might not be interested in funding, while still providing a balanced overall investment strategy. Comparing the Berkeley campus to his previous experience, Mr. Edley noted that Harvard Law School alumni are inclined to fund buildings; but even at Harvard and other private institutions, those buildings are financed with pledges of tuition revenue, while the alumni gift is placed in an endowment fund where it earns a higher rate of return. The professional school fee provides a revenue flow that can be used in capital markets. Mr. Edley expressed the wish that this model could be extended to all the campuses.

Faculty Representative Brown noted the apparent absence of Regental policy guidelines regarding the use of professional degree fees, and asked about a precedent or expectation about their use for capital projects. He also asked if there is support for this planned use of the professional degree fees among the law school faculty, students, and the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. He recalled that Boalt Hall alumni are not inclined to make donations for capital projects, and wondered whether current law school students share that inclination.

Mr. Edley responded that capital projects have been financed using other revenue streams; opportunity funds, overhead from research contracts, sports revenue, and

housing revenue. He did not know if student fees had been used before to finance capital projects. Based on consultation with UCB Vice Chancellor–Administration Brostrom he opined that this strategy is exceptionally secure and will be well received by the markets, since the school is certain of fee revenue. He reported that the faculty at the law school is enthusiastic about the proposal, seeing it as a balanced strategy for completing the strategic plan, including financial aid, faculty expansion, and competitive faculty salaries. The project has been approved by four campus-level committees, of which three were Academic Senate committees. Mr. Edley reported that students who are informed about the project are supportive. He noted that graduating third-year students organize a fundraising campaign for a class gift, and that the campaign of the class of 2007 enjoyed 100 percent participation although tuition had doubled, leaving many departing graduates with debt. He opined that students recognize that fee increases result in a better law school, and that they recognize the school’s effort at burden sharing to achieve its goal. He recalled that the professional degree fees will be used for purposes other than the building project as well.

Faculty Representative Croughan noted that the rationale for the project includes a broader vision for the school and concern about the quality of life for students and faculty. While it makes sense to locate library stacks underground, she opined that placing classrooms underground is antithetical to student and faculty quality of life. She asked why some design aspects appear to contradict the purpose of the project.

Mr. Gayle responded that many current classrooms at Boalt Hall are internal to the building and that this is consistent with the increasing dominance of digital media. Mr. Edley noted that light wells are being considered in the design, but added that windowless classrooms are not unusual in legal education. He stressed the importance of providing classrooms of the appropriate size, and that the site itself does not allow the luxury of classrooms with windows. Mr. Gayle pointed out that the project design includes not only library and teaching spaces; it also provides a significant area of community space outside the classrooms and library for student and faculty interaction. Mr. Edley observed that the law school courtyard is currently little used. The project design will activate the courtyard space and create a central area for the law school community.

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

5. **PHYSICAL PLANNING AND DESIGN VISION PRESENTATION UPDATE, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Brase introduced Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Rebekah Gladson and Richard Demerjian, Director of Campus and Environmental Planning. Mr. Brase recalled that the Regents approved the Irvine campus’ 2007 Long Range Development Plan at the November 2007 meeting.

Mr. Demerjian recalled that the 2007 LRDP includes a planning framework and development program with the physical capacity to accommodate substantial growth in campus population, academic space, and on-campus housing through 2025. The land use plan and other plan elements balance program needs with environmental and site conditions. Sector-specific planning and guidelines ensure that campus projects will adhere to planning principles and LRDP goals and objectives. As an example, sector plans for the academic core guide the placement of buildings to ensure efficient use of land resources, a cohesive community, and long-term flexibility. Circulation planning in the academic core reduces reliance on automobiles to retain a pedestrian-oriented, high-quality environment. Mr. Brase pointed out how parking, easily accessed from the campus perimeter, helps to maintain the academic core as a pedestrian zone. Mr. Demerjian briefly noted features of UCI landscape planning, including measures to enhance the environmental quality of the campus, such as establishment of significant native plant and habitat restoration areas.

Mr. Brase presented a list of goals and objectives presented to the Committee in 2002, with the addition of one new goal, design for sustainability and reduced carbon footprint. He encouraged the Committee to consider not just the building projects, but the campus landscape.

Ms. Gladson began by noting the rather fragmented architectural vocabulary of the Irvine campus, due to its combination of 1960s brutalist architecture and postmodern architecture. One campus planning goal has been to create an architectural vocabulary to link buildings and create a feeling of context, to create edges, portals, and transparent entrances to buildings, using materials that enhance the pedestrian experience. As an example, she cited the Biological and Physical Sciences Ring Mall, with buildings using similar but not identical materials. The Anteater Recreation Center in the east campus references the agrarian vocabulary of the campus. Ms. Gladson identified areas designed to be meeting places for students. She discussed how campus architecture manages density, and how the Ring Mall includes five- and six-story buildings but maintains a comfortable environment for pedestrians. Mr. Brase emphasized the importance of intentional density management at UCI. Because the campus plan includes what he described as a 14-acre hole in the center, Aldrich Park, density outside that center must be managed; otherwise the campus could become suburbanized, not pedestrian-amenable.

Ms. Gladson pointed out the plazas and gathering places located between all major buildings and called attention to variation in the height and profiling of buildings on the Ring Mall, and the avoidance of flat roofs. One challenge for the campus has been to bring the brutalist buildings down to a human scale while renovating them. An example is the Claire Trevor Theatre, with a glass structure partly enclosing the outdoor lobby.



Ms. Gladson briefly discussed buildings with serious maintenance issues, such as one building, about 15 years old, with deteriorating fiberglass panels. Mr. Brase added that one goal has been to build structures that will require no major maintenance for 20 years. Certain buildings from the 1980s have exhibited premature failure and required costly repairs. He referred to the unfunded deferred maintenance backlog as a major unsolved problem of the University, stressing that the campus cannot afford new maintenance.

Ms. Gladson briefly mentioned features of other campus buildings and noted the ease of orientation and way-finding on campus, such as a road leading directly into a parking structure, with no need to turn left or right.

Next Ms. Gladson turned to sustainability efforts. She noted that the campus had the first apartment complex in Orange County with a LEED Gold rating, and anticipated that the new Medical Education building might achieve a Gold rating. This building has natural ventilation and a solar chimney, which helps with passive air flow.

Mr. Brase presented a list of all sustainability efforts currently under way at UCI. Irvine was the first campus to make a campuswide LEED submittal. UCI is now working with UCM and UCSB to have the U.S. Green Building Council streamline its process for certification and make that process less expensive. He mentioned the UCI bus fleet, the first in the nation to run on 100 percent biodiesel fuel, and suggested that the “greenest” action by the campus has been to encourage students to live on campus who might have been commuters. Mr. Brase informed the Committee that UCI had signed a letter of intent the previous day for a one-megawatt solar installation on campus; this will be a distributed solar panel on eight rooftops, one of the largest photovoltaic installations in California. A third-party provider will be responsible for building, maintenance, and operation. The campus will pay the provider what it would otherwise pay for public utilities. Mr. Brase described the project as cost-neutral for UCI and very carbon-beneficial.

Mr. Brase presented UCI’s last listed goal, which is to become the most attractive research campus in the U.S. He invited the Regents to visit the campus. He concluded the presentation by discussing the UCI design review process, carried out by the Campus Planning and Environmental Committee, which has been active for 43 years, chaired by the Chancellor. There have been two consulting architects over the entire working life of the campus, which has contributed to the consistent application of a design framework.

Regent Hopkinson stated that she is impressed with UCI’s design, sustainability projects, and especially process, which results in commendable time and money efficiencies. Committee Chair Kozberg praised the exemplary work done at UCI and the speed with which projects are completed; she expressed the Regents’ pride in the Irvine campus.

Regent Bugay inquired about the economics of the solar project. He noted that it will be economically neutral, and asked why it would not be better than neutral. Mr. Brase responded that the campus would not be able to carry out this project using traditional sources of tax-exempt financing available within the University. The private sector has certain tax advantages: accelerated appreciation, investment tax credit, and two forms of rebates and subsidies. UCI will also allow the successful bidder to sell the emissions credits for five years in order to make the project feasible. Mr. Brase suggested that there may be tremendous interest in using this model once projects like this are made feasible.

**6. AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL FINANCING FOR THE NEW UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED MEDICAL CENTER RENOVATION PROJECTS, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

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

From: Irvine: UCI Medical Center Clinical Laboratory Replacement Building – preliminary plans, partial working drawings and construction – \$3,947,000, to be funded from hospital reserves.

To: Irvine: UCI Medical Center Clinical Laboratory Replacement Building – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$49,497,000, to be funded from external financing (\$43,297,000) and capital leases (\$6,200,000).

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

- (1) Irvine: New University Hospital Site Improvements – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – \$23,972,000, to be funded from external financing.

- (2) Irvine: New University Hospital Shell Space Completion – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment – \$139,044,000, to be funded from external financing (\$115,322,000) and capital leases (\$23,722,000).

- (3) Irvine: UCIMC Building 1A Renovation, Floors 2 and 3 – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$13,612,000, to be funded from external financing (\$11,813,000) and capital leases (\$1,799,000).
  - (4) Irvine: Chao Comprehensive Cancer Center Remodel – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$16,098,000, to be funded from external financing (\$14,291,000) and capital leases (\$1,807,000).
- C. The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed \$242,223,000 to finance UCI Medical Center Clinical Laboratory Replacement Building, New University Hospital Site Improvements, New University Hospital Shell Space Completion, UCIMC Building 1A Renovation, Floors 2 and 3, and Chao Comprehensive Cancer Center Remodel projects, 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) As long as the debt is outstanding, the gross revenue of the Irvine Medical Center shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
  - (3) The general credit of The Regents shall not be pledged.
- D. 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.
- E. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Regent Hopkinson noted that the action requires certification to the lender that interest paid by The Regents is excluded from gross income for income tax purposes. She asked why the University is providing certification to a private lender that this interest is exempt, when this should be the lender’s legal responsibility. She requested clarification from the campus or from General Counsel. General Counsel Robinson responded that he would examine the issue.

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

**7. PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF SITE AND DESIGN PARAMETERS, UCI MEDICAL CENTER CLINICAL LABORATORY REPLACEMENT BUILDING, IRVINE CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice Chancellor Brase explained that UCI is seeking guidance on design parameters in order to proceed with an expedited process. He recalled that this process has been successful and enjoyed the support of the Committee.

Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Gladson briefly presented the project. She explained that this building is different from an ordinary laboratory building for research and teaching; it is a clinical laboratory building with a low percentage of office or dry space. The high percentage of laboratory space drives up the cost of the project. This will be a high-density pathology laboratory with 115 assignable square feet per person.

Ms. Gladson identified the project site at the Medical Center and described the hospital site plan, including buildings to be taken down to create space, and the context of the surrounding buildings. A challenge of this project is to create a context of buildings in the area, where there is currently no strong cohesive architectural vocabulary. The building will make use of some materials used at the new hospital building: copper, glass, and pre-cast concrete. Some existing buildings will be painted with this color palette, so that the Medical Center begins to acquire the sense of a campus, similar to UCI's academic campus.

Ms. Gladson briefly mentioned the environmental studies carried out on the project. She noted access and circulation patterns. The laboratory will be a four-story building; the campus is encouraging its design teams to make possible a fifth floor at the same budget.

Mr. Brase pointed out that UCI is using the development of the new hospital and other projects as an opportunity to turn the Medical Center from a disorganized assemblage of buildings into an ensemble that is similar to a campus. He informed the Committee that the UCI hospital project is two months ahead of schedule.

Ms. Gladson described the building's conceptual design, a combination of window wall, curtain wall, concrete, and metal screening materials, similar to the new hospital. She presented the materials board. Design teams will be submitting proposals on February 11. The campus will then seek Regental approval for an interim item or at a special meeting.

Committee Chair Kozberg instructed the campus to proceed with the project. She cited this presentation as an example of an early opportunity for the Regents to indicate their concerns or approval, which allows the project to be realized more quickly.

Regent Hopkinson stated that the site parameters were clear, but the design less so. Ms. Gladson outlined the basic structural and material requirements presented to the design teams, emphasizing that the materials must be consistent with those used at the new hospital, with similar colors of concrete and metal panels.

**8. ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, COWELL STUDENT HEALTH CENTER EXPANSION AND RENOVATION, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

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

- A. Adopt the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Cowell Student Health Center Expansion and Renovation, Santa Cruz campus.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Chancellor Blumenthal introduced Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Frank Zwart. Committee Chair Kozberg informed the Committee that UCSC had received a letter from the Santa Cruz Office of the City Attorney that day withdrawing opposition to the project. Regent Hopkinson stated that the project memorandum is comprehensive. She described the design included in the memorandum as somewhat restrained.

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

9. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, ADOPTION OF FINDINGS/OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, UNIVERSITY HOUSE MEETING CENTER AND CHANCELLOR RESIDENCE, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the “Proposed Project” as indicated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

- A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.
- B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- C. Approve the “Reduced Scope Alternative” design of the University House Meeting Center and Chancellor Residence, San Diego campus.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Chancellor Fox introduced Vice Chancellor for Resource Management and Planning Gary Matthews, Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Boone Hellmann, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Resource Management and Planning Jeffrey Steindorf. She emphasized the important role of a chancellor’s residence in the interactions of campus and community. Ms. Fox asked that the Committee delay action on the recommended items. The campus provided a film presentation illustrating relevant issues related to this project.

The film began by noting the importance of the community-campus partnership that has contributed to the success of UCSD, and the role of the University House since its purchase in 1967. Jim Posakony, Chair of the UCSD Academic Senate Division, described it as the “doorway” for the UCSD campus. The House is located on seven acres overlooking the Pacific and has served as the residence for the first seven chancellors. The film pointed out the current poor condition of the structure, which has suffered water damage, foundation cracks, wood rot, mold, roof problems, slope erosion, and building code violations. Seismic deficiencies were discovered and the House was closed in 2004. The film referred to the summer 2006 UCOP recommendation to redevelop the House. University Architect Hellmann expressed the campus’ excitement about this opportunity. He pointed out that the House was closed for health and safety reasons, but that it also no longer met the campus’ functional needs for University and community events. Therefore a new design is being proposed.

The film reported the campus’ efforts to study the archeological, environmental, and historical issues associated with the site. It noted that this is an important archeological site where ancient Native American remains have been discovered,

and reported that consultation regarding repatriation of these remains is ongoing with representatives of the Kumeyaay Nation. The University has used sophisticated ground-penetrating radar techniques to locate potential human remains or cultural artifacts. Consulting Archeologist Susan Hector noted UCSD's efforts to study previous archeological investigations of the site, to conduct ground surveys using radar and canine forensic techniques, and to meet with the Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee. She emphasized that UCSD's approach has been careful and has included evaluation of available information about the site. The film stated that the overall scope of the new project has been reduced after consultation with community members, donors, and site experts. Landscaping and grading has also been reduced to minimize negative impacts. Vice Chancellor Matthews stressed the campus' wish to preserve the site for its landscape and trees and to reduce the use of water. Reduced water use will diminish ground water runoff into the canyon.

The film continued by noting that the property has been recognized by the State Office of Historic Preservation for the archeological value of the site and for the Pueblo Revival architectural style of the building, which was designed by master architect William Lumpkins more than 50 years ago. Consulting Historian Meta Bunse praised UCSD's thorough efforts to understand the history of University House and to incorporate this history into the structure's future use. The film stated that elements of the original house will be used in the new design, including remnants of the adobe walls, corbels, ironwork, and tiles. Rob Quigley, former UCSD Design Review Board member and Fellow of the American Institute of Architects, endorsed the new project, praising it for its layering of new construction on original elements and for leaving much of the older structure intact while creating a more functional building.

The film explained that the new University House will contain a new meeting center as well as a private residence for the Chancellor, but occupy a smaller footprint on the site. Project Designer Wallace E. Cunningham expressed enthusiasm about the opportunity provided by this project. The film pointed out the incorporation of green elements in the design, which seeks the equivalent of a LEED Silver certification. The design will include a natural ventilation system, an Energy Star-compliant roof, and water-efficient landscape plant materials.

UCSD Foundation Trustee and neighbor Pauline Foster stressed the unique value of this property for the surrounding community and pointed out that community concern for the property was reflected in a fundraising effort. The film reported that redevelopment is scheduled to begin in summer 2008. The facility would reopen in time for UCSD's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2010. The film underscored the team effort that led to the new design and ended with an appeal by Mr. Posakony for approval of the project.

Ms. Fox noted that materials provided to the Regents describe the proposed project and a reduced-scope alternative. In response to a question by Committee

Chair Kozberg, Ms. Fox explained that the campus was prepared to make a presentation on the proposed project and the reduced-scope alternative, but that there are a number of other alternatives outlined in the Environmental Impact Report.

Committee Chair Kozberg referred to correspondence received about this project and stakeholder concerns. She recommended that the Committee accept Ms. Fox's recommendation to postpone action and use the opportunity for negotiation with concerned parties, with the hope of finding common ground. Ms. Fox informed the Committee that UCSD would like to present the item again at the March meeting if possible.

Committee Chair Kozberg indicated that this would be possible, and that this would allow the Committee to use the intervening two months productively to examine the issue of repatriation of Native American remains. She asked that President Dynes convene an appropriate group of individuals to examine this complex issue and expedite a resolution, taking into account design features and all the comments received. In response to Committee Chair Kozberg's question, General Counsel Robinson clarified that a motion was not needed, as the Committee has provided a clear direction.

10. **ADOPTION OF ADDENDUM AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, TELEMEDICINE RESOURCE CENTER AND RURAL PRIME FACILITY, DAVIS HEALTH SYSTEM, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Addendum to the Education Building EIR, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the Addendum to the Education Building EIR.
- B. Adopt the attached Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Telemedicine Resource Center and Rural Prime Facility, Davis Health System, Davis Campus.

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Regent Hopkinson opined that the project memorandum was complete and praised the quality of the design integration.

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



**11. PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, MANAGEMENT SCHOOL FACILITY, PHASE 2, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Boone Hellmann recalled that the Regents approved Phase 1 of the Brady School of Management facility in November 2004. In November 2006 the Regents approved the Phase 2 project for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program. The current presentation is a preliminary review of project design and an opportunity for consultation.

He began with an image of the Phase 1 project. The site is located in the northwest portion of the campus. Mr. Hellmann explained that two primary documents guide UCSD project planning; the 2004 Long Range Development Plan guides land use, and the 1989 UCSD Master Plan guides the physical development of the campus. Important components in the planning for this area of the campus include the High Point Wedge, a large green area developed to provide open space on campus, view corridors to the Pacific Ocean from Ridge Walk, and Eleanor Roosevelt College, located to the south.

Mr. Hellmann briefly noted important existing structures in the site area, and indicated the efforts to preserve ocean vistas along Ridge Walk. The existing building is constructed using a rain screen system, with a relatively economical material on the exterior, Trespa panels, which allow for a sophisticated design. He pointed out the precise location of the Phase 2 addition on the north side. Mr. Hellmann presented floor plans and explained how the addition will fit into the existing facility. He briefly outlined the various facilities planned for Levels 1-5. Level 1 will include an auditorium and instructional space; Level 2, a media center, student organizations, and administrative space; Level 3, academic and instructional space; Level 4, academic offices and administrative space; and Level 5, an executive conference facility and research center. There will be connecting bridges to the existing facility on Levels 3 and 4.

The intention of the architectural design is to follow the vernacular of the existing building. Mr. Hellmann precisely indicated the demarcation of the existing building from the new addition. He showed images of the building from all sides, including views of the courtyard, the grand stair, and the drop-off entrance. He noted that the item will be brought back to a future meeting for final design approval.

Regent Hopkinson commented on the image of the existing building. She noted the dominance of the pointed pieces on the upper level and that similar front panels in the Phase 2 project also form a very dominant architectural overhanging piece. She opined that this feature is somewhat overwhelming in the images, but acknowledged that it might appear different in life.

Mr. Hellmann suggested that this feature of the building may not be as overwhelming in life as it seems in the photograph. He pointed out that the angle of the building accentuates the perspective. He observed that this part of the campus is experiencing a major expansion; the School of Management stands alone at present, but in the future it will be surrounded by prominent buildings, such as a new housing project with five-story buildings. The intention of the design is that the building make an impression and have a presence. There will be significant use of the building by the outside community, and the campus would like a building that serves as an architectural marker.

Regent Hopkinson reiterated that she found this feature somewhat overwhelming and dominant. Mr. Hellmann suggested that the drawings to be presented in March will give the feature a less dominant appearance. Committee Chair Kozberg asked Mr. Hellmann to present renderings or other relevant materials to Regent Hopkinson and to discuss the item with her before the next presentation.

12. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, CAMPBELL HALL SEISMIC REPLACEMENT BUILDING, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice Chancellor Denton explained that the current presentation was a preview of the Campbell Hall Seismic Replacement Building, which replaces an existing building of the late 1950s. The new building will provide 25 percent more square footage, a significant development for UCB, a campus with constrained space. The site is located near the Hearst Mining Circle. This project is part of a strategic initiative for the Physical Sciences presented with the campus' ten-year capital plan at the July 2006 meeting. Seismic and program improvements have been or are being carried out at Le Conte Hall and Birge Hall; the third building to be renovated is Campbell Hall. Mr. Denton described the architectural context. He pointed out that most of the classical UCB buildings have pitched roofs, but that the buildings in this part of the campus have gabled roofs. This will be echoed in the new Campbell Hall.

Associate Vice Chancellor for Project Management Robert Gayle presented views of the new Campbell Hall, a State-funded seismic project. He explained that the project intends to conform to the UCB precedent of generally stepping down the natural slope of the campus. The building will present a palette of materials and forms to the Mining Circle which is consistent with historic context. The first and perhaps most significant impression campus visitors have of the building is the view from the East Gate.

Mr. Gayle pointed out the gabled roof which will face north to the Mining Circle and the fenestration patterns and materials which are intended to harmonize with

the campus' classical core palette. He noted detailing work remaining to be done on the joinery of the building panels. Then he pointed out that the southern part of the building does not have a gabled roof. This reflects the height constraint placed on the project to reflect the stepping down of the campus, consideration of the views from other campus buildings, as well as cost management issues. To the broad campus, the building presents its gabled form and conventional palette, but behind Le Conte Hall, where laboratories and open office areas face west, the project design is challenged by the solar orientation. Here a neutral field palette has been adopted. Solar-controlled louvers allow views out of this west side but also provide solar shading. The fenestration forms and sill patterns are consistent with campus precedent.

Mr. Gayle next turned to the views out from the north and east ground level, and noted that an arcade along the north side of the building continues a pathway through the campus leading to the Chemistry complex to the east. The Mining Circle and Oppenheimer Way areas are identified as high-priority areas within the landscape heritage plan for the campus. The current project will be consistent with the campus' vision for these landscaped areas. The basement of the building is dedicated to laboratory space, for low-vibration laboratory functions. The floor levels above ground are dedicated to dry laboratories, teaching, and work areas. The building has a LEED Silver equivalent target, uses natural air flows, and attempts to keep the floor plans open to reduce energy use.

Citing time constraints, Committee Chair Kozberg asked the Committee members to present their comments directly to the campus.

13. **UPDATE ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AND CONFERENCE CENTER AND HOTEL, DAVIS CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Chancellor Vanderhoef recalled that UCD presented the Graduate School of Management project to the Regents for approval of budget and external financing in May 2007. The campus has since then appointed a successful design-build team after an appropriate competition. The project has been expedited and construction is under way.

Mr. Vanderhoef introduced Campus Architect Clayton Halliday. Mr. Halliday stated that the new design better corresponds to its neighborhood context, using a palette of materials also used at the Mondavi Center. The project aims to achieve LEED Gold certification. He noted the successful design-build partnership with contractor Sundt and architect Sasaki. The construction costs are currently approximately \$330 per gross square foot.

Committee Chair Kozberg praised the high quality of the materials presented.

**14. DESIGN UPDATE, HOUSING AND DINING SERVICES ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Kozberg commented that the design appeared much improved since the last presentation. Campus Architect Hellmann responded that the specific concerns of the Committee were addressed in this design revision.

Regent Hopkinson stated that the renderings were clear and recognized a significant improvement in the design. She referred to her concern about the overhang on the upper level, expressed at the November 2007 meeting, and stated that the suggested change has not been made. Mr. Hellmann responded that the overhang has been reduced by eight feet. He pointed out the revised scheme with a view from the northwest, where the overhang appears even with the edge of the window screen wall. Committee Chair Kozberg suggested that Mr. Hellmann spend time with Regent Hopkinson to review this aspect of the building.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff