The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
April 14, 2004

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at1000 Broadway, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Hopkinson, Kozberg, Marcus, Montoya, Murray, and Seigler; Advisory members Anderson and Pitts

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

The meeting convened at 11:00 a.m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of February 18, 2004 were approved.

2. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, EAST CAMPUS APARTMENT PROJECT, PHASE II, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee:

A. Adopt the Findings.

B. Approve the design of the East Campus Apartment Project, Phase II, Irvine campus.

C. Authorize the President to approve any required design changes, if such changes do not materially alter the scope of the project.

[The Findings were mailed to all Committee members in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that the East Campus Apartment project, Phase II, is a continuation of the Phase I student housing project approved in March 2002 and nearing completion. The Phase II project also is a third-party development with outside ownership and management on Irvine campus land through a groundlease. It will provide affordable on-campus housing at below-market rents.

During the groundlease term, the tenant will be responsible for all maintenance and repair, leasing, management, and operation of the project. Specific terms of the groundlease will be submitted to The Regents for approval at a future meeting.
Project Site

The 26-acre Phase II site is adjacent to Phase I, in the East Campus area of UCI. When completed, Phases I and II will create three physically distinct communities: an undergraduate community in Phase I, an undergraduate community in Phase II, and a graduate community comprised of units from both phases. The site is bounded by undeveloped University property and Campus Drive on the north, UCI Arroyo Vista Housing development on the west, Anteater Recreation Center on the southwest, East Campus Phase I on the south, and Culver Drive on the east.

The project is consistent with the land use assumptions and planning principles set forth in the Irvine Campus Long Range Development Plan. The design is compatible with the neighboring community. A landscaped setback and landscaped parking areas will serve as a buffer between the apartment buildings and the neighboring off-campus community. The project will be responsible for restoring and maintaining a streambed area of approximately two acres as a visual amenity to the campus. Additionally, there is an approximately one-acre easement for the Metropolitan Water District within the site that is not buildable.

There will be 1,240 surface parking spaces in perimeter community lots. The ratio of spaces is 0.75 per undergraduate bed and 1.0 per graduate bed. In addition, there will be eight visitor spaces at the undergraduate community center.

Project Design

The Phase II project consists of 1,559 beds in 542 apartment units, with a building density of 68 beds per buildable acre. The units will vary from one bedroom with one bath up to three bedrooms with two baths. Graduate students will have 250 beds available in one section of the Phase II project, with undergraduates occupying the balance of 1,309 beds. Most of the apartments are designed for single occupancy of each bedroom with a limited number of double occupancy bedroom units designed to offer a lower-cost option for students. The entire project will have approximately 15 building structures that will include various apartment building types and sizes with two- to four-story elevations. Other building types include one-story community buildings and small support buildings with common laundry facilities. Each graduate unit will have a washer and dryer. The community centers will have pools, meeting rooms, and eating and entertainment spaces. Other project amenities will include open green spaces, a park, cooking areas, meeting areas with seating, a stage, and a basketball court.

The wood construction will reflect traditional California residential styles: the residential units in the graduate area will be Prairie style, the interior graduate community center will be of a California Mission design, and the undergraduate community will be Spanish and Monterey styles.

Access roads and landscape buffers will separate undergraduate and graduate student housing. Internal streets will serve as fire access and routes for pedestrian and bicycle

use, while other streets will lead to perimeter parking. Bike lanes, pedestrian ways, and a shuttle service will provide safe access to the central core of the campus.

Following extensive consultation with the City of Irvine and the local community, a Memorandum of Understanding between the campus and city addresses measures to be pursued by both parties to promote compatibility between the project and the surrounding community. Project design and implementation of Phase II will conform to the measures identified in the MOU. Project design will conform also to the more restrictive of either UC building requirements or City of Irvine building codes. Fire safety compliance will fall under the jurisdiction of the State Fire Marshal. The third-party development team will manage the project. The campus will hire a project manager to assure construction is completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Environmental Impact Summary

The Regents certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the East Campus Student Apartments project in 2002. The project evaluated in the Final EIR was to be developed in two phases of approximately 500 apartments per phase. The Regents also approved a Phase I project consisting of approximately 500 apartments and adopted mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR as conditions for approval.

The Final EIR was intended by The Regents to be the basis for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act for discretionary actions related to the implementation of the East Campus Student Apartments project, including the Phase II project. The mitigation measures previously adopted and incorporated as conditions of approval for the East Campus Student Apartments project mitigate the significant or potentially significant environmental effects of the Phase II project to less-than-significant levels, except as otherwise set forth in the project Findings adopted for the Phase I project. Accordingly, no further public review of the EIR for the Phase II project is necessary. The campus will be responsible for implementing and monitoring all mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR.

Findings

The Findings discuss whether the Final EIR adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the Phase II project, as well as the adequacy of mitigation measures previously adopted and incorporated as conditions of approval for the Phase I project. The Findings also discuss the acceptability of remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable.

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

Regent Montoya asked about the setting of rents. Mr. Brase explained that for third-party projects the rents are calibrated to be at least 10 percent below market and at a level that does not undermine the demand for campus-owned housing. Regent Marcus asked whether there has ever been a situation within the University whereby the addition of

housing units had undermined its bond payments. Senior Vice President Mullinix recalled a period in the early 1990s when there was a reduction in demand and the State was in a decline during which there were some projects that were not filled, but it did not threaten the University's ability to service the debt.

Regent Murray asked about the displacement of residents in the Irvine Meadows West trailer park. Mr. Brase reported that occupants of the trailer park had signed a contract acknowledging that they would have to move within a stated time. The campus intends to build parking on the site, which over time has become surrounded by campus development. The Long Range Development Plan envisions building a structure on the site within a few years.

Regent Hopkinson liked the design very much. She suggested that the earth tones be brightened.

Regent Montoya asked about the reaction of the neighborhood to the project. Mr. Brase responded that nearby residents resented the loss of a view to which they had become accustomed, despite their knowledge that the area had been designated for development. He noted that the project exceeds city standards in its setback, height, and landscaping.

Regent Kozberg asked about the building height. Mr. Brase explained that it had been designed with four stories and dense occupation in order not to have to replace green space within the campus center with student housing at some point. In response to a question by Regent-designate Anderson, Ms. Gladson reported that students were surveyed about their preferences for the design of the community center.

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

3. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, PSYCHOLOGY BUILDING, 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.

B. Approve and incorporate into the project all project elements, relevant 1990 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures, and project-specific mitigation measures identified in the project's Negative Declaration.

C. Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

D. Approve the design of the Psychology Building, Riverside campus.

[The Negative Declaration and Findings were mailed to Committee members, and the 1990 LRDP was mailed to all Regents, in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that in November 2002, The Regents approved the Psychology Building, Riverside campus, for inclusion in the 2003-04 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2003-08 Capital Improvements Program at a total cost of $33.76 million, to be funded by the State General Obligation Bond.

In September 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of HDR Architecture, San Diego, CA, as executive architect, with Shepley Bulfinch Richardson & Abbott, Boston, MA as design consultant.

Project Site

The proposed site is in the southwest region of the main academic campus and will link the proposed north-south Library Mall extension with the proposed east-west Citrus Mall. The proposed use is consistent with the land use designations in the 1990 UCR Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The Psychology Building will accommodate 51,915 asf in a building of 86,526 gsf. The project will provide instructional laboratories, wet and dry research laboratories, research and shared scholarly activity space, departmental offices, academic offices and support spaces, and a vivarium. The project is a three-story, H-shaped building with two main east-west wings, connected by a north-south central core.

The building is a steel structure clad with UCR campus brick, pre-cast concrete accents, and factory-finished aluminum windows with energy-efficient glazing. Sun-shading devices are used to provide additional solar protection. The palette of materials is consistent with the campus standard.

The project will help define the southern edge of the campus by serving as a focal point for people arriving from the southern parking areas. It will connect to and reinforce the existing north-south pedestrian Library Mall. The main entrance is through a new Palm Court formed by the wings on the building's west side. The building program is organized on three floors, with the offices and labs in the two wings and the more public areas in the central core. The service area and loading dock are located on the east side of level two for convenient access to Citrus Drive.

The Campus Design Review Board has reviewed the design, and an independent cost consultation has been conducted. The Office of Design and Construction will manage the project, with oversight by the Vice Chancellor–Administration.

Environmental Impact Summary

The Final Initial Study was tiered from the 1990 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report. It considers only project and site-specific impacts. Cumulative impacts and mitigation measures for all campus development proposed in the LRDP are addressed in the LRDP EIR. The campus received one letter of comment during the public review period from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control discussing recommendations for the Phase 1 Site Assessment, lead-based paint, and asbestos-containing material and polychlorinated biphenyls assessments, and including an invitation to participate in a DTSC cleanup program. A response letter clarified the fact that a Phase 1 Site Assessment had been completed and that the impacts regarding hazardous materials were fully analyzed in Section 3 of the Initial Study. Mitigation Measures included in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration are sufficient. No further mitigation is required.

Based on the impact assessment in the Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration, it has been determined that the proposed project would not, by itself, result in significant impacts, and that the cumulative impacts of the campus growth identified in the LRDP would be mitigated by the LRDP EIR mitigations. In accordance with CEQA's mitigation monitoring requirements, measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts identified in the 1990 LRDP EIR are monitored under the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program. New project-specific impacts and mitigation measures were identified and will be monitored in accordance with the Psychology Building Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

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

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

Regent Hopkinson advised paying attention to how the steam plant tanks to the rear of the site will affect views from the new building.

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

4. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SAN CLEMENTE STUDENT HOUSING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

The President recommended that upon review and consideration of the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

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

C. Amend the Long Range Development Plan.

D. Approve the design of the San Clemente Student Housing project, Santa Barbara campus.

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

It was recalled that in May 2002, The Regents approved the San Clemente Student Housing project for inclusion in the 2001-02 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-04 Capital Improvement Program at a total project cost of $116,702,000. The project is funded by a combination of external financing ($114,702,000) and University of California Housing System net revenues ($2,000,000). Repayment of the debt will be from student rents generated by the proposed additional bed spaces and from existing campus-controlled bed spaces.

In June 2002, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Fields Devereaux Architects & Engineers as Executive Architect for the project.

Project Site

The 11.5-acre project site is located west of the main campus and north of Isla Vista. The project fronts El Colegio Road, the main access road into campus from the west. The site occupies the south portion of Storke Field, the displaced portion of which play field will be moved north of nearby Parking Lot 38.

Isla Vista view corridors defined by the northern extension of three Isla Vista streets divide the site into three blocks. The site's development is based upon the proposed future realignment of El Colegio Road, which includes traffic roundabouts at each intersection. The site plan was also organized to minimize encroachment in Storke Field.

LRDP Amendment

The 1990 UCSB Long Range Development Plan indicates that the area north and west of Storke Field may be developed with up to 281 apartment units and 900 bed spaces. An amendment to the LRDP is required for the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing project to relocate the designated housing site to the southern portion of Storke Field, to accommodate the development of approximately 329 units and 976 bed spaces, and to revise the "Storke Campus Plan" that is included in the LRDP. An amendment to the LRDP is also required to modify building height standards to 50 feet on a portion of the housing project site.

Project Design

The San Clemente Student Housing project provides 972 beds of student housing, and four beds for resident managers, in 279,337 assignable square feet within a total area of 386,436 gross square feet. The project is designed in a style derivative of the regional Mediterranean architecture and is divided into three blocks of three-story apartment buildings fronting El Colegio Road, with each block containing a central courtyard with support spaces, laundries, and study rooms. A multi-purpose community building is centrally located within the development. The 327 apartments include 166 four-bedroom, 151 two-bedroom, and 10 one-bedroom units.

Parking for residents will be provided in a four-story, cast-concrete parking structure containing 622 spaces. An additional 220 parking spaces are provided in on-grade parking courts located at the extensions of the main Isla Vista cross streets which pass through the housing project and terminate at the field edge. A series of pedestrian "paseos" connects the parking, housing blocks, and courtyards, encouraging the interaction of the residents and also providing access to Storke Field. In addition, 479 spaces at Parking Lot 38 will be created to satisfy California Coastal Commission conditions for approval of the recently completed Manzanita residence hall complex.

The housing project is of sprinklered wood frame construction, short span with shear walls, and a slab-on-grade foundation system. The roofs are pitched-shed type with covered exterior corridors. The parking structure is long-span cast concrete.

Building exterior finish materials include sand-finished plaster, tile roofs, painted aluminum operable windows, painted steel balcony railings and decorative wood columns, pergolas, and eaves. The housing is naturally ventilated and is heated by hydronic baseboards served by gas-fired boilers. The project will be LEED certified.

The design of the San Clemente Student Housing project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by the campus Design Review Committee and by an independent design review team. Independent construction scheduling and constructability review will be provided. The campus Office of Design & Construction Services will manage the construction of the project, with assistance from the executive architect's project team. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Director of Design and Construction Services will perform project oversight. Construction will begin in January 2005 and be completed in July 2007.

Environmental Impact Summary

In response to the County's proposal, roundabouts will be installed at the intersections of El Colegio Road and Camino Del Sur, Los Carneros Road, Camino Pescadero, Embarcadero Del Mar, Embarcadero Del Norte, and Stadium Road. The County of Santa Barbara will be responsible for making improvements to the portion of El Colegio Road that is under County jurisdiction. UCSB will be responsible for implementing improvements to the intersection of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road, which is located on the main campus. The proposed roadway and intersection improvements are intended to address existing deficiencies in the operation of the roadway and to accommodate the vehicle traffic generated by the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing project and traffic resulting from future development at UCSB and in the Isla Vista and Goleta areas. These two parts were evaluated together, even though The Regents will be asked to implement only the housing part of the project.

Eight agencies and jurisdictions and ten members of the public commented on the project during the EIR review period. Responses to the comments are included in the Final EIR.

Mitigation measures to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant have been incorporated into the project. A project-specific MMP is included as an appendix to the Final EIR. Monitoring of the implementation of all mitigation measures will be performed in connection with the annual report for the LRDP MMP and will be conducted during various phases of project development as appropriate.

Findings

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

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher, Director Wolever, and Executive Director Brown presented slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson complimented the project and suggested that some warm colors be incorporated into the design. She noted that the administrative and special consultants' costs were $1.3 million on $116 million project, which seemed comparatively low. She requested the Committee to examine how administrative costs are allocated to projects. She noted also that project cost per space for 622 spaces was high at $20,000 per car.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio responded that industry standards are carefully examined. Building cost per space is the number that the University usually uses as a benchmark. In this case, the cost is $12,800. The difference between project cost per space and building cost per space relates to the site work and the administrative cost. He agreed to provide an explanation of the difference for this specific project.

Faculty Representative Pitts noted that the entry from the street provided open access to the hallways, which could create a security problem. Mr. Fisher commented that campus apartment complexes tend to be fairly open. Mr. Brown confirmed that the arrangement was typical.

Regent Kozberg believed that the project set a high standard for attractiveness. She asked whether the Coastal Commission had been consulted. Mr. Fisher responded that the campus has had a lot of communication with the community, which he believed could influence the Coastal Commission. Response to the EIR had been minimal. He noted that the project restores wetlands. He expressed the opinion that all potential points of contention had been addressed.

Regent Murray agreed that the project was beautiful. He was gratified that the campus will apply for full LEED certification. He was informed that the appearance of El Colegio will be improved by the addition of trees and the traffic flow will be enhanced. He was informed also that two-bedroom apartments on campus rent for $693 per person per month. Rates for this complex were based on the same level, which is below market.

Regent Marcus commented that the Committee needs illustrations of projects that are not idealized and that make it possible to envision the projects more precisely. He recommended that in future the Committee be presented with architectural renderings and elevations that provide a practical view. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio responded that there will be elevations included with all future project presentations that will be rendered to depict the finished materials as closely as possible.

Regent Kozberg found that the architectural vignettes and follies added charm to the project.

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

5. **CAMPUS VISION PRESENTATION, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Barclay commented that UCSF's vision for its academic and clinical future is to sustain and advance its unequaled comprehensive achievements in health sciences in teaching, research, and patient care. Essential to achieving that vision is a built environment that supports and nurtures such excellence. While the academic vision is ambitious and far-sighted, it must be achieved in a built environment that is and will likely remain for a long time multi-sited. The vision for the future built environment is guided by a set of overarching principles and informed by the lessons of the campus'

three major sites: Parnassus, Mount Zion, and Mission Bay. While the vision for Mission Bay is focused, it is less developed for Parnassus and Mount Zion. This is because the significant land-use decisions for these two sites will be driven by the outcome of a hospital replacement LRDP amendment and have yet to be made. Once the Regents approve that amendment, the campus will move to develop contemporary master plans for Parnassus and Mount Zion to guide future development efforts to create a distinctly UCSF sense of place, identity, and unity at each site.

Campus Architect Wiesenthal discussed UCSF's urban plan and approach to physical planning. He noted that, because of its many sites, the campus does not have a single image. The multiple sites suggest multiple responses to urban design and physical planning. The campus is at a crossroad with regard to its clinical enterprise. The way in which the replacement hospital strategy develops to comply with the SB1953 seismic codes will have an impact on the three primary campus sites as well as ancillary sites. He stated that his presentation would set a context for discussion over the next several years, as Mission Bay is built out, about developing the hospital replacement strategy and determining the best use of the Parnassus campus.

Mr. Wiesenthal began with a broad discussion about the planning themes. He reported that unique qualities about UCSF inform campus planning. The goal is to invoke images of San Francisco and the University's role within the city. He emphasized that the campus is not one site with satellites but rather is made up of three primary sites dispersed across the city. The campuses should reflect and invigorate their neighborhoods. There has been a conscious effort not to draw boundaries around each campus but rather to diffuse their edges. At Mission Bay, for instance, rather than inserting a foreign organizational theme, the traditional city grid developing around the site has been extended so as to knit the new site into the city's fabric. Mr. Wiesenthal commented that another major theme is UCSF's health sciences focus, which provides a need to address its public service role more than a traditional combined undergraduate and graduate campus. Patients and the public should be able to see students and researchers and the linkage to that healthcare mission. Whereas on a more traditional campus, uses might be zoned into enclaves, at UCSF it is important to blend elements in order to reinforce those connections. It also implies the need for accessibility and visibility to differentiate it in the eyes of the public. The third major theme that will cut across all the sites is that of the accelerated rate of change in disciplines that a health sciences environment implies. He cited rapid technological advances in the clinical and biomedical research fields as examples. Campus facilities must be able to accommodate that rate of change. UCSF is more market- and industry-driven than other campuses, which has an impact on the built environment.

Mr. Wiesenthal briefly touched on process, the organization of committees, and the oversight involved in developing and delivering the campus' capital program. UCSF, in studying the evolution of the Parnassus campus, will determine what should and should not be replicated at other sites. The campus expanded in a piecemeal nature, with minimal overall vision or strategy, creating a lack of cohesiveness. Circulation is awkward, and there is no sense of place. Something that does work at Parnassus is the

sense of collegiality that exists. Its laboratory neighborhood arrangement has been replicated in Genentech Hall at Mission Bay. Another thing that works well at Parnassus is the mix of uses placing those in the clinical enterprise face-to-face with students and those in the research laboratories. Construction density has yielded optimal use of the land.

Mr. Wiesenthal recalled that UCSF began with a downtown site in 1864 and then moved in1900 to Parnassus, which was sand dunes. In the 1930s, the rest of the campus began to develop. In mid-century the surrounding neighborhood started developing, forcing campus buildings into a densely packed site that at this time houses the schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy, under a mandated space ceiling. With that inability to expand at Parnassus, in 1989 Mount Zion was integrated into UCSF to support the expanding clinical enterprise. The third primary site, Mission Bay, was acquired through a donation of 43 acres by Catellus Development and the City of San Francisco in 1997 to help keep UCSF in the city. Mission Bay was established to support the maintenance of UCSF's leadership in research. Current drivers of expansion are the growth in National Institutes of Health funding and the need to accommodate changing technology and improve the functionality of space by replacing and upgrading infrastructure. Community service must receive more emphasis in order to create a desirable quality of life and environment for those on the UCSF campus as well as in the community. New programmatic directions, including the relocation of investigators to Mission Bay, enabled activities such as stem cell research to be undertaken at the Parnassus campus. The need to adhere to seismic upgrade codes is a final driver.

Mr. Wiesenthal reported that a debate on campus about how best to interpret UCSF's philosophy at Mission Bay covered the spectrum, including having it mirror some of the design elements found at Stanford, such as the historical quadrangle and sense of unity, to making each building an expression of the world's best architects. The campus aims to benefit from the best intentions of both ends of the spectrum by recruiting the world's best architects for individual projects but giving them guiding principles and strong oversight so that they can contribute to a unified whole. It is hoped that through innovation and creative architectural expression, UCSF's campuses will reflect and inspire the connection between art and science. The master plan for Mission Bay, which was the result of an international competition won by Machado and Silvetti Associates in 1999, provided direction for the new campus and helped UCSF leadership formulate its overall principles.

The four principles–context, cohesiveness, connectivity, and collegiality–represent programmatic relationships, between people and their environment, between buildings and landscape, pathways and entrances, the city and the University, and to some extent the past, present, and future. Mr. Wiesenthal defined each principle and discussed its application. He explained that context refers to applying harmony and integration through urban scale, view corridors, massing, and the function of the streetscape, and encompasses architectural harmony and integration, which can be applied through proportion, articulation, and composition. The principle of cohesiveness relates to how buildings can be brought together, not for uniformity, but for unity and legibility. The

principle of connectivity applies to both visual and physical linkages. At Mission Bay, a matrix of paths, vistas, and courtyards has started to form that will define a predominantly pedestrian environment. The only through street will be critical to encouraging people to experience not just individual buildings but the entire campus. The principle of collegiality needs to be reinforced by campus design via networks of communal interaction spaces on a campus-wide scale. Mr. Wiesenthal added a fifth principle–that of sustainability. He reported that UCSF has a committee that adds this overarching vision to the four principles from the master plan in order to protect and enhance the environment and health of the UCSF students, faculty, staff, and the City of San Francisco through an approach integrating economic, human, and ecological viability.

Mr. Wiesenthal discussed the ways in which the principles were being applied across the various sites. He noted that the Parnassus campus is in the geographic center of the city, in a predominantly residential neighborhood. The challenge is to distinguish the site as a University of California campus, ameliorating banal institutional architecture and improving the pedestrian experience. Changes related to seismic upgrading and possible changes to the hospital will offer the chance to provide better context. Buildings will be scaled both to meet programmatic needs and to work with the topography and scale of the surrounding neighborhood. The interface with the neighborhood will be improved with open spaces and enhanced streetscape. Sustainability initiatives would likely include alternative means of transportation. With this inherited site, there is some cohesiveness in the colors and high ratio of window to wall that should be reflected in new buildings. Particularly for health science campuses, way finding must be adequate and there must be relief from the density and intensity of the clinical environment through the addition of open space. The interaction spaces that foster collegiality need to be leveraged where they can have the greatest impact and be coordinated with a pedestrian spine. Based on replacement hospital scenarios and the seismic demolitions that will be required, the Parnassus campus will offer substantial opportunities for having a positive impact in applying the guiding principles.

Mr. Wiesenthal addressed the Mount Zion campus, which blends into its neighborhood. The context is one of dense, mid-to-low-rise ubanity that needs building out to the street edges and the maintenance of a consistent streetscape. Building entrances and any open spaces that it is possible to create should stand out against the consistent urban background. There is too much variety. Any new buildings should not be dramatic individual architectural statements but rather should strive to tie together what will remain at the site. Connectivity requires working with the streetscape and locating entrances in ways that emphasize the connections between buildings. Collegiality there requires enhancing a network of differently scaled spaces for quiet contemplation for patients and caretakers plus spaces for larger gatherings. The vitality of the neighborhood streetscape must continue to be reinforced.

Finally, Mr. Wiesenthal discussed the Mission Bay campus. He commented that context there is evolving. The landscape includes post-industrial and developing mixed uses, with UCSF at its heart. The California College of Arts and the new baseball stadium are

its close neighbors. Developing context will be an iterative process of leading the development of the neighborhood while responding to the surrounding development. The Mission Bay Master Plan emphasizes the importance of massing and architectural composition in creating a unified and cohesive campus. The initial laboratory buildings have three different architects who are maintaining a palette of travertine and an articulated base, body, and 85-foot cornice. The three architects were given guidelines and strong oversight, but were allowed to express individual creativity within an overall sense of unity. The principle of cohesiveness extends to the landscape. Paving, seating, signage, and lighting will help to create a sense of place that is missing at Parnassus. In applying lessons from Mission Bay to elsewhere, it will be possible to take some of the features at other campus sites in order to stitch together the three primary sites in the eyes of the public. The connective fabric at Mission Bay is based on a landscape of open spaces and pathways. That network is being designed in concert with the architecture so that entrances are connected via pathways to other building entrances. The main campus green was an organizing element of the initial conception of Mission Bay and will create the largest venue in support of the principle of collegiality. As designed by landscape architect Peter Walker, the quadrangle is intended to accommodate the circulation and gathering on many scales. The principle of collegiality has been foremost in the design of Mission Bay, both inside and out.

Mr. Wiesenthal commented that completing the Long Range Development Plan amendment and making decisions about the location of the replacement hospital will enable the Master Plans for the Parnassus and Mt. Zion sites to be completed. Capital projects will continue to be developed and evaluated relative to the overall UCSF vision, applying the planning principles discussed.

In response to a question by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Wiesenthal indicated that there needs to be a decision concerning the alternatives for a replacement hospital before plans can be made concerning the location of patient care.

Regent Hopkinson asked when the final Long Range Development Plan, the decision on the hospital, and the Master Plan would be submitted for approval. As she did not recall the Regents' having had significant involvement in developing the Master Plan for Mission Bay, she asked what their role would be going forward. She was concerned about the continuity of materials, the landscaping, and similar issues. Committee Chair Marcus added that he could not see continuity and harmony among the buildings going up at Mission Bay. He was discontented with what he described as architecturally significant but unconnected buildings.

Mr. Barclay recalled that the Mission Bay land was gifted to the University by Catellus and the City and County of San Francisco. During the process of developing its Long Range Development Plan in the 1990s, the threat of having the campus move to sites outside of the city motivated civic leaders to assure that the University would acquire the Catellus property. In 1997 The Regents approved the LRDP and the land acquisition. The same group of civic leaders created a private, not-for-profit foundation called the Bay Area Life Science Alliance, which negotiated with Catellus and the City on the

University's behalf to get the land, and also conducted an international design competition, following which the Master Plan was gifted to UCSF. It was accepted by the campus without Regental participation and has guided the development of Mission Bay since then. He reported that the campus intends to submit an LRDP amendment to The Regents no later than November. Regent Hopkinson believed that the Regents should be given an opportunity for input before any action item is proposed. Regent Montoya believed that the presentation had been an important one that should be presented in a condensed form to the Regents.

Regent Marcus' concerns about the importance of unifying the campuses were acknowledged by Mr. Wiesenthal, who suggested that as part of the institutional philosophy at UCSF it be acknowledged that the University supports individual expression and new ways of thinking about the environment and architecture within a unifying framework.

Regent Seigler agreed with the concept of finding ways to unify the major UCSF campus sites. He asked what the overall vision was into the future for UC San Francisco. Mr. Barclay responded that his question was one with which the campus had been struggling. He believed it was a foregone conclusion that Parnassus and Mission Bay will remain major sites, and that significant use will be made of Mt. Zion. The programmatic relationships are complicated and will involve extended deliberation. Mr. Wiesenthal noted that if a campus is to honor the immediate context in which it resides, cues must be taken from those neighborhoods to guide an overall plan for continuity.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the presentation and seeing Mission Bay caused her to be concerned about the vision for the landscape plan. The landscape had seemed stark to her, and she objected to the extensive use of pine trees, which she viewed as inconsistent with the urban setting.

Regent Kozberg commended the group on its presentation, which she hoped could be used for many purposes. She noted there is a tendency to move away from Master Plans. Mr. Wiesenthal responded that every time the campus begins to think about a building at Mission Bay, the Master Plan is considered and shared with the architects. There have been some variations. A housing project was not envisioned initially, necessitating a reconfiguration of that block. He noted, however, that the adaptations remained faithful to the intent of the original plan. Mr. Barclay noted that three new buildings will be unveiled relatively soon, which should provide a better sense of the connective tissue and landscaping and a more visceral sense of the campus' view that it is building a theme with variations within the context of the Master Plan.

Faculty Representative Pitts believed that potentially the greatest change to the Master Plan could be if a patient care facility is located at Mission Bay. Faculty are concerned about how to make such a major leap.

Regent Marcus stated that if the campus is intent on using world-class architects for its buildings, it will be impossible, because of their stature, to create campus unity and harmony. He also commended the campus for its well-considered presentation.

6. **EDUCATION BUILDING (HEALTH, KNOWLEDGE, AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER), MEDICAL CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The project was presented by the Davis campus Associate Director–Facilities Administration, the Dean of the School of Medicine, and the Manager–Facilities Design and Construction.

Associate Director Boyd reported that, in anticipation of presenting this item for design approval at the June meeting, the presentation would provide an overview of the project, which is critical to the future success of the School of Medicine and is important from an architectural standpoint in order to bridge the various styles on the Davis campus. The project is a 122,000-gross-square-foot building housing classrooms, a library, student support services, administrative offices of the Dean, and shell space for future needs. The budget is $40.3 million. The architect is Carrier Johnson of San Diego.

Dean Silva emphasized the importance of the project to the medical school's accreditation. Many units of the School of Medicine are being relocated from the Davis campus to Sacramento in order to allow students to be in an environment that is oriented toward medicine. The project sits in the heart of the medical center, consistent with the academic quadrangle concept articulated in the 1989 Long Range Development Plan. It is equidistant between the main in-patient complex and the outpatient center as well as being just north of the research building.

Manager Rush discussed the context for the building and some preliminary design ideas. He acknowledged the challenge of creating a more cohesive campus architecture. A building style, landscaping materials, signage, lighting, colors, and window styles are being contemplated that will draw together the campus' eclectic set of buildings. The building will be the first at the Sacramento location that relates wholly to the educational mission of the medical center. Materials used on previous medical center buildings, including pre-cast concrete, painted metal panels, and blue-green glass, will be used for the education building. The deep windows will be shaded, and the building will have some curved surfaces to provide architectural interest and to relate to the nearby cancer center, administrative support building, and research buildings. The project recognizes the necessity of extending pedestrian connections among the education building, the ambulatory care building, and the main hospital. Two circulation patterns are emerging: the one for vehicles penetrates the center of the campus to allow patients easy access to services; a more organic and user-friendly pedestrian system loops through the various campus arenas in more direct lines. The landscape plan includes a semi-public plaza at 45th and X Streets, with its mirror image on the east side of the building. Classrooms and the library will be on the main floor of the four-story building, with the student commons on the second floor along with more classrooms, the dean's offices on the third floor, and

the fourth floor as shell space. A signature piece of artwork will be hung over the building's entry. It is expected that the building will be LEED certified.

Mr. Rush reported that the financing for the project will be presented for approval at the May Regents meeting, followed in June by a request to the Committee to approve the design.

Regent Hopkinson found it difficult to react to the architecture as presented in the slides. She admired the vertical glass elements but not the horizontal fenestrations. She noted that the pedestrian axes between the hospital and the education building appeared to be pavement on grass, which does not comport with the conceptual pedestrian scheme for the campus that has been shown in the past.

Faculty Representative Pitts was not comfortable with the face of the building, which to him looked industrial and flat. He believed it would benefit from some added complexity. Mr. Rush responded that the architect had attempted to simplify the building surfaces in order to avoid adding a new style that would not mix with established buildings.

Regent Murray agreed with Regent Hopkinson that it would be helpful to mark out the major pedestrian access in some way. He was hopeful that the campus would explore the use of solar roof panels.

Regent Kozberg observed that unless the pedestrian paths are more clearly designated, people will begin to take inappropriate shortcuts. In response to her question about the large size of the building's main lobby, Mr. Boyd explained that it is best described as an atrium between the two wings of the building and that it will provide seating for students waiting to enter classrooms.

The Committee went into Closed Session at 2:10 p.m.

. . . . . .

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary