The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
February 18, 2004

A Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was held on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Marcus, Lozano, Montoya, Kozberg, Hopkinson, Murray, Seigler, and Huerta; Advisory member Anderson

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

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of October 29 and December 10, 2003 were approved.

3. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CHASS) INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH FACILITY, RIVERSIDE 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 Negative Declaration for the project.

B. Approve and incorporate into the project all project elements and relevant 1990 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures identified in the project's Negative Declaration.

C. Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

D. Amend the UC Riverside 1990 LRDP land use map to convert approximately 1.6 acres designated for Public Services and Student Services to College of Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences.

E. Approve the design of the CHASS Instruction and Research Facility, Riverside campus.

[The Negative Declaration and Findings were mailed to Committee members and the 1990 LRDP EIR to all Regents 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 approved the CHASS Instruction and Research Facility, Riverside, for inclusion in the 2003-04 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2003-08 Capital Improvements Program at a total project cost of $32,127,000. The State General Obligation Bond will fund this project.

In August 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Leo A. Daly of Los Angeles as executive architect, with Pei Cobb Freed & Partners of New York City as design consultant, for this project.

Project Site

The CHASS Instruction and Research Facility site is in the northwest area of the main academic core of the campus, south of a portion of North Campus Drive, which is now a walkway between the Arts Building and Arts Mall on the west and Parking Lot 19 and the Physical Education Building to the east.

Because the proposed use is not consistent with the current land use designations, the 1990 LRDP land use map will be amended to redesignate approximately 1.6 acres of Public Services and Student Services usage to College of Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences. The project building committee, including representatives of students, faculty, and staff, reviewed the available building sites, along with the proposed uses and required program adjacencies, and found that the proposed site best meets the requirements of the project. Adequate land area and several alternative locations for public services and student services uses have been identified in the East Campus Entry Study, which examines the configuration of this area of the campus. The results of the study will be incorporated in the upcoming UCR LRDP update.

Project Design

The CHASS Instruction and Research Facility will provide teaching laboratories, research, and shared scholarly activity space, general assignment classrooms and academic offices, and support spaces. The project is a four-story building separated into two wings connected by walkways, with a partial mechanical basement. The building is clad in steel and UCR campus brick in a palette consistent with the historic campus standard.

The project reinforces existing pedestrian circulation patterns on campus and adds an east-west circulation route leading from the soon-to-be expanded Student Union to the Arts Building. Entrances are provided from the Carillon Mall to the south and from the courtyard adjacent to the Fine Arts Mall to the west.

The Campus Design Review Board has reviewed the design of the CHASS Instruction and Research Facility. Independent cost consultation and independent structural and seismic review have been conducted.

The Office of Design and Construction staff will manage this project, under the oversight of the Vice Chancellor, Administration.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study and Negative Declaration, tiered from the 1990 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, was prepared for the project to determine any potential environmental effects. Cumulative impacts and mitigation measures for all campus development proposed in the LRDP are addressed in the LRDP EIR. A draft Initial Study prepared for this project generated no comments during the public review period. The Initial Study analysis indicates that the project, with the inclusion of relevant 1990 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, will contribute incrementally to impacts previously identified in the EIR but will not result in any new significant impacts. Based on this analysis, the University has determined that project-specific impacts and mitigation measures are adequately addressed in the context of the LRDP EIR. The circumstances of the project are essentially the same as the circumstances under which the EIR was prepared. The proposed project will not, by itself, result in significant impacts, and the cumulative impacts of the campus growth identified in the LRDP will be mitigated. Measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts identified in the 1990 LRDP EIR are monitored under the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental review process, the relation of the project to the LRDP EIR, and conclusions regarding approval of the Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration for this project in conformance with CEQA.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson and Associate Director Chiu showed slides of the project.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson about the material on one side of the building, Mr. Johnson explained that it was fritted glass angled to deflect the sun. Regent Hopkinson suggested taking a more inventive approach to the stairwell design on that side of the building.

Committee Chair Marcus sought assurances that the color of the brick to be used was not the bright yellow depicted in the illustrations. Mr. Johnson reported that the brick would be the standard Riverside rust that has been used in many campus buildings.

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

4. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ROBERT MONDAVI INSTITUTE FOR WINE AND FOOD SCIENCE, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the 2003 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

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

B. Approve the design of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science, Davis campus.

[The Findings, Statement of Overriding Consideration, 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 2001, The Regents approved the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science at the Davis campus for inclusion in the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-04 Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of $54.8 million. The project will be funded from a combination of State ($33 million), gift ($20 million), and campus funds ($1.8 million).

Details of the project may be found in the minutes of the Committee's meeting of December 10, 2003, when the project was first submitted. The Committee delayed its approval in order to give the architect time to respond to concerns that were expressed at that time by Committee members.

Project Design

It was recalled that the RMI is designed to contain 75,000 assignable square feet of space within a total area of 130,000 gross square feet. It will provide sensory and teaching laboratories, research laboratories, faculty offices, departmental offices, and conference rooms for the departments of Viticulture & Enology and Food Science & Technology, and offices for the Robert Mondavi Institute. The building wraps around a courtyard containing event spaces and demonstration gardens. The three-sided courtyard opens on the west side to a teaching vineyard and dedicated open space that forms the centerpiece of a new gateway to the campus.

The reinforced concrete structure consists of three wings; two three-story wings for each of the two departments plus a two-story wing for the shared labs and the offices of the Institute. The building is clad in a combination of glass curtain wall, exterior cement plaster, and stone veneer.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared to analyze the environmental effects of the 2003 LRDP, including project-level review of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science. No significant project impacts were identified. In November 2003, The Regents certified the EIR. A Davis neighborhood group has filed a lawsuit challenging the sufficiency of that document. The petitioners have not sought a Temporary Restraining Order. Under CEQA, the EIR is considered legally adequate until the court decides the case, at the project proponent's risk. Thus, if this project is approved and the court finds the EIR to be inadequate, the University may be required to conduct additional environmental review, depending upon the portion of the EIR found to be inadequate. At that point, further Regental approval may be necessary.

Vice Chancellor Nosek and Assistant Vice Chancellor Segar presented slides of the project.

Mr. Nosek recalled that at its previous meeting the Committee had requested some changes to the design. The Committee had found the elevations too industrial. He reported that the campus had wanted to make elements such as the laboratory fume stacks part of the exterior sculpture of the building, which was broken into three segments in order to soften its large scale. The diversity in the design had generated comments from Committee members that there were too many elements.

Mr. Nosek commented that architecture that adheres to campus design concepts is particularly important in the project, which will be prominent on the campus. The use of outdoor space and sustainable materials is key. He noted that the landscape architect is Mr. Laurie Olin, who designed the landscape for the Getty Museum of Art.

The courtyard will include shade trees and herb gardens, and in addition to the main vineyard, there will be a small vineyard for growing varietals used in teaching. The palette of stone and cement plaster in light tan is similar to that of the Mondavi Center. The window treatments will be similar, also. In response to the Committee's observations, irregularities in the façade have been flattened in places to make a consistent plane, and the fume stacks have been incorporated into the roof form, which has been made more continuous and now sports gables to make it more in keeping with other agricultural buildings on the campus. Overall, the profile of the building has been lowered and the shape made more cohesive.

Mr. Nosek reported that the building will outperform the California energy code by 35 percent, is expected to attain LEED Silver rating, is using the principles of the Labs21 initiative, and has been entered in the PG&E Savings by Design program.

In response to a question by Regent Hopkinson, Mr. Segar reported that the campus anticipates a Superior Court judgment on the litigation concerning the environmental matters by August.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the cost of the project per assignable square foot seemed extremely high. She expressed concern about the fact that the University has a differentiation between assignable and gross square footage that often appears unusually high. Mr. Nosek responded that the net-to-gross square footage of the Institute was consistent with comparable University construction over the last decade.

Regent Hopkinson believed that the cost per square foot for the laboratory space was comparable to that of high-end biomedical research laboratories. Mr. Nosek explained that, as research done in the institute's laboratories will be individualistic rather than directed toward producing a product, the cost is elevated based on the density of fume hoods and the complex requirements for support space. The cost, although at the high end, is similar to that of other university laboratories. Regent Hopkinson maintained that the discrepancy should be evaluated in the interest of reducing costs.

Committee Chair Marcus suggested that the problem may be in the definitions used. Mr. Bocchicchio explained that the methodology used by universities differs from those used by other builders and is somewhat misleading. Committee Chair Marcus asked to be provided with a definition and analysis that would give the Committee an "apples to apples" comparison.

Regent Hopkinson noted that part of the reason the University's costs are so high may be attributed to mandated State requirements. She believed the point had come to examine those mandates and focus on efforts to overcome them. She recalled that Stanford University had examined its building practices and had reduced its cost per square foot as a result. Regent Kozberg suggested inviting a representative from Stanford to explain to the Committee the process that was used to accomplish this.

Regent Montoya requested that the discussion of the asf-to-gsf ratio address administrative fees, which vary among University projects. She believed the issues were related.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio agreed to provide the requested information. Committee Chair Marcus acknowledged the need to have informational items placed on the agenda concerning limitations on construction costs, what mandates constrain the University, and what can be done about them.

Regent Kozberg noted that Governor Schwarzenegger had announced a governmental performance review, making this a good opportunity to review elements that add costs without providing value and bring them to the attention of the government in the hope of getting some relief and putting some of that money to better use. Mr. Mullinix reported that the University had presented suggestions for improvements to Sacramento but that they had not been accepted.

Regent Kozberg observed that although the building materials for the project were sympathetic to the performing arts center, they continued the campus' neutral color palette, which she advocated reexamining in the interest of bringing out more of the character of the buildings. She noted that many of the public functions will be in the quadrangle, which she viewed as well thought through and well integrated. She hoped that Mr. Olin would be permitted to finish the remainder of the quad's landscape design.

In response to a question by Regent Huerta, Mr. Nosek reported that the winery and brewery, which are in the planning phase, will not be of a size sufficient to release the strong odors sometimes associated with large-scale production.

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

5. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, MAYER HALL RENOVATION AND ADDITION, SAN DIEGO 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:

A. Adopt the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Mayer Hall Renovation and Addition, San Diego campus.

[The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and Findings 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 approved the inclusion of the Mayer Hall Renovation and Addition project, San Diego campus, in the 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2004-09 Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of $41,285,000. The project will be funded from a combination of State funds ($40,726,000) and campus funds ($559,000).

In August 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of MBT Architects of San Francisco as Executive Architect for the project.

Project Site

The site for the proposed addition is on the northeast side of the existing Mayer Hall and to the west of Gilman Drive within the Revelle College Neighborhood. The expansion site is bounded by Bonner Hall to the north, the Eucalyptus Park Grove Reserve to the east, York Hall to the south, and Ridge Walk and the existing Mayer Physics Building to the west. The site is in accordance with the 1989 Long Range Development Plan academic land use designation.

Project Design

The project includes adding 45,000 asf of program area to Mayer Hall and renovating 35,319 asf of program area in the existing structure. The spaces include instructional and research laboratories and support spaces, offices, interactive scholarly activity and conference rooms, a machine shop, and a high bay. The work proposed for the Mayer Hall renovation portion of the Mayer Hall Addition and Renovation project is limited primarily to infrastructure upgrades and basic architectural improvements.

The five-story addition connects to the existing five-story Mayer building on the northeast side to form an L-shaped footprint. The addition is respectful of the Eucalyptus Park Grove Reserve boundary along the east and enhances the academic courtyard to the north. It is in conformance with the Revelle College Neighborhood guidelines.

A combination of pre-cast concrete, glass fiber reinforced concrete panels, and glazed aluminum curtain walls form the exterior. A cast-in-place concrete slab-and-beam system and concrete shearwall system that matches the structural system of the existing Mayer building is proposed for the addition.

The Office of Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project, with the aid of outside consultants and testing agencies as required. The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction will provide project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project generated comment letters from two public entities and from one member of the public. The comments were related to the proximity of the project to the Miramar Marine Corps Air Base and noise from overflight, concerns about Native American cultural resources, and the adequacy of the cumulative analysis. Responses to all comments are included in the Final MND. The campus concluded that upon implementation of mitigation measures contained in the 1989 LRDP Environmental Impact Report, in combination with project-specific mitigation measures for paleontology, geology, hazardous materials, and noise, the project as mitigated will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, associated mitigation measures, and evidence that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann and Director Holcomb showed slides of the project. Regent Montoya asked whether there were students on the campus' design review board. Mr. Hellmann responded that the board is composed of eight members; four are consulting professionals and four are academic administrative officers. The campus has preferred to rely on the judgment of professionals in the field.

Regent Hopkinson noted the high cost per square foot. She asked that Senior Vice President Mullinix, in preparing his responses to the requests relating to the previous item concerning different methodologies for calculating square footage, reexamine the appropriateness of the University's use of BOMA (Building Owners and Managers Association) statistics.

Although Regent Hopkinson was unhappy with the appearance of the ribbed concrete and some color choices, she was complimentary about the glass and metal choices for the addition.

Regent Lozano commented that the design seemed domineering and complex. She believed that a simpler design would allow for a more seamless flow between the old and new portions of the building. Committee Chair Marcus agreed. He noted that renovations seem to be a particular challenge for the University. He suggested that, in approaching this kind of assignment, the campuses should attempt not to replicate in the addition any unattractive aspects of the original building.

Regent Kozberg admired the design, which she viewed as an innovative way to bring old and new construction together. She liked the pop-out glass portions of the addition. She suggested approving the recommendation with the provision that at a future meeting the Committee be shown what refinements were done to this design based on their comments.

Regent Hopkinson attributed some of the Committee's concerns to the architect's confusing rendering of the project.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio recalled that the President's Office had been impressed when first presented with the project. He believed that there was a nice balance between the existing building and the addition. He acknowledged that the rendering made the plan look busier that it actually is.

Committee Chair Marcus moved approving the project, subject to having the campus examine the possibility of simplifying the design without making major modifications and present an updated rendering at the Committee's next meeting. The motion was duly seconded and approved.

6. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM, STEP 6, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

A. Approve the Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6, Irvine campus.

[The Tiered Initial Study and 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 March 2003, The Regents approved inclusion of the Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6 project in the 2002-03 Major Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of $36,596,000. The Capital Improvement Budget includes a parking structure with a total cost of $31,285,000 and a roadway with a total cost of $5,311,000. The parking structure will be externally financed. The roadway project will be covered by a separate action at a later date.

The design architect for the project is Robbins-Jorgensen-Christopher Architects, San Diego, with Parkitects, Irvine, as executive architect. The team was selected by the campus from among competing bidders.

Project Site

The project site is on the existing parking Lot 18C and Lot 18R on the south side of the School of Engineering and Computer Science quadrangle and along East Peltason Road. The parking structure will be located east of the Engineering Service Road, west of the future Southern Radial Road, and adjacent to the newly proposed Campus Surge Building. These improvements are in conformance with the campus Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The parking structure will be seven levels, with approximately 1,980 car spaces. It will displace 418 existing surface spaces, resulting in a net gain of 1,562 spaces. Consistent with existing parking structures, the proposed structure will be built using a Type I, cast-in-place, reinforced concrete moment frame. The structure will be naturally ventilated, which will require that at least 50 percent of the perimeter remain open to the air. There will be a primary vehicular entry and egress on the east side at the third level, connected to an auto and bike crossing at East Peltason. A secondary vehicular entry and egress will be located on the north side at the first level. The exterior architectural finish systems will include concrete elements, select masonry, and metal scrim screening.

The project will provide new landscape and hardscape around the parking structure. The western portion of E. Peltason Road will be widened from one lane to two lanes to facilitate peak traffic entry.

Design and construction of Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6 and the associated Campus Surge Building project will be undertaken as design-build projects. Proposals were solicited from a group of pre-qualified builder and architect teams. The design will be reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant, an independent seismic and structural consultant, and an independent cost estimator.

The campus Office of Design and Construction Services will manage the project, with the use of outside consultants and testing agencies as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Services will provide project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

The Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration that were prepared for the project generated some written comments, the campus' responses to which are included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration. After adoption of the recommended mitigation measures, any possibly significant 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 end of the public comment period, the campus received additional letters commenting on the proposed project from residents of the University Hills faculty and staff on-campus housing community. The comments focused on project location, lighting and other visual impacts, noise, and circulation improvements. Campus staff held meetings with University Hills representatives to discuss their concerns. As a result of these meetings and in response to the comment letters, the project design was modified. These modifications include solid screening on the southern façade of the parking structure that faces University Hills so as to shield nearby residents from potential light, glare, and noise, and also included measures to minimize lighting impacts on the top level of the structure. The additional comments received and the Irvine campus responses to these comments are contained in a supplement to the Final Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

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

This item was considered with item 7. below.

7. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, CAMPUS SURGE BUILDING, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

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

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of Campus Surge Building, Irvine campus.

It was recalled that by interim action in March 2003, the 2002-03 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program were amended to include the Campus Surge Building, at a total project cost of $12,860,000. The project will be externally financed.

The executive architect for the project is Robbins-Jorgensen-Christopher Architects, San Diego; the same architect was selected for the adjacent Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6 parking structure. The architect is part of a design-build team competitively selected by the campus.

Project Site

The project is located on existing parking Lot 18C in the south side of the School of Engineering and Computer Science quadrangle and along East Peltason Road. The Campus Surge Building will be immediately adjacent to the Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6 parking structure. These improvements are in conformance with the campus Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The four-story surge building will provide the University with open and closed offices, conference rooms, and dry laboratories suitable for a number of academic and administrative users. It will be a reinforced, cast-in-place, concrete moment frame structure with spread footings. The exterior finishes include concrete elements, select masonry, glazed windows, and metal scrim screen at the entrance. The materials complement the exterior finishes of the adjacent parking structure.

Proposals for the design-build project were solicited from a group of pre-qualified builder and architect teams. The design will be reviewed in accordance with University policy by on independent design consultant, independent seismic and structural consultant, and an independent cost estimator. The campus Office of Design and Construction Services will manage the project, with the use of outside consultants and testing agencies as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Services will provide project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

Refer to paragraph 6. above, *Adoption of Negative Declaration and Approval of Design, Parking and Transportation Improvements Program, Step 6, Irvine Campus*, for details about the environmental impact assessment and the University's response.

Findings

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

Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson and Director Demerjian presented slides of the project.

Regent Kozberg described the design as outstanding. In response to her question concerning the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Director Demerjian reported that the project was consistent with the campus' Long Range Development Plan, in which most of the environmental impacts were analyzed. Circulation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration generated comments only from off campus, and these have been addressed.

Regent Hopkinson was impressed with the team approach.

Regent Murray noted the concerns of community members and the changes the campus made to address them and asked whether the community had accepted those changes. He observed that many large buildings are being constructed along the perimeter of the campus near University Hills. He asked whether the size of the parking structure could be reduced in some way. Associate Vice Chancellor Gladson responded that the site slopes, with the result that the parking structure is in effect no higher than a four-story

building. Mr. Demerjian reported that meetings are ongoing with the community homeowners, who seem satisfied with most of the project details.

Regent Seigler was impressed with the sensitivity of the campus administration in working with the neighbors. He commented that, in general, it is difficult to assess buildings based on the elevations and illustrations that are provided. He suggested that the Regents attend campus visits when possible and that when the campuses show proposed designs to the Committee they also show a video in order to give the members a feel for the overall campus design.

Committee Chair Marcus noted that the garage side appears to have many colors and textures. He suggested making it match the surge building more closely.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the recommendations contained in items 6.,above, and 7. were approved.

8. **LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio recalled that in previous meetings Regents had expressed interest in life cycle cost analysis. He provided an update on the University's approach and the development of its methodologies.

Mr. Bocchicchio pointed out that life cycle cost analysis is not a new concept for the University. It is usually carried out informally without a standard methodology. Analysis is done intuitively by the architects and engineers that are commissioned by the University. This informal process can lead to less than optimal trade offs between the performance of various building systems and their aesthetics. Also, the life cycle cost criteria may not always be addressed at the same level as more explicitly documented design criteria. Nearly all campuses require design professionals to analyze life cycle costs of major building systems and components at some point in the design process. Typically, this happens during the value engineering process. Often a formal analysis is provided during that phase of a project.

Mr. Bocchicchio noted that often operations and maintenance personnel, who understand how particular pieces of equipment and building components and systems perform over the long term, participate in design meetings. Their intuition and experience are valuable to the design process. Also, every campus gives to project architects and engineers a book of standards for design that incorporate materials and systems that have performed well over time.

Mr. Bocchicchio observed that although the University does not have a common methodology for doing formal life cycle cost analysis, its policies on green buildings call for the inclusion of explicit consideration of life cycle costs along with other factors in project planning and design, in recognition of the importance to the long-term operations of a particular facility. All new and major renovation projects must enroll in the Savings by Design program, which is funded by utility companies, to produce formal life cycle

costing reports that inform the design process as to what systems perform best over the lifetime of a building. It is used to predict a building's energy use and the performance of its energy-conserving features. Upon completion of that program, the campus may be awarded a rebate on utility bills of up to $150,000.

Mr. Bocchicchio reported that development of the new green policy implementation plan continues. A Universitywide methodology for life cycle costing will be established to assure that when the Committee receives projects, the information will come from the same base and allow for fair comparisons. During the development phase, financial assumptions need to be established to cover escalation rates, labor and materials, utility costs, discount rates, the expected service life of a particular system, and operations and maintenance costs. Another part of the implementation planning with relation to the Presidential policy is to find ways to study systems centrally. Eventually, life-cycle cost analysis will be incorporated during the budget and design processes for each project. He emphasized that meeting minimum University standards for life cycle cost performance is critical.

Mr. Bocchicchio believed that the consideration of life cycle costs needed to be elevated to a higher level on the scale of values. Decisions need to be made against a set of values that are embraced by all segments involved in the project planning. He reiterated that guidelines for implementing the policies consistently across the system will be developed.

In response to a question by Regent Seigler, Senior Vice President Mullinix emphasized that, while the University should receive funding to maintain State-funded buildings, that funding has not been forthcoming in recent years. Because of this unpredictability of funding, the University tends to use materials that may increase initial cost but last longer.

Regent Murray believed that establishing a systemwide goal of achieving the lowest overall life cycle costs and elevating the priorities of life cycle analysis were crucial in order to assure that money is spent appropriately. He suggested that The Regents vote to adopt formally the goal of minimizing the life cycle cost of the University's buildings.

Committee Chair Marcus recalled that the Committee had spent a great deal of time considering the adoption of a green building policy and that it was adopted unanimously. He believed that the policy addresses life cycle cost adequately and that no further statement of policy was needed, an opinion shared by Regent Kozberg.

Regent Lozano believed that now that policies are in place, it is most important to concentrate on the development of a plan for the evaluation and implementation of practices that will move the University closer to its stated goals.

Mr. Bocchicchio reiterated that the guidelines to reach that goal were being developed. He noted that he would continue to inform the Committee about the progress that was being made.

9. **COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CHASS) PSYCHOLOGY BUILDING, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson discussed the plan to construct a three-story, State-funded psychology building. He showed slides of the project that illustrated the relationship between the CHASS building and the organization of the campus. The psychology building is adjacent to the library mall, along with another important mall to be built on the southern end that will tie in with the graduate school of management.

Mr. Johnson reported that although the CHASS building is in a relatively new area of the campus, it takes its cues from building materials that have been used on the campus and from the landscaping that is already in place. On the southern bar is the neuroscience section, and on the northern end are offices and classrooms. The second and third floors house faculty offices and department suites. A vivarium in on the main floor. The building materials will include Pacific clay brick and terra cotta. The center piece of the building, a large glass area, will house a conference room. A trellis and solar shading devices will protect punched windows from direct sunlight.

Regent Kozberg expressed concern about security issues with regard to the vivarium. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the campus had past experience in dealing with the issue and had addressed its concerns with the appropriate staff and with campus police.

Regent Hopkinson was pleased with the look of the elevations, but she asked whether there would be flexibility long-term for using the space. Mr. Johnson believed that the design would not limit the building's uses in the future.

Committee Chair Marcus stated that he found the building design to be very attractive.

10. **C.V. STARR EAST ASIAN LIBRARY, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Denton and Assistant Vice Chancellor Gayle discussed the plans for building the V.C. Starr East Asian Library, a project that was incorporated into the capital program at the November 2003 meeting. The library is the first component of what will be the Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies, other components of which will be the Department of East Asian Languages and the Institute of East Asian Studies. Fund-raising for the project is nearly complete.

Mr. Gayle showed slides of the design. The site for the library faces Memorial Glade, which is the heart of the classical core of the Berkeley campus. Doe Library is opposite the site. Clear guidelines have been drawn up for the development of the site, consistent with the campus' New Century Plan, that have to do with the building's form, materials, alignment, and height. The guidelines were reviewed by the campus design review committee and embraced by the project architects, Todd Williams and Billie Tsien Associates. A feature of the New Century Plan is University Walk, which will connect with a pedestrian pathway from the new Stanley Hall, cross the face of the Hearst Memorial Mining Building, and connect with Memorial Glade. The campus is

contemplating building a monumental plaza and steps anchoring the Center for East Asian Studies buildings to effect an appropriate transition from the relatively high altitude of Observation Hill to the lower altitude of Memorial Glade. The entry of the building will be at its east end, as part of a composition which will address the new plaza.

Regent Hopkinson commented that it appeared from the rendering of the building that its stark corners and roof were monumental and overpowering and that the design lacked sensitivity and intimacy. She did not believe it matched the beauty of the best Berkeley campus buildings or was consistent with other buildings in that area. Mr. Gayle responded that, as it is intended that this building and the others in the Center be perceived as secondary to Doe Library, this building is lower and will not overpower or try to compete with the library. He noted that a large area depicted in the rendering is not exposed glass, but a screen intended to be of bronze. The sources of input for the building's design are the cultural roots of its program and classical beaux-arts architecture. Regent Hopkinson agreed that these could be compatible styles, along with the Craftsman style, but she maintained that the design as presented was not harmonious with its environment.

Committee Chair Marcus agreed with Regent Hopkinson's opinion that the vision as discussed was agreeable but that it was inconsistent with the renderings. He commented on the building's large, light-colored podiums. Mr. Gayle assured him that the building material is granite that will be no brighter than other Berkeley campus buildings. The selection of the materials was intended to match Doe Library as well as the adjacent Evans Hall. He noted the building will be aligned with the face of McLaughlin Hall and will be stepped down the hill.

Regent Kozberg suggested that the roof line could be part of the problem. Regent Huerta agreed with the previous comments that the building seemed too substantial. Committee Chair Marcus believed the design was dated. He suggested making another attempt at it.

11. **UNIVERSITY VILLAGE HOUSING PHASE 2, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor LeGrande recalled that the University Village Housing Phase 2 project is a continuation of the Master Plan for Albany Village that was started several years ago. At the time that the 390 units of the first phase were completed, the plan was to continue with the next phase, which was to include rebuilding the 1960s housing that remained. At that point, students expressed concern about the cost of the new housing and requested that a life cycle study be prepared to deal with the existing buildings. Mr. LeGrande reported that two studies and a peer review resulted in the decision to tear down the 1960s buildings and start fresh, based on indications that renovating the old buildings would be only a short-term solution. The proposed project was added to the capital plan at the November 2003 meeting.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Gayle described the University Village Phase 2 replacement housing, consisting of 558 dwelling units for graduate student families. He reported that a number of ways were studied to try to add units to the project. The yardstick had been

to compare the village to the allowable density that would prevail if the project were in the City of Albany. In order to achieve that density across the site, the addition of units would be about 200 more than were projected in the Master Plan. It was determined that 24 units could be added in this step and that a similar number could be absorbed in the remaining step 3, partly because of the more urban nature of that site zone. Adding these one-bedroom units was favored among alternatives because it did not entail the creation of a new building type. The addition of 24 units increases the project to 582 units and nearly 1,000 beds. At the same time, the opportunity was taken to try to mitigate the capital implications of this increase. Ways to value engineer the project are being identified in order to drive down the dollar per square foot cost of the entire step 2 development and absorb a significant portion of the increased capital cost of the added units. It is not clear whether all the additional scope can be absorbed within the existing budget. This project and its University Village EIR amendment will be before the Committee for design approval and certification mid-year.

Committee Chair Marcus noted that the elevations shown in the slides were multi-colored. He believed the buildings, being so close to each other, should be kept simple.

Committee Chair Marcus asked what steps had been taken to make the housing affordable for student families. Mr. LeGrande reported that the existing housing rents of approximately $600 per month were 50 percent to 70 percent below market. Those prices have been increasing as the campus attempts to lessen the gap between the old and new housing. The campus will do value engineering in an attempt to reduce the cost of housing further. The second phase of the project was redesigned to be less costly. An agreement was established with Alameda County to provide Section 8 vouchers for the most needy students, and the campus continues to look for ways to help students. Pre-reconstruction rents that were about $650 for a one bedroom unit will become about $1,160.

Regent Hopkinson recalled that part of the reason the project was being phased was to minimize the number of students who would be affected by rent increases and relocations. Mr. LeGrande confirmed that Phase 2 has two steps; the first to be completed in August 2007 and the second in 2009. Because students will graduate and move out of the housing, students will not be evicted.

Regent Murray asked whether any of the students currently there will have to pay the increased rents. Mr. LeGrande responded that there could be some students who would be asked to move into the newer housing if they have not completed their studies by 2007. Those rents would likely be grandfathered in. Students who are affected by the first phase of the transition will be moved into the other Section B housing. Anyone not accommodated in that housing will move to Section A housing, which is part of a third-party development. Anyone not fitting in those categories may move to East Village. The campus will try to keep rents comparable during the initial phase. Committee Chair Marcus was pleased to hear that the needs of graduate students were being weighed so carefully.

Regent Murray recalled that an issue that had been mentioned by students was that rent increases have been going up by 6 percent per year. He asked about guidelines to cover rent increases in student housing facilities. Mr. LeGrande responded that the strategic plan had been to increase rents 6 percent a year for about 10 years, but he noted that increases in recent years have been well below that figure. The campus reevaluates the situation each year and decreases the percentage in relation to the actual interest rates on the financing bonds that are sold.

Regent Kozberg emphasized the importance of providing sufficient graduate student housing, given the housing shortage in Berkeley. She believed this was a well thought out program for the future and would be a strong selling point for attracting good graduate students.

Regent Hopkinson commended the physical plan.

Regent Seigler believed that graduate students should be informed about how hard the University works to hold the cost of student housing to below market rates.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary