The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
September 4, 2003

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay, 600–16th Street, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Kozberg, Lozano, Montoya, Murray, and Seigler; Advisory member Pitts

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

The meeting convened at 10:25 a.m. with Committee Vice Chair Lozano presiding.

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

For the record, it was confirmed that notice had been given in compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing items on the day's agenda.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of June 11, 2003 were approved, Regent Montoya abstaining.

3. **ADOPTION OF INITIAL STUDY AND TIERED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, CENTRAL PLANT PHASE II, MEDICAL CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

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

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

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

(3) Approve the design of the UC Davis Central Plant Phase II, Medical Center, Davis campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2002, the President, in concurrence with the Chairman of the Board and the Chairs of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings and Finance, authorized the expenditure of up to $12.4 million of hospital reserves to fund planning, design, and construction costs related to the Central Plant Phase II project. The appointment of Jacobs Facilities, Inc. of Sacramento as the Executive Design Professional for the project was approved administratively.

Project Site

The site for the proposed building is located in the south-central portion of the medical center, east of Stockton Boulevard, and is bounded by 49th Street on the south and east and 2nd Avenue on the north. Surrounding land uses include a surface parking lot and the Ellison Ambulatory Care Center to the north, the existing Facilities Support Services Building and surface parking lots to the west, the existing Central Plant to the east, and Marion Anderson Elementary School to the south. The site has been designated as the Plant and Support Services Zone in the medical center's Long Range Development Plan as amended. The proposed use is consistent with this land use designation.

Project Design

The Central Plant Phase II project is designed to support the utility requirements of several major capital improvement projects, including the Surgery and Emergency Services Pavilion and the Tower II Phases 3 & 4 projects. The Central Plant Phase II will include two chillers, a four-cell concrete and fiberglass cooling tower and associated pumps and water treatment systems, and an upgrade to an existing low-pressure boiler to provide high-pressure steam for hospital sterilizers. Site development will include screen walls to enclose the cooling towers, landscaping, and concrete flatwork. The building exterior will be a combination of precast concrete, concrete block, and metal panels identical to the exterior materials on the Central Plant.

UCDMC's Facilities Design and Construction Office will manage the project, with assistance from the Executive Design Professional. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The medical center's Associate Director for Planning, Design, and Construction will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

The environmental review for the project has been completed. An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for public review. The IS/MND is tiered from the 1989 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report. Based on the IS/MND, the University concluded that with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures the project would not have significant impacts.

The proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the potential for impacts of the project in all environmental topic areas and found potential project specific impacts in the following areas: cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and transportation and circulation. All of these potential impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

A comment letter was received from the City of Sacramento regarding the structure of CEQA compliance for multiple projects tiered from the LRDP EIR, possible air quality impacts from demolition of the existing cooling towers, the potential for cultural resources related to previous use of the site as the State fairgrounds, the amount of city water required for the operation of the cooling towers, and disposition of existing cooling tower water. Responses to these comments are included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

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

Mr. Tom Rush, Manager for Facilities Design and Construction, presented slides of the project.

Regent Murray noted that, although there had been more of the old cooling towers, they had been smaller and less intrusive. Mr. Rush explained that the imposing size of the new towers was a reflection of the system's improved efficiency.

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

4. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, GEFFEN PLAYHOUSE EXPANSION AND RENOVATION, LOS ANGELES 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 the UCLA Geffen Playhouse Expansion and Renovation project, Los Angeles campus.

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

It was recalled that the University had entered into a Project Agreement with the Geffen Playhouse to allow the Playhouse the right to make extensive renovations and additions to the existing facility that is currently leased from the University. The agreement provides for the Playhouse to design, construct, and equip the facility with its own resources. The approximate $16.5 million cost will be borne by the Geffen Playhouse through its own fundraising efforts. The renovated building with its new additions will be the property of the University, and the Geffen Playhouse will continue in its role as the tenant under the terms of its underlying lease agreement. The project is scheduled to be completed in fall 2005.

The Committee was informed that the original 1929 building, the Westwood Masonic Club, was designed in the "Spanish Medieval" style by Morgan Walls and Clements. It is designated as a locally significant historic resource in the Westwood Specific Plan and is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. In the 1960s, the building was purchased by new owners and renovated by A. Quincy Jones to house a live theater, crafts store, and restaurant. In 1993, UCLA purchased the site for the purpose of establishing a professional venue to support UCLA's School of Theater, Film and Television.

In accordance with the Project Agreement, the Playhouse has selected its architect, Ronald Frink and Associates, and with the consent of the University will select its contractor at a later date. The University will review plans and specifications at each phase of design for conformance with code and quality, durability, and maintainability of the project.

Project Site

The site for the proposed facility is across the street from the main campus at the existing Geffen Playhouse, just south of the existing UCLA Hospital. The site borders Le Conte Avenue on the north, a retail complex on the east and south, and a service drive on the west.

Project Design

The project seeks to improve the comfort and amenities of the theater and expand its seating capacity; provide a new second stage and rehearsal hall; provide new and flexible backstage and support areas for the theater; provide expanded administrative office and ticket sales facilities; and make the facility compliant with all applicable building, safety, and accessibility codes.

The work will include the renovation of interior portions of the building and the provision of two additions: (1) a two-story-plus-mezzanine addition to the southeast

side of the building that will house a second stage with up to 120 seats and an additional lobby with a new entrance from Le Conte Avenue; and (2) a second floor to the existing southwest wing of the building to accommodate offices. The expansion will add approximately 13,200 gross square feet to the existing structure, making the completed new and renovated building 35,800 gsf. The project incorporates design recommendations of the consulting architectural historian to preserve and refurbish original character-defining elements of the building and is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

The second story office addition will consist of roof tile and stucco wall elements that are compatible with those of the existing structure. The larger addition of the second stage will be recessed from the street and will create a new court facing Le Conte Avenue. This two-story addition will have a glass façade facing the landscaped courtyard. The design of the addition seeks to retain the architectural integrity of the historic main building by forming an understated and noncompetitive interstitial glass surface between the main building and the blank wall of the adjacent retail building.

The structure of the building will be upgraded to address hazards directly related to egress of the building, including bracing of unreinforced masonry walls, anchoring of roof tiles, and bracing of chimneys and ceiling elements. A new mechanical system will be added, with equipment on the roof surrounded by a screen. New electrical service for the building will be provided in an expanded basement electrical room.

The design of the Geffen Playhouse Expansion and Renovation has been reviewed in accordance with University Policy by Michael Palladino of Richard Meier & Partners, an independent design consultant. Independent structural review by Englekirk & Sabol has been conducted at each stage of the project development.

The Geffen Playhouse has selected the Hileman Company to manage the project. UCLA Capital Programs will provide project review on behalf of the University. The Playhouse will use outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies as necessary. The Administrative Vice Chancellor will oversee the project.

Environmental Impact Summary

The potential environmental effects of the Geffen Playhouse Expansion and Renovation Project were analyzed in an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 2003. The IS/MND was forwarded to the State Clearinghouse and circulated among individuals and State and local agencies.

The IS/MND determined that the project could result in a potentially significant impact to the historic structure. To mitigate this potential, the IS/MND included measures that specify several requirements for the design of the expansion and renovation, as recommended by the Historic Structures Report (HSR) prepared for the project, to ensure that all applicable recommendations of the HSR, as determined by

the University, will be implemented and that consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation will occur as appropriate. In addition, the project incorporates mitigation measures that require the incorporation of all recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical report for the prevention and abatement of any identified soil- or seismic-related constraints and hazards to ensure soil stability during construction and operation of the project in order to reduce the potentially significant effects of seismic ground shaking. Lastly, the project incorporates measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts on paleontological resources that might be uncovered during excavation. The IS/MND concluded that the project as mitigated would not result in any considerable contribution to potential cumulative impacts.

Two comment letters were received during the public review period for the IS/MND. A letter from the Holmby-Westwood Property Owners Association, Inc. expressed concerns with the project design and parking requirements. A letter from the California Department of Transportation asked for possible mitigation of the project's effect on congested freeways, perhaps by paying a share of the cost of future improvements to freeway mainline facilities based on increased use due to additional playhouse traffic. Responses to both letters are contained in the Final IS/MND.

The Final IS/MND also includes the project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Monitoring of the project-specific mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND will be conducted by the Geffen Playhouse project manager.

Findings

The Findings address the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding approval of the IS/MND for this project in conformance with CEQA.

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

In response to a question by Regent Montoya, Vice Chancellor Blackman affirmed that funding for the project must be guaranteed before construction may begin. In answer to a further question, he reported that most events at the theater will be held in the evening and will not add significantly to daytime traffic. There is adequate UCLA parking for attendees.

Regent Murray noted that the site is compact and asked about provisions for deliveries. Mr. Blackman believed that the new design would improve access for deliveries, particularly to the backstage area.

Regent Kozberg commented that the project uses the space very creatively and preserves the artistic nature of the historic design.

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

[*At this point Committee Chair Marcus joined the meeting.]*

5. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, STUDENT CENTER EXPANSION – PHASE 4, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the Student Center Expansion, Phase 4, Irvine campus.

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

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 Student Center Expansion, Phase 4 project at a total project cost of $61,500,000. In July 2003, The Regents approved an amendment to the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program to increase the project scope and budget. The increase in project cost was $6,967,000, increasing the total project budget to $68,467,000, and 26,184 asf of new program space was added. The project will be funded from external financing ($65,281,000) and housing reserves ($3,186,000).

In January 2003, the appointment of WTW Architects of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as executive architect for this project was approved administratively.

Project Site

The project is composed of separate components in two locations. The expansion of the existing Student Center main building will extend to an undeveloped portion of the project site and include partial demolition of the existing Student Center. The expansion of the existing Cross Cultural Center will extend into a parking and service area southwest of the existing facility, which is located across the Ring Mall from the Student Center main building between the Gateway Study Center and Student Services I. These sites are consistent with the 1989 Long Range Development Plan. Site development for both the Student Center main building and the Cross Cultural Center expansion will include hardscape and softscape, along with necessary utility relocations and connections.

Project Design

The Student Center Expansion, Phase 4 project will provide approximately 111,263 of new assignable square feet (asf). Due to current fire code restrictions, constructability issues, and program requirements, 22,930 asf of the existing Student Center Complex will be demolished. Existing wood-framed structures, completed in 1981, cannot be expanded based on current codes. The structures will be removed and the displaced area incorporated into the new, higher-density, fire-resistive building.

The four-story Student Center Expansion will be constructed using a structural steel frame with concrete masonry veneer over metal studs. It will reflect an architectural vocabulary seen throughout the campus that emphasizes classical organization with a base, a middle, and an attic story. A tower will provide a symbolic designation at the arrival point of the building. New entrances to the remaining portions of the existing building will be provided for easier recognition and access. Outdoor courts and terraces will be integrated into the design to accommodate a variety of flexible and programmable areas ranging from dining to performance spaces.

The expansion of the Cross Cultural Center will incorporate additional meeting and administrative areas in a two-story addition to the existing facility. Also included will be the renovation of 975 asf of student group area. Plaster will be used as the exterior material for the building addition to match the existing building finish. The entire building will be painted to complement the warm neutral colors used on the main Student Center building. Adjacent site work will use the same concrete finish and colors incorporated into the main building's site-work.

The design of the Student Center Expansion Project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant, seismic-structural consultant, and cost estimator. The campus Office of Design and Construction Services will manage the project. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Services, will oversee the project.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project. Various local, State, and federal agencies and service providers, as well as interested individuals and organizations, reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Written comments received and the Irvine campus' responses to these comments are included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Implementation of the project will have insignificant impact in most environmental impact areas but has the potential to have significant impacts to the following areas unless the recommended LRDP EIR and project specific mitigation measures described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are incorporated into the project:

aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; noise; public services; and transportation/traffic. After adoption of the recommended mitigation measures, all impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels. All mitigation measures will be monitored through the Mitigation Monitoring Programs established for the LRDP and for the project.

Subsequent to the printing of the Final Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, detailed architectural planning led to an increase to the project of 26,184 assignable square feet, which will result in a Student Center approximately 13 percent larger than anticipated under the Final Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. The increase resulted from adding an additional floor to one new wing of the building, slightly expanding the building footprint of another new wing, and modifying the lower level space. Any increased student use and occupancy of the building is dependent on increased student enrollment projected to occur regardless of project implementation. The additional full-time staff associated with the increased space are positions relocated from within the campus. Potential environmental impacts resulting from the additional space are not anticipated to differ from those described in the Final Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

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

[At this point Regent Hopkinson joined the meeting.]

Vice Chancellor Brase and Campus Architect Gladson showed slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson expressed concern about the way in which the University funds such projects. She believed that the practice of using fees voted in by the students may be imposing an unwanted burden on future students and that projects often are too luxurious, with astronomical costs per square foot. She believed that high expenditures for student facilities were particularly troublesome during the current economy. She advocated reexamining the policy at a future meeting. Committee Vice Chair Lozano suggested that, as Chair, she raise the matter with the Committee on Finance.

Along with her concern about student-funded projects, Regent Hopkinson was concerned about the mandate to spend the extra dollars to meet the highest levels of energy sustainability. She advocated reconsidering The Regents' green building and sustainable energy policy.

Regent Kozberg noted that the campus had taken to heart the suggestions that Committee members had made previously and had added charm to the design.

Regent Murray commented that the building provided a sense of space, but he was concerned that it would be difficult to navigate. He asked why the tower was located on the parking lot side of the site rather than the ring mall side. Ms. Gladson explained that, as it is 25 feet higher that the adjacent building, the tower would be visible to people entering the campus from several roads and would be an identifying marker. She noted that finding one's way would be improved in one respect by the addition of a new entrance to the campus bookstore from the ring mall.

In response to a question by Regent Montoya, Ms. Gladson pointed out that the Cross Cultural Center expansion was not within the student center main building, as students wanted it in a separate spot, but that it was located only about 70 feet away.

Committee Vice Chair Lozano noted that the floor plan shows a multipurpose room that is larger than the performance space, which she believed would likely attract the greater number of students. Vice Chancellor Brase responded that there are several other major performance spaces within the immediate area. In response to a further question, Ms. Gladson reported that there will be natural light throughout the student complex, some of it provided by light wells where formerly open areas will be enclosed.

Committee Chair Marcus commented that he found the project to be pleasant and well designed.

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

6. **ALBANY VILLAGE HOUSING UPDATE, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Denton introduced the Berkeley campus' plans for the next phase of Albany Village Housing. He reported that University Village in Albany is 76 acres three miles from the campus and is bordered by creeks, open space, and recreation and institutional facilities. It has the advantage of being located in a desirable school system that accommodates the children of students who live there.

Mr. Denton reported that key housing issues came out of the Strategic Academic Plan developed earlier in the year as a precursor to the Long Range Development Plan. The strategic plan recognizes that the high costs and scarcity of housing in Berkeley pose significant problems for students. The campus hopes to maintain its inventory of housing, provide housing to first-year graduate students, and provide up to three years of housing for new faculty. He showed aerial views of the Albany site.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Lollini discussed the details of the University's plan for Albany Village. He reported that institutional and industrial facilities that surround the site include Albany City Hall and an elementary school. The community design objectives include creating a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use environment; enhancing the amenity package, and developing high-quality architecture and landscape. Step

One, completed in 2001, provided townhouses and flats for students with families. It replaced the majority of the original1940s shipyard workers' housing and received a number of design awards. The design-build strategy proved to be effective. The housing is University-owned and operated.

Mr. Lollini reported that Step Two will replace housing from the 1960s and construct apartments for single graduate students that will be more dense than the Step One housing and have lower rents. Step Three covers 26 acres in the northern section, including the Gill Tract. The 1998 Master Plan will need amendment in order to transfer the use of the tract from agricultural research to student housing and mixed-use development. The proposal employs a third-party developer through a groundlease. Old recreational facilities and the community center will be replaced, and an infant-toddler center will be added to serve the families of students and faculty. Although the architecture for this phase will be slightly different, the character of the village will be maintained.

A ring of amenities at the edge of the site helps to create a buffer between the village and the industrial areas. Mr. Lollini reported that the campus is working with the City of Albany, which has received a $1 million grant from the State, to restore Cordonices Creek. The campus will grant a right-of-way to the city, which will develop a bikeway and restoration plan for the creek. The campus is working also with the Little League and girls' softball and soccer leagues to arrange for their access to and maintenance of the recreational components of the project.

Mr. Lollini commented that the Final Environmental Impact Report and the designs for Steps Two and Three, as well as the Step Three groundlease, will be presented to The Regents next year. The draft Master Plan project EIR is expected to be on the Committee's October agenda.

In response to a question by Regent Montoya about discounted rents, Mr. Lollini explained that the campus' rent target is 15 percent below market. In Step One, because of the attempt to manage the rent differentials between the 1940s housing, the 1960s housing, and the new housing, rents have not been stepped up in line with the market and are about 25 percent below it.

Regent Hopkinson asked what percentage of all students will be housed by the campus. Mr. Lollini reiterated that the campus' housing strategy is to maintain the inventory of student family housing, which this project makes possible. With the 950 units in Albany Village and 75 units in Smyth-Fernald near campus, there are roughly 1,000 family units. The campus' strategy includes housing all first- and second-year undergraduate students who desire it, which will necessitate building 2,000 units, and housing 50 percent of entering graduate students.

Regent Montoya commented that the project was well-planned and addresses a number of issues concerning student housing. She noted that graduate students need space in which to gather, and she expressed the hope that some could be provided in

this project. She cautioned that as the designation of housing as historic has increased, it has become more difficult to demolish old housing.

Regent Murray asked where Albany Village residents will be relocated during construction and how community interest concerning uses for the Gill Tract and a community garden will be incorporated into the plan. Mr. Lollini recalled that during the planning the residents expressed a desire to have their community garden preserved, which has been done. A number of groups have advocated reserving the Gill Tract for agricultural uses, but the campus views student housing and recreation as a higher priority. During reconstruction, the two phases will constitute between 200 and 250 occupied units at any point, which allows for the normal attrition rate. No one will be displaced, and advance notification has been provided to the residents.

Committee Chair Marcus asked for further information about rental rates. Mr. Lollini reiterated that the first phase of the housing is at 25 percent below market. The new housing will be about 45 percent below market. Senior Vice President Mullinix added that there may be some units set aside as low-income for needy students, but he noted that the campus prefers to deal with means testing at the financial aid level rather than to set aside low-cost housing accessible to relatively few needy students.

Committee Chair Marcus noted that, while there is a need for 120 units of faculty housing, this project provides only 30. Mr. Lollini explained that there are 30 units at the Clark Kerr campus, 30 will be added with this project that will be attractive to families with children who want access to the Albany School District, 30 may be located downtown in conjunction with private development, and the location of a further 30 remains to be determined. The campus would prefer to separate the projects in order to provide lifestyle choices to incoming faculty. Regent Marcus was of the opinion that faculty should be offered the same sense of community in the University setting that students get. He advocated having a separate community center and dining area for faculty as a way of enhancing interaction. He also advocated soliciting faculty input concerning ways of making UC Berkeley attractive, with a view towards enhancing recruitment. He supported replacing graduate student units with faculty units in Albany Village if market surveys indicate faculty interest in this type of housing. Mr. Lollini anticipated that market surveys of faculty preferences would be conducted as part of the work with the project developers.

Regent Marcus asked about the rationale for using a groundlease and separate developer for the project. Mr. Lollini responded that graduate student housing is more typical of the marketplace, unlike undergraduate or student family housing. The University has operated student family housing for 50 years and intends to continue doing so. This is an issue where private resources may be brought to bear. The campus is working with a nonprofit student housing development team that has a long history in this kind of development and can bring in financing sources that lessen the impact on the University's debt capacity level. Senior Vice President Mullinix noted that the University will retain a fair amount of control in the arrangement.

Regent Hopkinson asked whether adding family housing where there is no tax basis is an issue for the Albany School District. Mr. Lollini responded that the school district's principal concern is that there will be a drop in student enrollment during the construction period. The campus is exploring a voucher system for students who might otherwise live in the village during that time frame. He believed that the school district would benefit from the large international component of village residents in that it gets special funding as a result of their presence.

Regent Marcus emphasized the importance of picking a retail developer with a sterling track record.

Regent Lozano expressed the hope that the recreational spaces within Albany Village would be open to the community. Mr. Lollini noted that local youth groups manage the properties.

Regent Marcus suggested that the density of the project could be doubled. Mr. Lollini reported that the campus had designed three-story units rather than four-story units so that families would have fewer stairs to negotiate. Also, the campus wished to provide surface parking principally for the student families whereas graduate students would have structured parking. Further, the campus wished to respect the City of Albany's zoning ordinances. Mr. Marcus suggested reexamining the decision about the density level.

7. **CAMPUS VISION PRESENTATION, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

Chancellor Yang presented a vision for the physical environment of the Santa Barbara campus. He recalled that the campus started as a teachers' college for the arts and home economics. In 1944 it became a part of the University. In 1954 the campus moved to its current location, a former Marine Corps air base. In 1958 it was officially named the University of California, Santa Barbara. It granted its first bachelor's degree in 1966. In 1995 the campus was elected as a member of the Association of American Universities, the fourth UC campus to achieve that honor. In the last five years, three UCSB professors have won the Nobel Prize in the hard sciences.

Chancellor Yang mentioned two distinguished members of the campus community. He recalled that five years ago the campus had recruited Professor Shuji Nakamura, who discovered blue lasers. His presence has enhanced donations from technology companies worldwide. Blue lasers produce no heat and so cost about 15 percent of what light energy costs. He reported that a popular professor, Luis Leal, whose recent book *Myths and Legends of Mexico* is a great hit, won the National Humanities Medal in 1997 and is still teaching at age 93.

Chancellor Yang reported that a recent issue of *U.S. News and World Report* ranked UC Santa Barbara as twelfth among all public universities, but he noted that if the

ranking were not based on resources per student, it would be among the top 8. It is ranked in the top ten by *Science Watch*.

Mr. Yang noted that external research funding, which last year was $144 million, has nearly doubled in the past ten years and continues to rise. He reported that recently the campus had received a $50 million grant from the Army to develop biomolecular chips, which will be used to build the next generation of sensors. UCSB will collaborate with Cal Tech and MIT on the project.

Chancellor Yang noted that, as UCSB's fundraising capability has advanced to $1 million per week, it seems the right time to build a vision for the campus to have a physical environment that matches its academic environment and keeps pace with its academic achievements.

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher reported that the process to determine how to build a better campus was just beginning but that it had moved quickly through the urban design phase. He described some characteristics of the 990-acre campus, but he emphasized that the current focus is on the academic core and a small housing component. The process was begun by hiring an urban planner, which brought together faculty, administrators, staff, and students to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the campus and determine what opportunities for change might exist. The exercise disclosed that strong and weak areas were interspersed on the campus. Favorite areas were the coastline, the lagoon, the mountains to the north, the east bluffs, the campus mall, the academic green on the east side, and the recreation facilities. Weaknesses included the presence of old barracks, loading docks within view corridors, underdeveloped public spaces, obstructed pedestrian corridors through the campus, and the interface among the bicycles, pedestrians, and autos.

Mr. Fisher showed slides to illustrate the current density of the campus and superimposed images of how the campus would look if some of its features could be rearranged. Ideas for connecting the campus to the greater landscape include extending Pardall Mall, opening a grand mall from the bus drop-off to Storke Plaza, and adding a mall to connect University Plaza to the lagoon. He emphasized that the campus' greatest resource was its spectacular site, which needed to be used to the best advantage. The plan also addresses the need to establish a sense of harmony and order. It proposes that 3 million gross square feet be added to the campus in the future. Mr. Fisher illustrated through slides how new buildings could fit into the current footprint, noting that despite the additional square footage, the effect would be one of increased openness. Modular and low density buildings and surface parking lots are logical places to add campus capacity. The construction would start to define new campus spaces and lend a sense of university tradition through the creation of strong axial spaces, courtyards, and well-designed connective tissue. He showed a few areas in detail to illustrate how architecture and building placement could take better advantage of the background of sea and mountains.

Mr. Fisher reported that Isla Vista had recently completed a long-range plan that envisions strong connections on the west edge of the campus in order to improve the relationship between town and gown. The plan suggests that the University build graduate student and faculty housing along the perimeter, essentially bringing the village into the campus.

Concerning infrastructure, Mr. Fisher reported that the urban planner had determined that the campus could get 30 percent more cars on the campus while also reducing the four-lane roadway system to two lanes, with roundabouts replacing intersections. Surface parking lots would be replaced by parking structures. All parking would be moved to the perimeter of the campus, except for a garage under the mall space. He showed slides of a more structured pedestrian system, which would improve the interaction between pedestrians and bicycles, and a more complete grid of bike lanes.

Following the steps toward the development of an overall direction in planning, the process of drawing up architectural guidelines was begun. Mr. Fisher noted that there are many architectural styles on the campus, some parts of which still look like a Marine base. Early buildings were prairie and international style, built for efficiency rather than looks. Later, post-modern buildings were added. Recent buildings tend to relate more effectively to their surroundings and reflect some of the character of Santa Barbara. The character of the next generation of architecture will need to take into account context and incorporate both new and traditional ideas.

Mr. George Pernsteiner, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, emphasized that the design planning process, the kinds of approaches to be used, and the steps to be taken, are only the beginning stages of a long process. The campus plan provides a sense of organizing principles: taking advantage of the natural setting; using space efficiently; and creating coherent open space and design. He noted that, although the natural setting of the campus was very special, it could not be seen and appreciated from the heart of the campus. A principle of the plan is intentionally to take advantage of the natural setting relative both to buildings and to open spaces. The plan also envisions using building sites and space efficiently, which currently is prevented by the haphazard aggregation of buildings that have been inherited from the Marines, were built during different eras, and that take up considerable land. The envisioned three million gross square feet could be added to the campus absent some surface parking and 200,000 square feet of one-story buildings. More intensive use would make it possible to do more construction on the campus and at the same time organize the open space in a way that will make people feel connected to the natural environment.

Mr. Pernsteiner observed that the campus is difficult to navigate. In implementing the campus vision, it will be made clearer how every part of the campus relates to features that can be noted. Also, the variety of building styles in evidence makes it hard to get a sense of being in Santa Barbara. An architecture must be created that fits with what has been built but is more evocative of the region.

Mr. Pernsteiner reiterated that the plan under discussion addressed only the core of the campus. This fall, a master housing plan will begin to assess housing needs for undergraduate and graduate students and faculty, and possibly even for staff because of the high cost of living in Santa Barbara. Some ideas the community wants the campus to embrace will be pursued, such as the building of faculty housing along the spine of Isla Vista. Infrastructure will be examined. Although bike paths, roads, and pedestrian plans have been mapped out to a large degree, other parts of the infrastructure have not yet been addressed. Sewer, water, and communications also need integration in order to support the vision in the overall plan. Design criteria must be developed to provide coherence on campus. During the next few years, these strands need to be brought together to form a plan that will make sense for the next 20 years.

Chancellor Yang noted that many years had been spent building good relationships with the State, county, and city governments in the face of an anti-growth environment. He believed that in terms of discipline and focus, the university which most resembled UC Santa Barbara was Princeton, as it does not have a medical or business school and is very strong in religious studies, science, physics, chemistry, engineering, and humanities. He hoped that in another 20 or 30 years people would refer to Santa Barbara as the Princeton of the west. He believed that, while in many areas UC Santa Barbara has already exceeded Princeton, it must enhance the comparison by developing a vision for its physical environment. He urged the committee members to offer him guidance in this endeavor.

Regent Hopkinson expressed enthusiasm for the direction being taken. She mentioned that in addition to the things being discussed, emphasis needs to be placed on developing gateways for drivers that will create the impression of entering a distinct campus. Also, she hoped that, in developing an architectural vision, no attempt would be made to relate new designs to unattractive older buildings. Mr. Fisher noted that the east campus gate will feature a very structured entrance that will include stone gates and will be defined by a tree-lined approach. Changes being contemplated for the west side entrance include removing kiosks, adding a roundabout, and planting a double row of trees on El Colegio. He reported that the campus had retained the same urban planning team to address the needs of the west campus.

Regent Kozberg was hopeful that entirely new landscape guidelines would be created. She observed that it would be difficult to integrate the many architectural styles and suggested that the campus might reconsider laminating new features onto old buildings, which has been an effective strategy on the Los Angeles campus.

Regent Lozano was also complimentary about the campus' new vision. She had some reservations, however, about what appeared to be a very dense approach to the use of the acreage, suggesting that placing so many buildings in a finite space might make the architecture overwhelming. Mr. Fisher responded that even with the addition of 3 million square feet, which probably represented more than would be added within the next 20 years, the campus would remain at half the density of UCLA and that new

buildings would have four stories or fewer, thereby retaining a relatively open feel to the landscape.

Regent Montoya was unconvinced that the Santa Barbara campus should become much more dense, and she observed that building underground parking, which was mentioned as a possibility under the mall, would cost too much ever to be approved and should be reexamined. She asked what thoughts had been given to improving access to the campus. Mr. Pernsteiner responded that for many years students have had free bus service and that the campus had a contract with the metropolitan transit district for discount fares. He envisioned entering into other agreements to create more transit-only sites and improve commuter service from other parts of the county. Mr. Fisher noted that cars are not a major mode of transportation on the Santa Barbara campus, which accommodates 25,000 people per day but has only 5,000 parking spaces. Bicycles, which have access from the county bike path, are prevalent.

Committee Chair Marcus emphasized the need to consider the fact that the campus is located near a city with a very distinguished architectural style that is in harmony with the ocean and the mountains. He observed that there are architects around the world who understand how not to dispose of the old or refrain from bringing in the new but rather focus on integrating the two. He was hopeful that the Santa Barbara campus would be successful in designing a strategy to create architectural unity.

8. **MISSION BAY BUILDING 21A PARKING STRUCTURE AND RELATED DEVELOPMENT, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

The Committee walked outside to look at large samples of wall color under consideration to replace the vibrant purple originally proposed for the Mission Bay parking structure. The members indicated a preference for the darker of the two examples of terra cotta paint.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary