The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
February 25, 2003

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Suite 109, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Kozberg, Ligot-Gordon, Lozano, Moores, and Sainick; Advisory members Murray, Seigler, and Pitts

In attendance: Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Senior Vice President Mullinix, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 10:15 a.m. with Committee Vice Chair Sainick presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of December 13, 2002 were approved.

2. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, LOS ANGELES 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 recommend:

(1) Certification of the Environmental Impact Report for the UCLA 2002 Long Range Development Plan.

(2) Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final EIR.

(3) Adoption of the Statement of Overriding Considerations included in the Findings.

(4) Adoption of the Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

(5) Approval of the 2002 Long Range Development Plan, Los Angeles campus.

[The Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Findings were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Vice Chancellor Blackman recalled that in November 1990, The Regents adopted the Long Range Development Plan (1990 LRDP) for the UCLA campus. The 1990 LRDP is the comprehensive land-use plan that guides physical development of the campus to support its teaching, research, and public service mission. The 1990 LRDP identified eight land-use zones and proposed net new development of 3.71 million gross square feet over a 15-year planning horizon through academic year 2005-06. Of the 3.71 million gsf proposed, 1.1 million were allocated to provide much-needed on-campus graduate student housing. The 1990 LRDP also adopted a parking space limit of 25,169 spaces and a vehicle trip generation limit of 139,500 average daily vehicle trips, while planning for an essentially stable student enrollment and providing for a small growth in the overall campus population. The 1990 LRDP also incorporated a goal to house approximately 50 percent of UCLA student enrollment in a combination of University-owned housing or private-sector housing within walking distance of campus.

In 1998, the State and the University agreed that the University would conduct feasibility studies to assess the University's ability to accommodate projected enrollment between the years 2005 and 2010. In accordance with the Master Plan for Higher Education, which guarantees access to the University of California for the top 12.5 percent of California's public high school graduates, the projected increase in enrollment results from an increase in the number of high school graduates over the next decade. Accordingly, UCLA was asked to plan to accommodate an increased enrollment of 4,000 full-time-equivalent students through 2010. As the increase will exceed the student enrollment projections described in the 1990 LRDP and analyzed in the 1990 LRDP Final EIR, as amended, an update to the 1990 LRDP and a new Environmental Impact Report have been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The proposed 2002 LRDP accommodates the anticipated increase in student enrollment in both the regular and summer academic sessions and extends the 1990 LRDP horizon year from 2005-06 to 2010-11 while maintaining the development, parking, and trip generation limits that were adopted in the 1990 LRDP.

Implementation Status of the 1990 LRDP

Of the 3.71 million gsf originally approved under the 1990 LRDP, approximately 644,000 gsf has been built, 1.36 million net gsf is under construction, approved for construction, or has been analyzed in a certified EIR, and approximately 1.71 million gsf remains for future development.

The existing campus parking inventory consists of 21,020 marked spaces and 1,310 stack spaces. Approximately 3,500 additional parking spaces are either under construction or approved in conjunction with the Replacement Hospital, the Intramural Field below-grade parking structure, and the Southwest Graduate Student Housing and Parking project. As these additional parking spaces become available for use, the campus reliance on stack parking operations will reduce accordingly to maintain the campus parking limit of 25,169 spaces adopted in the 1990 LRDP. As of 2001-02, the

campus average daily vehicle trip generation totaled 121,799, approximately 13 percent below the vehicle trip generation limit adopted in the 1990 LRDP.

The 2001-02 on-campus population, in comparison with the 1990 LRDP projections, is less than the 1990 LRDP projections for academic year 2005-06. The on-campus student headcount has risen slightly above those projections as the campus endeavored to begin accommodating additional students. An Addendum to the 1990 LRDP EIR, adopted by The Regents in November 2001, demonstrated that during the planning period for the 2002 LRDP, an increase of one to three percent of student enrollment above the 2005-06 projections could be accommodated without modifying the conclusions of the analyses contained in the 1990 LRDP Final EIR.

In academic year 2000-01, approximately 46 percent of the UCLA student enrollment was accommodated in University-owned or private sector housing within walking distance of the campus. With completion of the Southwest Student Housing and Parking project, which began construction in 2002, the 1990 LRDP goal to house 50 percent of student enrollment will be met.

Summary of the 2002 Long Range Development Plan

The proposed 2002 LRDP is a land-use plan to guide development of the UCLA campus through the horizon year 2010-11 in support of the teaching, research and public service mission of the University. Adoption of the 2002 LRDP does not constitute a commitment to any specific project, construction schedule, or funding priority. Each development proposal must be approved individually as appropriate, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Program Development Needs

UCLA's academic programs continue to evolve as needs emerge and new disciplines are developed, but no significant change in the basic academic structure and program goals is anticipated during the planning horizon of the 2002 LRDP. However, the addition of students will require new faculty, support staff, and other related employees, and therefore some added instructional and office space will likely be needed. Because most of the student enrollment growth will be at the undergraduate level, the programs centered in the College of Letters and Science will need to accommodate the largest share of growth. Growth is also anticipated to occur in the following areas: undergraduate programs in information studies; the arts and architecture; and theater, film and television; graduate professional teacher and principal training programs in education; engineering and computer science programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and social welfare doctorate programs.

UCLA's ancillary programs, particularly student housing and recreation, will experience increased demand from anticipated enrollment growth. This LRDP includes a specific housing proposal to construct up to 2,000 additional beds of undergraduate student housing on campus. Other administrative units, student

services, and childcare will face varying demands for added service. Growth in research and patient service programs of the medical center could result in response to new initiatives and funding opportunities. With the proposed provision of additional undergraduate student housing, it is anticipated that on-campus parking can continue to be provided at the same existing level of service within the parking inventory limit established in the 1990 LRDP.

The LRDP considers the existing and anticipated program space needs to address the academic, administrative, and support requirements associated with estimated student enrollment and campus population growth. The LRDP proposes to accommodate future growth within the remaining development capacity of 1.71 million gsf previously approved under the 1990 LRDP while also maintaining the limits on parking spaces and vehicle trips articulated in the 1990 LRDP. The fundamental intent of the 2002 LRDP remains unchanged from that of previous LRDPs approved by The Regents in 1963, 1983, and 1990: the LRDP objectives and proposals represent the best possible relationship among UCLA academic, research, and public service goals; faculty and student needs; site characteristics; and integration with the surrounding on-campus and off-campus community.

Campus-wide Development Objectives

UCLA is a mature campus with well-established building, circulation, infrastructure, and open space patterns. While campus land resources are limited, opportunities for infill and redevelopment remain. Planning for future development at UCLA will include continued examination of the utility and cost-effectiveness of renovating or replacing aging facilities, the constraints of a fully developed urban environment, and the capacity limitations of regional infrastructure. Within the planning horizon of the 2002 LRDP, the campus urban design framework will be guided by the following academic, physical, and operational development objectives:

Academic Objectives:

- Offer teaching, research, and service programs of the highest quality to serve the needs of the Los Angeles region, the State of California, and the nation.
- Build an academic community of faculty and students in keeping with an institution of UCLA's caliber.
- Build a strong organization of staff employees through training and professional development programs and attention to the work environment.
- Foster diversity among students, faculty, and staff, and through curriculum, academic programs, and public service.
- Ensure student access in a manner consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, while continuing to enhance the quality of the academic program and meeting the University enrollment growth target to accommodate an additional 4,000 FTE students at UCLA by 2010-11.
- Develop an academic, administrative, and physical environment that supports outstanding research and creative activity.

- To the extent feasible, place new buildings in locations that offer programmatic advantages due to proximity of related academic disciplines.
- Create an intellectual milieu and shared ethic that fosters excellence and a sense of community on campus.
- Create an environment for student life that fosters students' academic, personal, and social development.
- Continue to serve the Los Angeles region through provision of cultural, health, educational, and other community programs.

Physical Objectives:

- Maintain the 1990 LRDP campus parking cap of 25,169 spaces.
- Maintain the 1990 LRDP campus vehicle trip cap of 139,500 average daily trips.
- Develop a maximum of 1.71 million gsf of additional building space, which represents the remaining approved 1990 LRDP development allocation.
- Continue the in-fill development of the UCLA campus, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and energy consumption.
- Retain the human scale and rich landscape of the campus while enhancing its function as a mature university in a fully developed urban environment.
- Locate and design facilities to enhance spatial development of the campus while maximizing use of limited land resources.
- Respect and reinforce the architectural and landscape traditions that give the campus its unique character.
- Continue to integrate landscaped open space (including plazas, courts, gardens, walkways, and recreational areas) with development, to encourage use through placement and design.
- Provide recreational facilities for students, faculty, and staff on campus.
- Provide a landscaped buffer along the western, northern, and eastern edges of the main campus.
- Design future development on the southern edge of the main campus to enhance the campus interface with Westwood Village.
- Maintain the integrity of the campus historic core.
- Locate new building projects to ensure compatibility with existing uses and the height and massing of adjacent facilities, to the extent feasible.
- Provide accessibility for the disabled in the siting and design of new buildings or the renovation, restoration, or reconstruction of exiting buildings.
- Clarify and strengthen existing pedestrian and vehicular circulation to enhance way-finding and promote safety.
- Develop on-campus housing to enhance the educational experience for students and continue the evolution of UCLA from a commuter to a residential campus.

Operational Objectives:

- Accommodate a proportion of enrollment growth by using existing campus facilities more intensively during the summer, thereby minimizing capacity impacts to student services, housing, parking, and traffic, by limiting population growth in the regular session when campus activity is highest.
- To the extent practicable, continue to incorporate design features, technological adaptations, and planning principles into future campus development to encourage or reinforce the concept of environmental sustainability and stewardship, including the conservation of resources, the minimization of waste, and the compatibility of land uses.
- Promote the efficient use of water through natural drainage patterns, drought-tolerant landscaping, and recycling and reuse.
- Encourage energy efficiency through thoughtful design that considers the effective placement of buildings and the use of shading, to the extent feasible.
- Continue to acquire and use clean fuel vehicles for public transit and fleet vehicles.
- Provide and promote opportunities for the use of alternative transportation modes.
- Plan, design, and implement the proposed project within the practical constraints of available funding sources.

Primary Elements of the 2002 LRDP

The 2002 LRDP addresses the following primary elements through academic year 2010-11:

- An estimated increase in the average weekday on-campus population of 4,873 students, academic and staff employees, and visitors for the three-quarter regular session above the 2001-02 baseline of 56,668 individuals.
- An estimated increase in the average weekday on-campus population of 6,992 students, academic and staff employees, and visitors for the 12-week summer session above the 2000 baseline of 34,126 individuals.
- Development of 1.71 million gsf remaining and approved under the 1990 LRDP to address existing and future program needs, as well as the space requirements associated with an increased student enrollment.
- Development of 2,000 beds of undergraduate student housing in the Northwest zone of campus including associated recreation and parking.
- Continued promotion and expansion of the existing Transportation Demand Management Program, consistent with regional planning efforts to improve traffic and air quality.
- Continued compliance with the existing limits of 25,169 on-campus parking spaces, including stack parking, and 139,500 average daily vehicle trips attributable to UCLA.

In addition, in order to balance the specificity required for the planning and environmental analysis with the flexibility needed to accommodate future development, under the 2002 LRDP each of the proposed development allocations by

zone will be permitted to vary by up to 30,000 gsf over the 2002 LRDP planning horizon without requiring an amendment to the LRDP, so long as (1) additional square footage needed in a particular zone is balanced by a subtraction of the same amount of square footage from one or more of the other zones, (2) the Botanical Garden zone allocation will not change, and (3) any proposal will be consistent with the 2002 LRDP development objectives and CEQA.

Consistent with the policy amendment concerning Long Range Development Plans recently approved by The Regents in January 2003, the approval of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, or in appropriate circumstances, The Regents, may be required for any LRDP amendment project or other action when, in the judgment of the President, an action merits review and approval by The Regents because of budget matters, fundraising activities, environmental impacts, community concerns, or other reasons.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act to analyze the environmental effects of the 2002 LRDP, including a project-level review of the proposed Northwest Housing Infill Project (NHIP). The NHIP will provide up to 2,000 beds of undergraduate housing in three nine-story buildings, a recreation facility, a relocated facilities management storage building, and the Dykstra parking structure on infill sites in the northwest zone of campus. Recommendation for design approval of the Northwest Housing and Dykstra Parking Structure projects is being submitted concurrently to The Regents for consideration as separate actions. The recreation and facilities management storage components of the NHIP may to be proposed at a later date, pending funding availability. The Draft EIR consists of Volume 1 and Volume 1a, a program-level analysis of implementation of the 2002 LRDP, and Volume 2, a project-level analysis of implementation of the NHIP. The EIR identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives for both the 2002 LRDP and NHIP.

On June 12, 2001, the University issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) announcing the preparation of the EIR for the 2002 LRDP EIR. A revised NOP was subsequently issued to acknowledge that the potential environmental effects of the 2002 LRDP will be considered along with the proposed NHIP housing component of the LRDP. The revised NOP was accompanied by an Initial Study (IS) describing the project and proposed scope of analysis. The revised NOP/IS was circulated to responsible agencies, interested groups, and individuals for a 30-day review period. A community information and EIR scoping meeting was held to solicit input from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations regarding the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures and significant effects to be analyzed in the EIR.

The Draft LRDP and EIR for the 2002 LRDP, including the NHIP, was issued on October 31, 2002, and initially circulated for public review and comment for a 46-day

period. In response to a request from the community, the public review and comment period was extended an additional four days. The Draft EIR was widely circulated. The availability of the document and notice of public hearing were publicized in the *Los Angeles Times* and *UCLA Daily Bruin*, and on the internet. In addition to a community leader information meeting, a briefing for local elected officials, and several meetings with representatives of the homeowner association in proximity to the proposed NHIP, a public hearing was held to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR.

Nine individuals provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. In addition, 370 comment letters were received during the public review period. The following is a summary of the letters received and the range of issues raised:

State Department of Transportation (2 letters)

- Request to consider additional mitigation for cumulative traffic conditions and suggests UC consider relocating growth to less impacted areas.

City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (1 letter)

- Requests alternative traffic mitigation measures.

Neighborhood Homeowner Associations (4 letters)

- Statements reflecting lack of support for additional campus growth.
- Request to provide additional information, additional mitigation for traffic and air quality impacts, analysis of more alternatives.
- Request for explanation of how UC developed the enrollment growth target for UCLA and what alternatives were considered in light of the significant environmental effects caused by that growth.
- Requests for more information and expression of lack of support for the proposed recreation and facilities management storage elements of the Northwest Housing project.

Other Organizations (6 letters)

- Requests for additional information including enrollment and demographic data.
- Request to extend public review period.
- Lack of support for growth.
- Request to designate a 4-acre area on campus as a ‘coastal sage scrub preserve’.

Interested Individuals (360 letters)

- Requests for UCLA to reduce traffic, noise and air quality impacts caused by bus activity at the Hilgard Bus Terminal. (4 letters)
- Requests for campus support for bicycle transportation mode. (8 letters)
- Requests for the continuation of BruinGo, a fare-subsidized transit program. (342 letters)

The Final EIR contains the comment letters received on the Draft EIR and a transcript of the public hearing, detailed responses to the comments received, text changes to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs.

Project Impacts

Implementation of the 2002 LRDP, including the NHIP, has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A detailed summary of these impacts is included in the Findings and in the Draft EIR. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, significant and unavoidable impacts from the 2002 LRDP including implementation of the NHIP will remain in the following categories:

Air Quality

- Peak daily emissions of nitrogen oxide resulting from construction impacts.
- Peak daily emissions of carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, and nitrous oxide resulting from daily operations during the twelve-week summer session.

Noise

- Ground-borne vibration and noise impacts to on-campus uses resulting from construction.
- Impacts from an increase in ambient noise levels to on- and off-campus uses resulting from construction.

Traffic and Circulation

- Operational impacts during the regular session at four intersections during the AM peak hour.
- Operational impacts during the summer session at 12 intersections.
- Construction impacts resulting from truck trips.

If the City of Los Angeles does not implement all feasible mitigation measures identified in the 2002 LRDP Draft EIR, then impacts could remain significant and unavoidable at five intersections during the regular session and at 25 intersections during the 12-week period of summer instruction.

Cumulative Impacts

Air Quality

- Air emission impacts will make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative regional air quality impacts from daily emissions of criteria pollutants during the regular and summer sessions during project construction.

Traffic

- Construction vehicle activity will make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts on local streets and intersections during both the regular and twelve-week summer session during project construction.
- Exceeding the applicable LOS criteria will make a significant and cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts on local streets and intersections resulting from project operations during both the regular and twelve-week summer sessions.

Alternatives

In addition to the proposed 2002 LRDP project, the LRDP EIR analyzed three project alternatives: no project or continued implementation of the 1990 LRDP through 2010-11 without enrollment growth beyond current levels; off-site relocation of discrete programs and associated parking to a 35-acre site at Playa Vista with regular and summer session enrollment growth; and regular session growth only with no enrollment growth during the summer session. In addition, the LRDP EIR considered four other alternatives that were found to be infeasible: phased construction; xeriscapic landscaping; full implementation of the 1990 LRDP by 2005-06; and no project or reduced enrollment.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The UCLA campus will be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents to implement, and continuing programs and procedures that serve to reduce environmental impacts identified in the EIR. To assure that all measures, programs and procedures are implemented in accordance with CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared and is included in the Final EIR. The MMRP provides a reporting mechanism for the mitigation measures and programs and procedures that are made conditions of approval to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment.

Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Findings discuss the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, programs and procedures, monitoring program and alternatives. The Findings also set

forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant effects in the areas of air quality, noise, and traffic.

Vice Chancellor Blackman presented slides of the campus to show the ways in which it is being developed.

Regents Kozberg and Lozano had high praise for the LRDP, noting that the campus was being transformed and improved. Mr. Blackman reported that after publication of the Final EIR a comment letter was received from the California Department of Fish and Game requesting a review of the baseline biological information contained in the FEIR and supporting the conservation of a specific four-acre area of open space in the northwest portion of the campus. The University's response provided specifics as to why the habitat was deemed to be of low quality. The University is not planning to preserve the area, nor is it planning any construction on it. Concerning traffic impacts, it was reported that the campus maintains a dialogue with and enjoys the cooperation of the City concerning the mitigation of traffic problems.

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

[For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the February 25, 2003 Committee of the Whole.]

3. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, NORTHWEST CAMPUS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT HOUSING, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that subject to the approval of the UCLA 2002 Long Range Development Plan and certification of the associated Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend:

A. Adoption of the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations pertaining to Hedrick North Residence Hall and First Floor Renovation, Rieber North and West Residence Halls and First Floor Renovation, and Sproul Hall First Floor Renovation as contained in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the UCLA 2002 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report.

B. Approval of the design of Hedrick North Residence Hall and First Floor Renovation, Rieber North and West Residence Halls and First Floor Renovation, and Sproul Hall First Floor Renovation, Los Angeles campus.

[The Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that in March 2002, The Regents approved preliminary plan funding for six capital projects associated with the Northwest Campus Student Housing and Parking plan. Following completion of preliminary plans, the campus proposed the three housing projects described below and one parking project to accomplish the goals of the Master Plan for the Northwest campus. In September 2002, The Regents amended the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program to include three projects associated with the Northwest Campus Undergraduate Student Housing Plan for the Los Angeles campus at a total project cost of $197,614,000. The three projects are as follows:

- Sproul Hall First Floor Renovation, total cost $9,765,000, funded by external financing ($8,765,000) and the Los Angeles campus' share of the University of California Housing System (UCHS) Net Revenue Fund ($1,000,000).

- Hedrick North Residence Hall and First Floor Renovation, total cost $67,093,000, funded by external financing ($63,504,000) and the Los Angeles campus' share of the UCHS Net Revenue Fund ($3,589,000).

- Rieber North and West Residence Halls and First Floor Renovation, total cost $120,756,000, funded by external financing ($111,616,000) and the Los Angeles campus' share of the UCHS Net Revenue Fund ($9,140,000).

In April 2002, the appointment of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, LLP of Los Angeles, California as executive architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The project site is in the Northwest campus zone, which constitutes approximately 90.5 acres of the 419-acre UCLA campus. The Northwest zone is bounded by Sunset Boulevard on the north, Veteran Avenue on the west, Gayley Avenue on the south, and Charles E. Young Drive West on the east. The area consists of hilly terrain characterized by slopes between the existing buildings. The elevation range is between 320 and 560 feet above mean sea level. Existing land-use conditions in the Northwest zone are primarily residential and recreational in nature.

Project Design

The project will construct three new undergraduate residence halls and renovate the first floors of three existing high-rise residence halls. The new residence halls will accommodate 1,987 beds and have dining facilities, commons facilities, and related support space. Demolition of the Housing Administration Building, a vending storage building, and surface parking lots HH and RH will be necessary to create a site for the proposed construction. Each eight- or nine-story building will be of concrete.

The first floors of the existing Sproul, Hedrick, and Rieber Halls will be renovated and redesigned to accommodate administration, customer service, dining, business functions, learning and study areas, and recreation and social areas.

Most of the new rooms will have two double-occupancy bedrooms with connecting bathrooms. There will be 410 beds in single-room suites, each consisting of 10 single private bedrooms with a common living room and two compartmentalized bathrooms; 44 beds in double-occupancy rooms with private bathrooms; and 41 beds in single bedrooms with private bathrooms for the resident assistants. In addition, the project will have a total of nine non-revenue faculty apartments.

The building aesthetic is consistent with UCLA Architectural Guidelines. The project incorporates buff concrete and UCLA blend brick into the hardscape and walkways and UCLA blend brick into the entryways and lower-level façades of the buildings. The upper façades will be a combination of painted concrete columns and pilasters, with brick masonry and exterior plaster, unitized window units, curtain wall, and painted metal sunscreens.

Site development work for the project will consist of reconfiguration of the existing utility distribution systems to accommodate the new construction and will provide an augmentation to the existing Northwest campus sewer system that is currently near its design capacity. Site work will also provide solutions for existing pedestrian and vehicular access and circulation conflicts in the northwest quadrant of the campus.

The design of the proposed housing projects has been reviewed in accordance with University Policy by Anshen+Allen Los Angeles, an independent design consultant. Independent cost estimating by JCM Associates and independent structural engineering review by Englekirk & Sabol have been conducted at each stage of the project development.

UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project. A construction management firm will be engaged in the role of University's Representative during the preconstruction, bidding and construction phases. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Administrative Vice Chancellor will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

See item 2, ***Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Long Range Development, Los Angeles Campus***, for a summary of environmental impacts of the project.

Public comments received on the Draft EIR relevant to NHIP concentrated on the proposed associated recreation use and relocated storage facility for Facilities Management. Relative to these issue areas, the comments focused on requests for additional project-specific descriptions, siting of these uses on the project site, and

consistency with the Stipulated Use Agreement and surrounding land uses. In addition to these issues, comments included remarks on enrollment growth, Hilgard Bus Terminal, BruinGo, and inquiries regarding additional alternatives and traffic and air quality mitigation measures.

The Final EIR contains the comment letters received on the Draft EIR, a transcript of the public hearing, detailed responses to the comments received, text changes to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Project Impacts

Implementation of the NHIP has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A detailed summary of these impacts is included in the Findings and in the Summary Chapter of the Draft EIR. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, significant and unavoidable impacts from NHIP implementation will remain even after implementation of mitigation measures in air quality, noise levels, and traffic.

If the City of Los Angeles does not implement all feasible mitigation measures identified in the 2002 LRDP Draft EIR for the NHIP project, then impacts could remain significant and unavoidable at four intersections during the 12-week period of summer instruction.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts are described in Item 2 above.

Alternatives

In addition to the proposed NHIP project, the EIR analyzed two project alternatives: no project/no build that will leave the project site in its present condition; and an Alternative Site that includes a 2,000-bed housing complex provided on Lot 32 with additional dining and student services, as well as 801 subterranean parking spaces beneath the development. In addition, the EIR considered three other alternatives that were found to be infeasible: Extended Construction Period; Reduced Project; and Increased Housing.

Mitigation Monitoring Program

The UCLA campus will be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents identified in the EIR. To assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared and is included in the Final EIR. The MMRP provides a reporting mechanism for the mitigation measures

(MM) and programs and procedures (PP) that are made conditions of approval to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment.

Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Findings discuss the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, monitoring program, and alternatives. The Findings also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant effects in the areas of air quality, noise, and traffic and circulation.

Vice Chancellor Blackman and Campus Architect Averill presented slides of the project.

Regent-designate Seigler and Regent Sainick expressed their appreciation for the fact that the design reflects the traditional look of UCLA. Regent-designate Seigler commented that the tall palm trees used in the landscaping do not provide much shade. Mr. Blackman responded that they were chosen for that particular area because of the accessibility requirements for safety vehicles and the need for low maintenance. He agreed to consider the possibility of using other tall trees.

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

4. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, DYKSTRA PARKING STRUCTURE, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that subject to approval of the UCLA 2002 Long Range Development Plan and certification of the associated Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend:

A. Adoption of the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations pertaining to Dykstra Parking Structure as contained in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the UCLA 2002 Long Range Development Plan EIR.

B. Approval of the design of the Dykstra Parking Structure, Los Angeles campus.

[The Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Vice Chancellor Blackman recalled that in March 2002 The Regents approved preliminary plans only for six capital projects associated with the Northwest Campus Student Housing and Parking plan. In September 2002 The Regents approved the three housing projects: Sproul Hall First Floor Renovation; Hedrick-North Residence Hall and First Floor Renovation; Rieber North and West Residence Halls and First

Floor Renovation. At that time the Dykstra Parking Structure was separated from the housing projects. In November 2002 the President approved the inclusion of the Dykstra Parking Structure, Los Angeles campus in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of $8,620,000. The President also approved external financing for the project to be repaid from Parking Systems net revenues.

In July 2002 the appointment of Studios Architecture of San Francisco, California as executive architect for this project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site for the Dykstra Parking Structure is surface parking lot DH adjacent to Dykstra Hall. The structure will be built into a hillside, with one level partially below grade, between Dykstra Hall and Bradley International Hall.

Project Design

The Dykstra Parking Structure will have four levels accommodating 294 parking spaces with the entrance at the same grade level as the Bradley Motor Court and the remaining three levels partially below grade. Vehicle queuing space approaching the structure will be provided to minimize conflicts between automobiles and pedestrians. The structure will accommodate two-way vehicle traffic and 90-degree parking stalls.

The pedestrian circulation to and from the parking structure will be integrated into the surrounding paths. The principal pedestrian exit from the parking structure will be located at grade level, adjacent to the Bradley Motor Court, while a secondary exit will be located to the west serving the De Neve Plaza Housing complex.

The interior of the structure will be a combination of exposed and painted concrete, while the exterior will be a mix of UCLA brick, stucco, and painted concrete in colors to match the adjacent buildings. The automobiles and their headlights will be screened from view by a combination of brick screen walls and a metal guard-rail system. The garage will be open in design and naturally ventilated.

The structure will be a post-tensioned concrete floor and beam system. The graphics and lighting will be consistent with UCLA standards for way-finding and safety. Exterior lighting will provide adequate lighting levels without spilling excessive light into the adjacent neighborhood. Safety features will include emergency telephones placed at marked locations, bollards, and a fire alarm system.

The landscape will blend with the existing adjacent hillsides. To ensure adequate screening of the proposed structure, mature Canary Island pines will be relocated to this site from elsewhere on campus. The existing mature trees along Gayley Avenue will be protected in place.

The design of the Dykstra Parking Structure has been reviewed in accordance with University Policy by Hardy, Holzman, Pfeiffer & Associates, an independent design consultant. Independent cost estimating by JCM Group and independent structural engineering review by Englekirk & Sabol have been conducted at each stage of project development.

UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project. A construction management firm may be engaged in the role of University's Representative during the preconstruction, bidding, and construction phases. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Administrative Vice Chancellor will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

See Item 2. above for a general description of the environmental impacts and their mitigation.

The alternatives, Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations are discussed in Item 2 above.

In response to a question from Regent Lozano, Mr. Blackman assured her that the importance of good lighting and security measures had been taken into account. Campus parking facilities are monitored by service personnel and are supplied with well-marked safety stations.

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

5. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ENGINEERING 1 REPLACEMENT BUILDING, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the "Nanosystems and Engineering Facilities Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report" certified by The Regents in July 2002, the Committee:

A. Adopt the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

B. Approve the design of the Engineering 1 Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus.

[The Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring Program were mailed to the Committee members in advance of the meeting.]

It was recalled that in November 2002, The Regents amended the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program to include the Engineering 1 Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus, at a project cost of $28,722,000. The project cost will be funded from a combination of gift funds ($19,100,000) and external financing ($9,622,000). The total project cost of the replacement building is $55,900,000. Additional funds of $27,178,000 are to be provided by State funds ($26,278,000) and gift funds ($900,000) under the approved Engineering 1 Seismic Mitigation project.

In November 2002, the appointment of Anshen + Allen of Los Angeles, California as executive architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The east wing of the existing Engineering 1 Building is located on the proposed building site, which is bounded by Ackerman Union on the north, the Math Sciences Building and Boelter Hall on the east, a service drive and Engineering IV on the south, and the west wing of Engineering 1 and Westwood Plaza on the west. The topography of the site slopes approximately 35 feet from the northeast portion adjacent to Math Sciences down to the access drive below at the southern edge. The project includes decoupling the utilities of the two portions of the existing Engineering 1 Building and the demolition of the east wing. The location was chosen in accordance with the 1990 Long Range Development Plan as well as the proposed 2002 LRDP.

Project Design

The Engineering 1 Replacement Building will house teaching and research laboratories, support space, meeting and seminar facilities, and faculty, post doctoral, and graduate student offices. The first floor will also include unimproved shell space for future campus use.

The building's planning module allows for flexible combinations of laboratory benches, equipment and workspace, and the ability to restructure spaces to accommodate new and emerging technologies over time. The Departments of Bioengineering, Computer Science, and Materials Science and Engineering will be the primary occupants of the building.

The design of this five-story structure has considered the future building to the west of a Phase 2 Engineering Building. The organizational concept for the full site envisions a series of laboratory blocks alternating with office blocks along an east/west public circulation spine. The Engineering 1 Replacement Building will include the first portion of the spine that will be extended in the future. To the north of the circulation spine there will be a series of north-facing offices and meeting rooms. The primary entrance to the building will be at the third level in the northeast corner of the site adjacent to the top of the Portola Steps. Service access will be from the first floor at the existing service drive located to the south.

The building aesthetic is consistent with the UCLA Architectural Guidelines. The external walls of the north and west sides of the building will be primarily of concrete with UCLA blend brick cladding punctuated by deeply recessed windows. Sections of the north façade and the rooftop screen wall will be composed of a buff-colored terra cotta and trim that recalls the original buff terra cotta in the historic core of the campus. In an effort to increase the daylight to labs and open office areas, the east and south façades of the building facing the service alley and Boelter Hall are composed of glass curtain wall, painted metal sunscreens, and terra cotta.

The concrete-frame building will hide its major mechanical and electrical system in its lowest level to the north and on the roof, where it will be surrounded by an equipment screen.

An independent design consultant has reviewed the design of the Engineering 1 Replacement Building in accordance with University Policy. Independent cost estimating and independent structural review has been conducted at each stage of the project development.

UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project. A construction management firm may be engaged in the role of University's Representative during the pre-construction, bidding, and construction phases. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Administrative Vice Chancellor will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

The potential environmental effects of Engineering 1 replacement project were analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report entitled *Nanosystems and Engineering Facilities Plan*. The Draft EIR was released for public review. One routine comment letter was received from the Southern California Association of Governments.

The Final EIR was certified by The Regents in July 2002 in conjunction with its approval of the design of the CNSI Building project. The Final EIR evaluated the potential environmental effects of the project in 14 environmental issue areas: land use; population, employment, and housing; parking, access, and traffic; biological resources; archaeological and historical resources; visual quality; geology, soils, and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; air quality; noise and vibration; utilities and service systems; energy; hazardous materials; and public services.

The Final EIR indicates that the Engineering 1 Replacement Building project will result in significant impacts prior to mitigation in the following areas: biological resources; visual quality; construction air quality; construction noise and vibration; and hazardous materials. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, impacts related to short-term construction air quality and noise will remain significant and unavoidable. Three alternatives to the project were analyzed in the Draft EIR: no

project; construction of the CNSI Building and Engineering 1 Replacement Building on the Engineering 1 Site; and Alternative Site - Parking Lot 32.

A Mitigation Monitoring Program, to ensure implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts, is included in the Final EIR. Monitoring of the implementation of mitigation measures will be conducted annually in conjunction with the annual status report for the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures for the project, project alternatives, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. The Findings also set forth a Statement of Overriding Considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant environmental effects for short-term construction air quality and noise.

Vice Chancellor Blackman and Campus Architect Averill showed slides of the project.

In response to a question by Regent-designate Murray, Mr. Averill confirmed that the laboratory and office spaces had separate air systems and the laboratories are equipped with high-efficiency fans.

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

6. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, DAVIS HALL NORTH REPLACEMENT BUILDING, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as indicated in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects Environmental Impact Report certified by The Regents in January 2002, the Committee:

(1) Adopt the Findings.

(2) Approve the design of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building, Berkeley campus.

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

It was recalled that in September 2001, The Regents amended the 2001-02 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-04 Capital Improvement Program to include the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), Berkeley campus. Funding for preliminary plans of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building (identified as CITRIS II in the September 2001 agenda item) was approved

in the amount of $6,300,000 funded by the State through the California Institutes of Science and Innovation program ($6,200,000) and gift funds ($100,000). In January 2002, The Regents certified the Environmental Impact Report for the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects (NEQSS), Berkeley campus, which includes this project, and amended the Berkeley campus 1990 Long Range Development Plan to extend the LRDP envelope for net new space.

In January 2003, The Regents amended the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program to include this project to be funded from a combination of State funds through the California Institutes for Science and Innovation ($87,325,000), and gift funds ($30,325,000). The total combined project cost for the Davis Hall North Replacement Building is $117,650,000.

In September 2002, the appointment of Johnson Fain Partners of Los Angeles, California as Executive Architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The facility will replace the existing Davis Hall North and will extend into the adjacent open area between Naval Architecture and Davis Hall South, along Hearst Avenue. The use of this site for this project is consistent with the Berkeley 1990 LRDP, and the January 2002 amendment added 325,000 gsf to accommodate the Davis Hall North Replacement and three other building projects.

Project Design

The 79,420-assignable-square-foot project will be the headquarters for CITRIS and its research and instructional programs. Major building components include flexible dry laboratory space, distance learning classrooms and an auditorium, multi-media center, office and administrative space. Approximately 18,700 assignable square feet will be dedicated to a state-of-the-art silicon based micro-fabrication facility.

The massing and materials are consistent with planning principles developed in the College of Engineering Facilities Master Plan study of February 2002 to integrate the building within the stylistically-diverse Engineering precinct of the campus and to create a scale sympathetic to the Naval Architecture Building and other craftsman-style buildings on Hearst Avenue. The new building is set back on Hearst Avenue the same distance as the Naval Architecture Building. The wing of the building closest to Naval Architecture and Hearst Avenue is three stories high. The building increases to five stories above grade as it abuts the existing Davis Hall South tower. The basement levels, one at the microfab and two at the CITRIS tower, further reduce the visible mass of the building.

The building structure is a combination of reinforced poured-in-place concrete at the lower levels and a perimeter steel moment frame with bracing in core areas at upper

levels. The building enclosure is predominantly pre-cast concrete panels with integral color. Windows are rectangular with proportions that relate to the windows on Naval Architecture. A three-story atrium provides space for interaction between the public floors at the main entry. The plaza at the front of the building provides a generous separation that is respectful of the Naval Architecture Building. A trellis at the base of the building on the west façade will shade an outdoor seating area facing the open area at Soulé Road.

The design of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by independent design consultants and a value engineering team. Independent structural review has been conducted at each stage of the project development.

Berkeley Campus Capital Projects unit will manage the project with assistance from the Executive Architect's project team. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Campus Architect will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

In conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedures for implementing CEQA, environmental effects of the Davis Hall North Replacement Building were analyzed in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety (NEQSS) Project Environmental Impact Report. The NEQSS EIR was tiered from the 1990 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) as amended, and adopted by The Regents in 1990. The NEQSS EIR was certified by The Regents in January 2002 in conjunction with its approval of the amendment to the 1990 LRDP extending the LRDP envelope for net new space.

The Davis Hall North Replacement Building project is substantially the same as analyzed in the Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects EIR. No substantial changes are proposed, and no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken have occurred since certification of the NEQSS EIR.

The public review period for the Draft EIR was extended in response to requests from the City of Berkeley. Forty-four comment letters were received. A public hearing was held at which 33 people commented. Letters, cards, and the public hearing transcript were included in the Final EIR. The Final EIR contained the comments on the Draft EIR, responses to these comments, and revisions based on comments received. Community concerns about the NEQSS Projects and LRDP amendment were responded to in the Final NEQSS EIR.

Subsequent to certification of the EIR by The Regents, the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley campus, with participation of the Office of General Counsel, reached agreement on a set of further steps to address community concerns with impacts of the

NEQSS projects. In honor of that agreement, the campus expects to replace tennis courts that will be converted to parking by the NEQSS projects.

Significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, either because mitigations are not available or are currently considered infeasible, include short-term significant noise levels.

The Berkeley campus is responsible for implementing all mitigation measures identified in the NEQSS EIR applicable to this project as an element of the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), which is included in the Final NEQSS EIR. The MMP provides a reporting mechanism for the changes to the proposed project, which are made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

Findings

The Findings further elaborate on the project's consistency with the NEQSS EIR.

Vice Chancellor Denton and Assistant Vice Chancellor Gayle showed slides of the project.

Regent Kozberg and Regent-designate Murray agreed that the design had improved in appearance in that the new colors and the texture of the roof were more in keeping with the surrounding buildings and were more attractive than in the original plan.

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

7. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AMENDMENT OF THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, WEST ENTRY PARKING STRUCTURE, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed West Entry Parking Structure project as indicated in the Tiered Initial Study, the Committee:

(1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

(2) Approve and incorporate into the project all project elements, relevant 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, and project-specific mitigation measures identified in the project's Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

(4) Amend the UC Davis 1994 LRDP land use map.

(5) Approve the design of the West Entry Parking Structure, Davis campus.

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

It was recalled that in July 2002 The Regents approved preliminary plans for the West Entry Parking Structure project. In January 2003, The Regents approved the inclusion of the West Entry Parking Structure, Davis campus in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvement Program, at a total project cost of $38,502,000. The project will be funded from external financing ($34,688,000), campus funds ($2,500,000), and parking reserves ($1,314,000).

In January 2003, the appointment of Watry Design Group, Inc. of Redwood City, California as Executive Architect for this project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The proposed site, which is located on the central part of the UC Davis campus on the north side of Hutchison Drive between Dairy Road and Klieber Hall Drive, is designated for Academic and Administrative uses in the 1994 Davis Campus Long Range Development Plan. The proposed use is not consistent with this land-use designation. Land-use designation changes will convert 2.9 acres of Academic and Administrative to Parking, and in exchange 2 acres of Parking Lot 41 will convert from Parking to Academic and Administrative. The West Entry Parking Structure will consist of the Parking Structure and a separate office building that will house Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) and the Police Department's public safety programs.

Project Design

The West Entry Parking Structure contains approximately 1,453 parking spaces on six levels. The exterior finishes will be exposed cast-in-place concrete, glass and pre-cast concrete panels at the corners, and metal frame and glass screen walls on the west and east facades.

The office building portion of the project will contain administrative space for TAPS and the Police Department's public safety programs within a total approximate area of 20,800 gsf. The office buildings will be two stories high with steel frame interior structure and concrete masonry unit, exterior shear walls. The exterior finishes will be colored concrete masonry, with pre-cast concrete elements at the doors and windows.

The design of the West Entry Parking Structure project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant and value engineering teams.

UC Davis Architects & Engineers Department will manage the project with assistance from the executive design professional's project team, with outside consultants and testing agencies as necessary. The Campus Architect will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Draft Tiered Initial Study was prepared for the project. The Notice of Intent and Draft Tiered Initial Study for the project were circulated for a 30-day public and agency review, which was extended by request from campus faculty and staff working on parking and transportation issues. A summary of the comments received during the public and agency review period is included in the Tiered Initial Study. A letter from the California Department of Transportation raised issues regarding potential modifications to nearby freeway ramps. Twenty-eight communications from UC Davis employees raised mainly financial issues related to the funding of the parking structure and were not related to CEQA issues. The comments from employees did include a small number of CEQA issues related to traffic, bicycles, emergency response, and construction impacts which were addressed adequately in the Draft Tiered Initial Study.

The Tiered Initial Study identifies potential environmental impacts of the project in the areas consistent with the 1994 LRDP EIR and traffic and circulation roadway impacts. The Tiered Initial Study identifies adequate mitigation measures to reduce the project impacts to a less than significant level. The Tiered Initial Study is accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

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

Vice Chancellor Blackwelder and Campus Architect Strand showed slides of the design.

Regent Kozberg observed that, notwithstanding that it was for a parking structure, the design was quite attractive. The campus reported having used the glass treatment previously and not experiencing maintenance problems with it. Regent-designate Murray was informed that the garage has spaces set aside for alternative fuel vehicles. It was explained that the highest level had no roof because other buildings do not look down upon it and to add a roof would have increased the cost. One may be added later if funds become available. In answer to a question by Faculty Representative Pitts,

Mr. Blackwelder reported that, although the charge to park will add about $17 per month to overall campus parking rates, parking costs on the campus remain lower than on other campuses.

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

8. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, HECKMANN CENTER PHASES 1 & 2 AT PALM DESERT, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of Heckmann Center Phases 1 & 2 at Palm Desert, Riverside campus.

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

It was recalled that in February 2003, the Heckmann Center Phase 1 Palm Desert-Riverside campus was approved administratively at a total project cost of $8 million, which will be funded by a gift of $6 million from the Richard J. Heckmann Foundation and a $2 million loan from the Palm Desert Redevelopment Agency which was approved by The Regents at the May 2002 meeting. Street improvements to adjacent Frank Sinatra Drive have been accomplished through the use of City of Palm Desert Measure A funding.

Architram Design Group of Ontario designed the Phase 1 building in collaboration with LHA of Pasadena as the executive architects. Upon approval of the design by the Committee, the campus will enter into an agreement with the architects to provide appropriate professional architectural services through the completion of the Phase 1 project.

In July 2001, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Heckmann Center Phase 2, Palm Desert-Riverside campus in the 2001-2002 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-06 Capital Improvements Program. The total project cost will be funded by State funds.

In May 2002, the appointment of Rossetti Architects, Inc. of El Segundo as executive architect for the Phase 2 project was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site is a portion of a 20-acre parcel at the intersection of Frank Sinatra Drive and Cook Street in Palm Desert that is part of the 200-acre Valley Education Center, a CSU San Bernardino facility. The entire 200-acre site has been designated for Educational and Institutional uses by the City of Palm Desert.

The Master Plan for California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center designates the uses allowed for the 200-acre site and includes a general site layout. The 20-acre parcel was obtained through negotiations with CSU, San Bernardino and the Palm Desert Redevelopment Agency. The Regents has received title to 8.51 acres and an option to acquire an additional 11.3 acres. The location is generally consistent with the Master Plan.

Project Design

The projects will constitute the initial development of the University of California academic center at Palm Desert. These buildings will be located on an 8.51-acre parcel at the highest elevation of the 20-acre site and will be visible when approaching the site from any direction. A collaborative design effort between the campus and the two architects, including the development of common design standards, ensures that the buildings will be constructed using a common color and material palette of stone tile, stucco, glass and metal panels.

Heckmann Center Phase 1

The two-story Heckmann Center Phase 1 is designed to contain 12,403 assignable square feet within a total area of 20,132 gross square feet. The Phase 1 facility will be the primary administrative center for the complex and will house faculty offices as support for the academic programs in the Palm Desert facility.

The complex will house academic spaces that will include two lecture rooms with adjacent break out areas, seminar rooms, conference spaces, faculty and administrative offices, a café, and related support spaces.

The two-story building will be a braced framed steel structure with stucco and metal panels on the exterior. The building is semi-circular in shape and developed around a tiered plaza area. The building is oriented so that its glass surfaces face the north and northeast onto the tiered patio. To the south and southwest a double exterior wall will mitigate the desert heat and sun. The exterior colors and materials are derived from the desert environment. Finishes include plaster in natural colors accented with metal panels.

The design of the Heckmann Center Phase 1 building has been reviewed in accordance with campus policy. The campus conducted an independent cost consultation and independent structural and seismic review of the documents done by the architect under contract to the donor.

Heckmann Center Phase 2

The Heckmann Center Phase 2 is designed to contain 17,660 assignable square feet within a total area of 28,484 gross square feet. Phase 2 will provide a multidiscipline, multifunction instruction, research and distance learning facility for the study of entrepreneurial management and related curricula.

The building will be a two-story structure with the main axis running in an east/west direction. Entries will occur at the south side adjacent to the courtyard/plaza, which is shared with Phase 1, and at the north side adjacent to the parking lot. The entries will lead into a main ground floor lobby that will also act as the pre-function space for the auditorium and seminar rooms. From the ground floor lobby an elevator and open stairway will lead to the second level, which will contain administrative offices, computer labs, a large classroom, and class labs.

The design of Phase 2 uses a sweeping arc that plays off the circular plan of Phase 1 and serves to create a sense of semi-enclosure along the axis of the tiered patio. A bridge connects the plaza level of Phase 1 with the second level of Phase 2. The north entry is skewed at an angle perpendicular to the prevailing northwest winds and set back into the building's atrium. The curvilinear footprint of the building and an earth berm further protect the south courtyard from the wind.

The building will have a braced frame, structural steel system sheathed in stone tile and metal panels and embellished with aluminum framed insulated glass curtainwalls. The design includes three levels of architectural sunscreens along the south elevation. The second floor walkway, upper architectural eyebrow, and the upper roof all serve to protect the atrium from the intense desert sun. Exterior materials consist primarily of stone tile in a natural earth tone, lightly tinted insulating glass, and accent painted metal panels, compatible with Phase 1.

The design of the Heckmann Center Phase 2 building has been reviewed in accordance with campus policy. Independent cost consultation and independent structural and seismic review have been conducted.

The Office of Design and Construction staff under the oversight of the Vice Chancellor, Administration will oversee both projects. Outside consultants and testing agencies would be used as necessary.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study was prepared for the proposed Heckmann Center Phases 1 and 2 projects, tiered from the California State University San Bernardino Coachella Valley Campus Master Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Initial Study considers only project and site specific impacts. Cumulative impacts and mitigation measures for the Master Plan development are addressed as they apply to this proposed project. A draft Initial Study was prepared and circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day review period. Based on the impact assessment in the final Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project, as mitigated, would not by itself result in significant impacts, and that the cumulative impacts of the development of the Master Plan area identified in the CSUSBCV Master Plan EIR would be mitigated by Master Plan EIR mitigation measures.

Measures to reduce or avoid significant cumulative impacts identified CSUSBCV Master Plan EIR are monitored under the city-adopted Mitigation Monitoring Program. New project-specific impacts and mitigation measures and applicable revised CSUSBCV Master Plan project-specific impacts and mitigation measures that were identified will be monitored in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program, included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental review process, the relation of the project to the CSUSBCV Master Plan EIR, project impacts and mitigation measures addressed in the context of the Heckmann Center Phases 1 and 2 Final Initial Study, and conclusions regarding approval of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project in conformance with CEQA.

Vice Chancellor Webster and Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson showed slides of the project.

In answer to a question by Regent Lozano, it was explained that the unusual semicircular design, which was favored by the donor, is an efficient one. The Committee advised considering making the central courtyard, which is not well shaded, into a more hospitable and useful space. Mr. Webster explained that it was not thought that improvements such as the use of photovoltaic cells on the roof and the structural shading of more of the outside area could be possible within the budget, but he agreed to reconsider the possibility of adding such features. It was noted that the landscape design had not yet been fully developed and that consideration would be given to using native plants.

Regent Kozberg noted that the center is near a State college and asked whether the two were aligned. Mr. Webster responded that they would support and supplement each other. Senior Vice President Mullinix added that a program may be developed to foster some dual use of the facilities.

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

9. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, CAMPUS MULTIPURPOSE BUILDING, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Campus Multipurpose Building, San Diego campus.

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

It was recalled that in July 2002, the President, in concurrence with the Chairman of the Board, the Chairman of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, approved the Campus Multipurpose Building, San Diego campus, for inclusion in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-05 Capital Improvements Program at a total project cost of $18,525,000. The cost will be funded with external financing ($18,050,000) and campus funds ($475,000).

In January 2003, the appointment of Smith Group, Inc. of Los Angeles, California, as executive architect for this project, was approved by the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site for the proposed facility is in the central campus University Center neighborhood, east of Russell Lane, north of the Gilman Parking Structure, and south of the Visual Arts facility. The project use is consistent with the revised 1989 Long Range Development Plan land-use designation for the site. The site is currently occupied by a temporary inflatable structure that will be removed prior to construction.

Project Design

The Campus Multipurpose Building will contain 44,418 asf and will include lecture halls, classrooms, instructional support space, offices, and office support space. Three 125-seat classrooms are designed to serve a variety of disciplines and types of instruction. Two lecture halls will each seat 200 students.

The facility will be four stories above grade and "U"-shaped, forming an interior court to accommodate students gathering for classes. The open end will incorporate pedestrian bridge connections on the third and fourth floors. All the classrooms and lecture halls will be located on the ground floor to accommodate the high volume of student traffic. The offices, office support, and instructional support space will be located on the upper floors and will be connected with exterior balconies and walkways. The structure will be steel frame construction, with low-E glass and frit glass curtainwalls, and concrete block and plaster walls. The design is in accordance with the University Center neighborhood planning study and design guidelines.

Because the need for classrooms, lecture halls, and offices is so urgent to accommodate enrollment growth, UCSD proposes to use a fast track design coordinated by a construction manager. By releasing the construction work in several bid packages, the long-lead items such as the fabrication of the steel can begin earlier than normal and the site clearance and excavation work can begin while the remaining trades are being bid, thus shortening the overall construction duration. The project schedule has been developed in accordance with this methodology.

The University of California, San Diego Design Review Board has reviewed the design of the Multipurpose Building, in accordance with University policy. An independent cost estimate has been completed and an independent seismic review is in process.

The Office of Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project. Independent testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction, will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for the Campus Multipurpose Building. The MND was circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day public review. The adjacent U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Miramar sent its standard notice associated with aircraft operations noise, of which the campus is aware. The State Department of Toxic Substances Control provided information regarding its procedures, which the University understands and follows. The letters and their written responses were included in the Final IS/MND.

The proposed MND is tiered from the 1989 LRDP Environmental Impact Report. Based on the Tiered Initial Study, the University concluded that possibly significant short-term effects on the environment specific to the project will be mitigated effectively by revisions that have been made or agreed to by the University. The project will contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts that were analyzed adequately in the 1989 LRDP EIR.

Findings

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

Vice Chancellor Woods and Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann presented slides of the project.

Regent-designate Seigler expressed concern about the number of exits from the lecture hall, but Mr. Hellmann assured him that the number and width of the exits for all of the ground floor classrooms conformed to code. Regent Kozberg commented that accommodating a design to the site while staying within a reasonable budget must have posed some challenges, including having to use outside walkways. Mr. Hellmann acknowledged that compromises were made, but he noted that the design was flexible enough that it may be possible to add space at a later date. In response to an observation by Regent Lozano about the building's proximity to housing, Mr. Hellmann emphasized that the facade on the residential side was purposely softened by the use of popped-out windows and teak trim. He expected that the finished windows would be operable.

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

10. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, STUDENT ACADEMIC SERVICES FACILITY, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Student Academic Services Facility, San Diego campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2001, The Regents approved the State Budget Act that included the Student Academic Services Facility, San Diego campus, for inclusion in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2002-07 Capital Improvements Program at a total project cost of $29,692,000. The cost will be funded with State funds ($21,708,000), external financing ($1,984,000), and University funds ($6,000,000).

In December 2002, the appointment of Rob Wellington Quigley, FAIA, San Diego, as executive architect for this project, was approved within the Office of the President.

Project Site

The site for the facility is east of Myers Drive, south of Lyman Way, and north of Rupertus Way. It houses three wood-frame structures constructed in the 1940s that will be either demolished or relocated. The neighborhood is the hub of student activity, and the site is located conveniently near a parking structure, student center, and classroom building. The project use is consistent with the revised 1989 Long Range Development Plan land use designation for the site.

Project Design

The 75,000 asf Student Academic Services Facility will provide students and prospective students with a central, consolidated location for academic support and services related to enrollment management, student development, and academic enrichment.

The facility will be five stories above grade. Spaces with the highest student traffic will be located on the ground floor. The building footprint will be an "L" shape. The structure will be a concrete frame forming an arcade on the first and second levels, with steel construction on the upper three floors. The exterior envelope will incorporate low-E glass curtainwalls with a perimeter shade structure for sun control on the west and south sides. The design is in accordance with the University Center neighborhood planning guidelines.

The University of California, San Diego Design Review Board has reviewed the design of the Student Academic Services Facility in accordance with University Policy. An independent cost estimate has been completed and an independent seismic review is in process.

The Office of Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project. Independent testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), tiered from the 1989 LRDP Environmental Impact Report, was prepared for the facility. The MND was prepared and circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day public review. Two comment letters were received and responded to in the final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. The adjacent U.S. Marine corps Air Station Miramar sent its standard notice associated with aircraft operations noise, of which the campus is aware. The State Department of Toxic substances Control

provided information regarding its procedures, which the University understands and follows. Both letters were answered in writing and included in the Final IS/MND. Based on the Tiered Initial Study, the University concluded that the proposed project will not have significant environmental effects because revisions to the project have been made or mitigating measures have been agreed to by the University. On the basis of the Tiered Initial Study/MND and implementation of LRDP EIR mitigation measures in combination with project-specific mitigation measures for geology and noise, there is no substantial evidence that the project as mitigated may have a significant effect on the environment.

Findings

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

Vice Chancellor Woods and Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann presented slides of the project.

In answer to a question by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Hellmann noted that the pattern of walkways shown in the rendering was not final. He agreed that the design team would pay special attention to making the exterior area attractive.

Mr. Hellmann noted that, although the building has not been LEED certified, it uses materials that take advantage of sustainability requirements. Regent-designate Murray suggested that the campus should make an effort to inform students about its efforts generally with regard to energy sustainability in new construction projects.

In answer to a question by Regent Sainick, the Committee was assured that the building was designed with the flexibility to withstand seismic events.

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

11. **BIO-MEDICAL LIBRARY ADDITION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann provided an update of the design for the addition to the Bio-Medical Library and the effort to integrate it with the original building, which has a dynamic hyperbolic paraboloid roof. He showed slides of the design and displayed a building model in order to point out the building's reconfigured entry. The existing building has a pre-cast concrete screen wall that effectively camouflages it from view on the west side. Around the corner, the building material changes to exposed aggregate panels against which the addition will be juxtaposed. The glass areas of clerestory in the existing bio-medical library repeat the vertical mullions. The center part that links the two buildings is a neutral piece, a glass enclosure between the two buildings, but the architecture repeats the imagery in many ways of the uplifting roof on the southwest corner and the height, dimension, and repetition of the versicle mullions along the clerestory space. The dimension of the exposed aggregate panels is repeated in the glass and the horizontal sunshade components. The architecture changes on the east side to match more closely the basic sciences building next to it. There is a distinction between the two roof edges separated by glass. Mr. Hellmann believed that with these refinements the library will be a welcoming beacon for those driving into the School of Medicine.

The Committee agreed that, in the face of having to work with a building with an extreme design, the architects had done well.

12. **GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Woods stated that the new graduate school building, although not large, was an important addition to the campus. Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann discussed the design of the project.

Mr. Hellmann reported that the north part of the campus had experienced tremendous expansion and that the Graduate School of Management will create the context for its area. The building is sited in such a way that it has a courtyard that opens onto a large landscape wedge that acts as a buffer between neighborhoods. He showed conceptual drawings of the building, which is on the highest part of the campus and provides open vistas to the ocean. He then directed the Committee's attention to the floor plans, noting that the upper floors are office levels and that one end of the building houses a large auditorium. Window screens control the sun on the west and south sides of the building. On the north side a large portal allows fire access and provides pedestrian walkways and drop-off parking. The building materials are terra cotta in a light shade.

Regent Sainick observed that there is an open terrace on top of the auditorium and asked whether it was planned for use as a gathering place. Mr. Hellmann responded that it had been discussed but that because of budgetary considerations the space will not be able to be finished appropriately for that use.

In response to a question by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Woods reported that the campus was close to an agreement to name the building after a donor.

Regent Kozberg hoped that the design team would look at the Haas School of Business and the Andersen School of Business. She observed that business schools are often gathering spots for community leaders. Mr. Hellmann reported that the architects have designed a number of business schools and are familiar with their requirements. He pointed out that the courtyard was designed with that use in mind. Project Manager Michael Downs commented that the courtyard is designed to accommodate graduate ceremonies and fundraising activities of up to 500 people.

Regent Kozberg commented that the design was solid, but she believed that it could benefit from the addition of a few elegant design touches.

13. **CNSI DESIGN UPDATE, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher recalled that the Committee had considered the design for the California Naonsystems Institute previously and had made some observations and suggestions for refining the design. He played a virtual reality video that showed the way in which the campus is entered through the east gate as it exists. A new east gate project is planned that will tie into the redefined entrance to CNSI that will feature a passageway of trees opening into a clearing. A pair of gates will announce the campus' name. The entryway will continue through a grove of trees and end in a traffic circle that will replace an existing stop light. Mr. Fisher then showed how the CNSI will look in the context of its landscape. The building has a courtyard that provides views to the coast and features offices that face the ocean, taking full advantage of the spectacular site. He displayed a model of the building that is being used as a tool to help gather gifts, and he also showed still images of the building. He noted that eucalyptus trees had replaced the palm trees shown in the original design and a row of camphor trees or Italian stone pines may be used to provide a canopy around the traffic circle. The piece of artwork being developed for the north end of the building is made up of images extracted from scientific experiments. The colors will be baked onto metal panels and applied to the facade.

The Committee members approved of the changes made to the design.

14. **STUDENT HOUSING UPDATE, MERCED CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Desrochers recalled that the design of the first phase of the student housing and dining project for the Merced campus had been approved by the Committee in September 2002. At that time, the Committee had requested further information about the exterior design and had suggested that some modifications be considered. She invited Campus Architect Smith to discuss the progress of the project.

Mr. Smith showed slides of the design, noting that the 100-acre parcel on which the project is located is the first area of the new campus that has been made available for construction. The housing project is on an uphill slope that looks down on pastureland and a holding pond that is planned for expansion. The housing will consist of 600 units in two stories, with a commons and a food service area. It will border the central artery into the campus. He recalled that one of the principles of the vision for the new campus was to build low-rise housing using a form that will fit with the vernacular of the valley area. The character of the housing embraces principles that will continue to be expressed in the development of the campus character. These include sloping roofs with generous overhangs, stucco cladding, and timber edging. He noted that UCM is in a category that meets the criteria to be able to certify the housing to be built on the campus under the national sustainability rating system. The delivery method for the project is design/build, with bids to go out in the coming month.

In response to a question by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Smith pointed out that as the development had unfolded, the original building form and plan had continued to hold up. A change was made to the roof system, because the original design proved to be too costly. In eliminating the cost problem by making the roof form simpler, an advantage was gained through roof overhangs that will protect windows. The roof edges and the bracketing that supports the roofs are exposed and have become part of the architectural character.

Regent Sainick recalled that in the original design the pathways had seemed narrow. Mr. Smith responded that the architects had displayed some of their previous housing projects and had persuaded the design team that the widths were appropriate for their purpose and that there was enough separation between buildings.

Regent Kozberg acknowledged the advantage of extending the roof lines. She asked how the units would be embellished on the side that faces the main thoroughfare. Mr. Smith showed a slide that illustrated the relationships of the site to its topography and of the buildings to each other. He indicated that sunscreens on the windows and an abundance of trees and low planting would soften the aspect on the street side. Regent Kozberg then suggested that when the design/build group does its value engineering, special attention be paid to making the public side of the project attractive. Ms. Desrochers agreed to make sure of this. She reported that the design/build process will have to stay within established themes. Five companies have been pre-qualified to bid. They have been walked through the features of the design

as it stands and the other campus features. She explained that there will be a two-part approach to choosing a construction company. The amount of the bid will be one part, but then there are certain qualitative dimensions that will be used to judge the five bidders, and they will be given points for those dimensions. The low bid after that calculation is done will be accepted. She noted that this thoroughfare may remain the entry point for the campus for many years until funding is available for further expansion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary