The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
September 17, 2013

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents De La Peña, Feingold, Flores, Makarechian, Ruiz, Schultz, and Zettel; Advisory members Coyne, Jacob, and Leong Clancy

In attendance: Regent Newsom, Regent-designate Engelhorn, Faculty Representative Gilly, Secretary and Chief of Staff Kelman, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Dorr, Vice President Lenz, Chancellors Block, Desmond-Hellmann, and Khosla, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 3:05 p.m. with Committee Chair Makarechian presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of July 16, 2013 were approved.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. ***Amendment of Long Range Development Plan and Approval of Design Following Action Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act, Campus Solar Power Plant, Davis Campus***

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Campus Solar Power Plant and Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Amendment, the Committee:

(1) Approve the Tiered Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the Campus Solar Power Plant.

(2) Adopt the California Environmental Quality Act Findings for the Campus Solar Power Plant.

(3) Amend the UC Davis 2003 LRDP as follows:

a. Redesignate 70.0 acres from "Teaching and Research Fields" to "Support" to accommodate the proposed solar plant.

b. Redesignate 11.8 acres from "Academic/Administrative High Density" to "Teaching and Research Fields."

c. Redesignate 12.4 acres from "Academic/Administrative Low Density" to "Teaching and Research Fields."

d. Redesignate 45.8 acres from "Support" to "Teaching and Research Fields."

(4) Approve the design of the Campus Solar Power Plant, Davis campus.

B. ***Amendment of Long Range Development Plan and Approval of Design Following Action Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act, West Campus Solar Farm, Riverside Campus***

The President recommended that, upon a review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as reflected in the certified 2005 UC Riverside Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (2005 LRDP EIR) as updated and augmented by the certified 2005 LRDP Amendment 2 EIR (2011 Amendment 2 EIR) and the Addendum to the 2011 Amendment 2 EIR, the Committee:

(1) Adopt the California Environmental Quality Act Findings for LRDP Amendment 3.

(2) Adopt 2005 LRDP Amendment 3 to create the "Campus Infrastructure Overlay" land use designation and apply the overlay designation to an approximately 12-acre site.

(3) Approve the design of the solar farm project.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Makarechian said the consent agenda consisted of two items for approval of solar power projects at UC Davis and UC Riverside. He asked whether the two projects were comparable in design and power production.

UC Davis Vice Chancellor of Administration John Meyer said that these projects represent an effort to lower the campuses' carbon footprints. The Davis campus' size of 5,300 acres gives it more flexibility than some other UC campuses that have more limited open space. He reported that the Davis campus had recently received bids, which indicated that the campus would be able to increase the project to generate 14 megawatts annually at aggressive price points. The campus is fortunate to have a federal power contract at about seven cents per kilowatt-hour, and is not affiliated with Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) and is not paying retail rates. The advantageous federal contract made it

more difficult to negotiate a solar power contract that could match those very competitive rates. UC Davis negotiated a solar proposal that would match the federal rate in the contract's first years; the rate would increase according to an escalator clause for the subsequent six years, followed by an option to purchase or not.

UC Riverside Assistant Vice Chancellor Tim Ralston said that his campus' overriding consideration was that the solar power be priced competitively with the very favorable rate the campus enjoys with Riverside Public Utilities. Only recently had the price become competitive. UC Riverside's power purchase agreement and site license agreement would be signed this week, dependent on the Regents' approval. The project would provide power generation, addressing the campus' sustainability and renewable energy goals.

Committee Chair Makarechian asked if the ratio of power produced to number of dedicated acres was comparable for the two projects. Mr. Meyer explained that there was some difference between the two projects because the UC Riverside project would use solar tracking devices that would be more efficient per acre. UC Davis' initial bid was for fixed panels that would not track the sun. The Davis campus plans to explore solar tracking panels. Committee Chair Makarechian urged the campus to use the most efficient panels.

Committee Chair Makarechian added that energy used in the production of the solar panels should be taken into account when determining the project's energy footprint. Mr. Meyer said the Davis campus had not accounted for the carbon produced during the manufacturing of the panels. Committee Chair Makarechian asked about federal government credits. Mr. Meyer said that federal tax credits are separate from carbon issues relating to UC and State policies, which, as currently calculated, do not account for the production of the panels.

Committee Chair Makarechian asked whether UC would be charged by the utility companies for producing standby electricity for cloudy days. Director of UC Davis' Utilities Division David Phillips responded that the campus would not be penalized or have to pay standby charges; Mr. Ralston said the same would be true for UC Riverside.

Regent Ruiz congratulated the campuses on these solar projects and asked what PG&E would charge for electricity. Mr. Phillips said PG&E's rate would be about 13 to 16 cents per kilowatt-hour. Regent Ruiz asked whether the campuses compared the cost of building the solar projects themselves to contracting them out to a third party. Mr. Phillips said UC Davis evaluated that option and concluded that using a third-party contractor would be advantageous because outside contractors have access to tax credits, unlike the University. Regent Ruiz asked who bore the risk of future utility rate increases. Mr. Phillips said the Davis campus had generated a forecast of its expectations of future prices of electricity from the grid, and concluded that there would be escalations of three to five percent per year. The campus' solar power agreement would lock in prices for the 20- or 25-year term of the agreement. If grid prices were to increase more than forecast,

the solar pricing would not change; the contract contains no provision for market indexing.

Regent Ruiz said it appeared that the chosen location for the panels would not interfere with any planned campus expansion. Mr. Phillips agreed, pointing out that the project would be located in a remote part of the Davis campus. Mr. Ralston said that would be true for the UC Riverside project's location as well.

Regent Ruiz asked about the campuses' backup plans should there be a power failure. Mr. Phillips said the Davis solar power system would be designed to shut down during a power failure, as a safety precaution to prevent any back current from going onto the system. The solar power system would not increase reliability during power outages.

Regent Ruiz asked about the potential to increase the size of the solar projects. Mr. Phillips said the Davis campus' project was sized so that it would never export electricity back to the grid, because of regulatory complexities. The system would have substantial capacity for future expansion. Mr. Ralston said the Riverside system was designed to have capacity well below the campus' base load, but would be modular and could be easily expanded or downsized.

Committee Chair Makarechian expressed his view that two risks of the projects are dissolution of the third-party contractors' businesses or discontinuance of the tax credits. Mr. Phillips expressed his view that the Davis campus' risks were well mitigated, since the contract contained off-ramp provisions should the third-party contractor go out of business. The system would be installed on UC property. He expressed his understanding that the tax credits are locked in and would typically apply during the first six years of the contract. Committee Chair Makarechian added that UC could take over the system, which would be valuable.

Regent-designate Leong Clancy asked who would bear responsibility for the solar power systems' maintenance and if the projects would be eligible for Proposition 39 funds. Mr. Phillips responded that the third-party contractors would be responsible for the systems' maintenance. Vice President Lenz said that Proposition 39 funding had been allocated only for K-12 and the community colleges, but his office is working on the issue.

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

3. **REVIEW OF FACILITIES RENEWAL PLANS FOR THE PARNASSUS HEIGHTS CAMPUS SITE, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz said this discussion would involve UCSF's revised Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the physical plant associated with the campus' capital facilities and the revised Capital Financial Plan that would accompany the LRDP. This discussion would inform the Committee of the campus' plans for seismic remediation and facility renovations at its Parnassus Heights campus, particularly for the Clinical Services Building (CSB) and UC Hall, both located in an area zoned for instruction and research. The renewal plan has a number of goals including improving the facilities' seismic performance and increasing the campus' housing and office space.

UCSF Assistant Vice Chancellor Lori Yamauchi discussed plans for campus renewal and addressing seismic deficiencies at Parnassus Heights, UCSF's largest campus, and home to UCSF's four professional schools, its graduate division, educational facilities, research laboratories, medical centers, hospitals, and clinics. With more than 3.8 million square feet of building area, the campus is populated with more than 16,000 people including faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors. The campus is located on a steep hillside and is subject to a space ceiling policy, limiting its overall amount of built area. Many of its buildings are older, tightly configured on 30 acres of land, and interconnected, with major site utilities running through the buildings. The campus has very little construction laydown and staging area, making construction expensive and challenging.

Ms. Yamauchi remarked that UCSF is preparing its new LRDP to update and revise its last LRDP adopted in 1997. Facilities and infrastructure needs at Parnassus Heights and other campus sites have been evaluated, and a long-range renewal plan has been developed. Key drivers of the plan are remediation of seismic risks and infrastructure deficiencies, renovation of obsolete laboratory space, and increasing housing and academic space. A physical development strategy and facilities investment program are linked to the campus' new LRDP and Ten-Year Capital Financial Plan.

UCSF Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect Michael Bade displayed a map showing Parnassus Heights buildings that have been remediated, the Medical Sciences Building and Moffitt Hospital, and the two buildings, CSB and UC Hall, which will be remediated. A building at 145 Irving Street was replaced with a new building; the building at 374 Parnassus is scheduled to be demolished this fall.

The campus studied options for demolishing or reusing CSB and UC Hall. CSB is 107,000 gross square feet (gsf), containing research laboratories, clinics, classrooms, and offices. Seismically, CSB is rated Department of General Services (DGS) Level VI (formerly characterized as "very poor"). UC Hall, built in 1917 and the oldest building on the campus, with 147,000 gsf, including clinics, research laboratories, classrooms, and offices, is rated DGS Level V (formerly "poor"). Both buildings have very difficult construction access. UC Hall actually serves as a retaining wall supporting the hillside behind it, making replacement of the building challenging. The proposed solution to retrofit and renovate UC Hall was driven by the desire to maintain crucial campus adjacencies. UC Hall will eventually become housing, offices, and educational space, but CSB is well placed to provide dry research space to clinicians working in Moffitt

Hospital, since it is just a few steps from their clinics and adjacent to other research facilities.

Mr. Bade added that the renovation of UC Hall would also help with cost control, the schedule for the CSB renovation, and maintenance of ongoing campus operations during the renovation of CSB, since UC Hall would be used as relocation space for the office occupants of CSB. CSB laboratories would be permanently relocated to the Health Sciences Instructional Research Towers. Historical assets would be preserved; both UC Hall and CSB are capable of being listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Reusing UC Hall would also help control project costs and environmental effects. Costs would be reduced because the building's heavy frame and enclosures would not have to be demolished. Reuse construction would occur within the existing building envelopes, helping to contain environmental effects. Mr. Bade said many community neighbors of the Parnassus Heights campus are very concerned about environmental issues. The plan would also enable the campus to meet tight phasing requirements to remediate the buildings as quickly as possible, given the complexities of the campus' ongoing operations.

Mr. Bade reported that the campus is in the process of moving users out of CSB, with the goal of completing that process by 2015, at which point the remediation of CSB, the building with the lower seismic rating, would commence. After CSB is renovated and its occupants have moved back, UC Hall would be renovated in 2017-19, with its upper three floors, or about 60 percent of the building, being converted to student housing, and its lower three floors to educational and office space.

Committee Chair Makarechian suggested that when this project is brought back to the Committee, the presentation include more information about the cost savings of remodeling UC Hall within its existing walls versus demolishing and rebuilding it.

Staff Advisor Coyne asked for more information about what portion of new housing created at Parnassus Heights would be for staff, faculty, and students. Mr. Bade responded that, in general, the campus' strategy is to move students living in row houses along Third and Fifth Avenues into UC Hall, and eventually renovate those row houses as transitional faculty housing, to help recruitment and retention of young faculty. Ms. Yamauchi added that there are no specific goals for housing staff at the current time, but it would be in the University's interest to try to accommodate some of its clinical trainees' needs. Mr. Bade noted that housing close to the hospital in a student-oriented environment might not be attractive for staff with families.

Regent Zettel asked how the renovation would accommodate modern research facilities. Ms. Yamauchi responded that CSB's existing mix of research laboratories, offices, and clinics would be renovated into offices and classrooms. The campus determined that it would be more cost-effective to exclude wet laboratories in the renovation, given their utility requirements. Instead, adjacent buildings' wet laboratory space released when some laboratories moved to the Mission Bay campus would be used for laboratories formerly in CSB.

Regent-designate Engelhorn asked about efforts to communicate with the campus' neighbors regarding these plans. Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann said that UCSF has worked very hard to establish a dialogue with the community. The densely urban nature of the Parnassus Heights campus creates some unavoidable issues about which the campus has done its best to engage the community.

Regent Ruiz complimented the campus on this project and its potential to improve health care. He asked whether the renovation would increase the usable space at Parnassus Heights. Ms. Yamauchi said that the current plan would reduce the Parnassus Heights campus' total footprint and mitigate the effect of its presence. The campus currently exceeds its space ceiling by eight percent and the plan would reduce the campus' amount of overall space from its current 3.8 million square feet to 3.7 million. The campus' intent is to continue to support the Parnassus Heights campus' research and clinical enterprise within this reduced square footage, and to replace some of the inpatient activities now in Moffitt Hospital in a new addition to the hospital.

4. **APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOLLOWING ACTION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, NIMITZ MARINE FACILITY BERTHING WHARF AND PIER REPLACEMENT, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Nimitz Marine Facility Berthing Wharf and Pier Replacement project, the Committee:

A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and CEQA Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Nimitz Marine Facility Berthing Wharf and Pier Replacement project, San Diego campus.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz recalled that at its July meeting the Committee had approved a $25 million budget for replacement of the more than 40-year-old Nimitz Marine Facility (MarFac) Berthing Wharf and Pier, which have reached the end of their service lives. The project includes reconstruction of the shoreline revetment, a new structural cut-off wall beneath the top of the slope, new site improvements including paving and storm water management features, and upgrade and replacement of necessary utilities.

UCSD Vice Chancellor Gary Matthews said this project directly supports UCSD's research mission with the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (Scripps) operation of a small fleet of research vessels. Acting Associate Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect

Joel King remarked that the campus noted deterioration of the concrete structure of the pier in 2009 and hired a structural engineer who determined that the pier's service life was nearing its end. An emergency repair of the fendering piles was made in the past year. The new pier would match the footprint of the existing pier, important because of environmental requirements in San Diego Bay. The new facility would have the structural integrity necessary to accommodate modern equipment, mobile cranes, and fueling operations for the fleet. Utilities, including electrical, mechanical, and telecommunication, would be upgraded as required, with the capacity to meter University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) vessels that use the pier.

Scripps Associate Director of Ship Operations Bruce Appelgate said that the UC fleet of research vessels is the largest of any academic institution in the United States, providing 20 percent of the nation's capacity to conduct academic research at sea. Scripps' vessels travel worldwide as extensions of UC laboratories, and also conduct significant research on California coastal ecosystems, contributing greatly to understanding issues such as global climate change and fisheries management. Mr. Appelgate expressed pride in the UC Ship Funds Program, through which Scripps takes undergraduate and graduate students to sea, allowing them to propose and execute their own research under the mentorship of experienced Scripps scientists. Scripps facilities also enable development and testing of new kinds of research instrumentation.

Mr. King displayed a map of the MarFac wharf and pier at the mouth of San Diego Bay, a prime location for access to the eastern Pacific Ocean and the coast of Mexico. The new pier would be cast-in-place concrete on pre-cast concrete piles. The project would mitigate potential liquefaction that occurs in San Diego Bay during seismic events through an innovative plan to scarify the existing slope, mix that dirt on land with cementitious material, then replace it on the slope. As this new material cures, it would create a hardened concrete dam that would mitigate the liquefaction effect. The wharf and pier would be elevated two feet in anticipation of rising sea levels. Mr. King added that a new vessel under construction, the *Sally Ride,* would come to MarFac to replace the *Melville.*

Committee Chair Makarechian asked what portion of MarFac's operational funds come from indirect cost recovery and what effect current cuts in federal spending known as sequestration would have on these funds. Mr. Lenz replied that the campus was successful in securing $5 million for the project from the State in its 2013-14 budget and had submitted a grant application for additional funds available only for this type of project from the 2014-15 State budget.

Regent Newsom commented on Scripps research about the very large patch of man-made marine debris in the Pacific Ocean; this research led to San Francisco and other communities banning plastic shopping bags.

Regent-designate Engelhorn asked for a map overlay showing the areas of the ocean covered by robotic devices from Scripps ships at a future meeting.

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

5. **APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PLANS FUNDING, ENGINEERING VI – PHASE 2, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the 2013-14 Budget for Capital Improvements be amended to include the following project:

Los Angeles: Engineering VI – Phase 2 – Preliminary Plans – $3.15 million to be funded from gift funds.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz stated that this item requested approval of preliminary plans funding for the UCLA Engineering VI – Phase Two building, to accommodate multi-disciplinary information science and computation research programs of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science (HSSEAS). The building would provide research laboratories and offices for approximately 35 faculty, an incubation laboratory for the translation of research to commercial use, and a 250-seat technology-enabled Learning Center equipped to serve both traditional and online engineering students. Total project cost, including site improvements, is currently estimated to be approximately $70 million to be funded from gift funds. The campus has raised about $27 million to date in pledges and cash, and was requesting approval of $3.15 million in preliminary plans funding to be funded by gift funds.

Chancellor Block emphasized the critical importance of this project to the HSSEAS, which has suffered a critical shortage of space since the demolition of Engineering One, a 1940s-era building, which was obsolete and out of compliance with UC's seismic and accessibility standards. Engineering V, completed is 2006, replaced a portion of the research space. Construction on the first phase of Engineering VI commenced the prior year, funded in part by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, supporting consolidation and expansion of the school's clean energy research programs, but not addressing the school's broader space needs.

Phase Two of Engineering VI is driven by the HSSEAS' growth and by new teaching and research opportunities. The school has had no increase in teaching or research space since the 1980s, while experiencing significant growth in its number of students, faculty, and amount of sponsored research. The project has been part of UCLA's State-funded capital plan for many years, but State-allocated funds have been used for seismic, fire, and life-safety projects. As a result, the campus is solely responsible to fund its aspirations for new, improved academic facilities. Chancellor Block said this project would be funded entirely by gifts, with $27 million in cash and pledges already raised.

Dean of HSSEAS Vijay Dhir described the school's future educational and research plans, and its critical space shortage. Founded in 1945, HSSEAS has grown in stature and size, and is currently ranked among the top ten public engineering schools in the nation by *U.S. News and World Report* and seventh in the world by *Times Higher Education*. Research expenditures have doubled in the past 15 years, from $50 million to $100 million. Mr. Dhir said all this growth has occurred without any increase in the school's usable space. Lack of space is affecting HSSEAS' ability to recruit and retain outstanding faculty. In order to compete with other top schools of engineering and to enable hiring of new faculty, Phase Two of Engineering VI is necessary.

The new space created would be used mainly in the areas of information technology, and computer science and engineering, and would enable collaboration with faculty and students in nanoengineering and bioengineering. HSSEAS' new initiatives include activities involving big data (the management, synthesis, and transmission of large volumes of data on the internet), the Wireless Health Institute, the internet of the future, and domain-specific computing. In 2007, HSSEAS created the self-supporting Institute for Technology Advancement to incubate and commercialize new technologies originating from the work of faculty and students, increasing revenue to UCLA. This Institute is currently located off-campus, but would be brought into Engineering VI – Phase Two. In the same year, HSSEAS created the first UC online Master of Science in Engineering program, which has been very popular with working engineers and currently has 300 students; HSSEAS' goal is to increase the number of students in the program to 1,000. Other departments also offer professional certificate programs. The interactive Learning Center proposed for Engineering VI – Phase Two would be used to offer on-campus courses that could be recorded in its 250-seat technology-enabled classroom for online courses and hybrid courses with online and on-campus components. This venue could also be used for conferences and workshops among faculty, students, and professionals, and for collaborations with other campus departments.

Mr. Dhir pointed out that this project would require no State funds, since it would be supported completely by gift funds, with $27 million already having been raised in cash and pledges, of which $6 million had been specified for the Learning Center; there is strong interest from alumni. Engineering VI – Phase Two would be the last structure built in the engineering complex for the foreseeable future.

Vice Chancellor Steve Olsen said this item requested funding for preliminary plans for Engineering VI – Phase Two, which would contain 92,000 gross square feet and 60,000 assignable square feet; the campus would return to the Committee to request budget and design approval. He displayed a map showing the location of the proposed building, on the original site of Engineering I, demolished in phases ending in 2011, to make room for Engineering V completed in 2006 and occupied in 2007, and Engineering VI – Phase One, currently under construction. Engineering IV, completed in the 1980s, was the last building to provide increased space for the HSSEAS, notwithstanding the growth in its programs. Boelter Hall was constructed in phases in the 1950s and 1960s.

Committee Chair Makarechian congratulated the campus on the HSSEAS' rankings and its fundraising in support of this project. He commented that this item requesting funding for preliminary plans should not contain an estimated total project cost, since the project cost was not yet known. Publicizing an anticipated cost could cause contractors to increase their bids to that level.

Committee Chair Makarechian asked Mr. Dhir for an estimate of the space savings achieved by offering the school's online Master of Science in Engineering, compared with having students physically on campus. Mr. Dhir said that having the master's degree program's 300 students participate online, in effect, creates space for 300 more students on campus. Mr. Olsen said he would include those figures in the future presentation to the Committee about the project's budget. Mr. Olsen said the HSSEAS' goal is to increase enrollment in the online master's degree program to 1,000 students, which would be roughly 20 percent of HSSEAS' current total enrollment. Given that the HSSEAS uses 500,000 occupiable square feet, the space and budget savings from the online program would be significant.

Regent Ruiz complimented Chancellor Block and Mr. Dhir on the success and resourcefulness of the HSSEAS, and asked for information about how the Engineering VI – Phase Two project would increase the school's student, faculty, and research capacity.

Regent Newsom asked for clarification of the exact nature of the commitment being requested in the item. Committee Chair Makarechian said the item requested approval of only $3.1 million for development of a preliminary design.

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

6. **APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PLANS FUNDING, BLAKE HOUSE RENOVATIONS, REPAIR, AND SEISMIC IMPROVEMENT, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

The President recommended that the 2013-14 Budget for Capital Improvements be amended to include the following project:

UC Office of the President:	Blake House, Renovations, Repair, and Seismic Improvement – Preliminary Plans – $250,000 to be funded from UC Office of the President (UCOP) unrestricted funds (Searles Fund).
UC Office of the President:	Blake House, Deferred Maintenance – $370,000 to be funded from UCOP unrestricted funds (Searles Fund).

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz stated that this item requested approval of preliminary plans for renovations, repairs, and seismic improvements of Blake House, a 13,000 square foot facility built in 1924 and donated to the University in 1957. Blake House, located in Kensington about four miles north of the Berkeley campus, is currently used to provide educational opportunities for students of UC Berkeley's Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning Department at the College of Environmental Design as well as a public resource for the local community. The total cost of the project, including site improvements would be approximately $3.5 to $6 million, to be funded by discretionary funds from the Searles Fund account. The item requested approval of $250,000 for the development of preliminary plans and $370,000 for deferred maintenance, including addressing immediate roof repairs. Committee Chair Makarechian clarified that this request was only for preliminary plans funding and $370,000 in deferred maintenance. Mr. Lenz agreed, noting that the project would be brought back to the Committee for approval of the budget.

Committee Chair Makarechian asked about long-term plans for Blake House. Mr. Lenz responded that, aside from the immediate needs of the facility, a decision about long-term plans for Blake House had not been made. A number of options exist, including, for example, using Blake House as a residence for the President of the University, for entertainment functions of the President, as a meeting or conference center for UC regional partners, or as a residence for visiting faculty members. Mr. Lenz said the Committee would be provided with the relative cost of various options at a future meeting. Committee Chair Makarechian asked that the best uses of Blake House be examined, including the options of selling all or part of it. Mr. Lenz said Blake House currently had an important programmatic use as a site for instruction through the Berkeley campus, adding that he would look into current restrictions on the sale of the property, since proceeds from a sale might have restricted uses.

Regent Ruiz expressed concern about plans for Blake House, given its condition, location, parking that would be inadequate for entertaining, and the cost of maintenance. He acknowledged the history of the property, but questioned whether it is necessary for the President of the University to have a house for entertaining. Mr. Lenz said these were reasonable questions that should be evaluated.

Regent Flores asked what precedents exist for uses of the property and when Blake House could be available for use. Mr. Lenz said the timing would depend on future decisions about the best use of Blake House. The house's current condition limits its use for any purpose. The current item requested funds for preliminary plans and necessary maintenance, then the next steps can be determined. Immediate maintenance must be done to retain the value of the house. Regent Zettel agreed that the value of the property must be protected by performing maintenance such as roof repairs.

In response to a question from Regent Schultz, Mr. Lenz explained that the Searles Fund is an endowment that can address needs such as the chancellors' or President's residences, among other uses.

Regent De La Peña asked what would be involved in the $370,000 for deferred maintenance, other than roof repairs. Committee Chair Makarechian said repairs would also deal with other water intrusion problems. Mr. Lenz added that his office has only a general idea of the complete repairs and renovation needed; specific plans and costs would not be known until the process of hiring an architect and obtaining a professional evaluation is complete. Committee Chair Makarechian clarified that this item requested only urgently needed repairs and preliminary plans funding to obtain more information about renovation options and their costs, including an evaluation of the best use of the property.

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff