The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
September 21, 2004
Open Session

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at UCSF–Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Anderson, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Montoya, Ornellas, and Ruiz; Advisory members Juline, Rominger, and Brunk

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

The meeting convened at 10:20 a.m. with Committee Chair Hopkinson presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of June 30, 2004 were approved.

2. **EXCEPTION TO REGENTS' POLICY ON INDEMNIFICATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN SAVINGS BY DESIGN PROGRAM**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend that The Regents authorize and approve campus participation in the Savings By Design program in accordance with the terms and conditions of the standard Savings By Design contract for services.

It was recalled that in June 2003, The Regents authorized the President to adopt a policy on energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction of University facilities. In furtherance of the goal of improving the energy efficiency of University facilities, the President has determined that the Savings By Design program offers a variety of analytical services and incentives that, if fully employed, will help campuses and their design teams improve energy efficiency in new facility designs.

The Savings By Design program is funded by the public goods surcharge on utility bills in California. Funds collected through this surcharge are used by the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to sponsor the Savings By Design program through the California investor-owned utilities Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas Co., and San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

The program encourages high-performance nonresidential building design and construction and offers building owners and their design teams a wide range of services.

Design Assistance provides information and analysis services tailored to the needs of individual projects, to help achieve the most energy-efficient building possible. Owner Incentives help offset the costs of energy-efficient buildings. Design Team Incentives reward designers who meet ambitious energy efficiency targets.

Implementation of the University's Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards requires all new building projects, as well as significant renovation projects which will replace electrical equipment and HVAC systems and components, to enroll in the Savings By Design program. Enrollment requires a contractual relationship with the utility providing Savings By Design services in each campus service area. These services typically consist of energy-efficiency analyses of designs of building systems and life-cycle cost analyses upon which incentive awards to owners are based. The University's proposed standard of outperforming California Code of Regulations Title 24 energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent will qualify all University projects for both design assistance and incentive awards.

Indemnification Issue

The standard Savings By Design agreement requires the building owner receiving the rebate to indemnify the utility that administers the program from liability claims brought against the utility which are caused by or connected in any way with the owner's performance of the Savings by Design agreement. The purpose of this language is to guarantee that the utilities will not be brought into litigation concerning the design of the building simply by virtue of having administered the rebate program, as they are required to do by the PUC, and paid a rebate to the owner. The Savings By Design agreement is a PUC-approved form that cannot be changed based upon the identity of the owner. The Office of the General Counsel believes that because any liability associated with the design of a University facility already falls upon the University and its design professionals as a matter of law, the University's agreeing to this very limited indemnity represents very little or no risk to the institution. Nonetheless, Regental authorization of such indemnity is required because The Regents has not delegated to the President the general authority to extend indemnity to parties with whom the University contracts when the indemnity pertains to the acts of third parties over whom the University has no control. Balancing the advantages of participation in the program against the remote risk associated with the indemnity, staff in the Office of the President believe that it is in the best interest of the University to use the form of agreement required to participate in the program.

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

3. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE 2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report for the UC San Diego 2004 Long Range Development Plan.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final Environmental Impact Report.

C. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations included in the Findings.

D. Adopt the Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

E. Adopt the 2004 Long Range Development Plan, San Diego campus.

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

Vice Chancellor Woods recalled that the 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the University of California, San Diego provides a general land use plan to guide the physical development of the main campus in La Jolla. The 2004 LRDP identifies institutional and development objectives, delineates campus land uses, and estimates the new building space needed to support program expansion through the planning horizon year 2020-21. The 2004 LRDP updates the plan adopted by The Regents in 1989. The Regents approved a separate LRDP for the UCSD Medical Center Hillcrest in 1995 to guide the development of that campus through 2010-11.

The Master Plan for Higher Education in California directs the University of California to provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences. Given the projected increase in the number of high school graduates and in accordance with the Master Plan, which guarantees access to UC for the top 12.5 percent of California's public high school graduates and qualified transfer students from the California community colleges, UCSD was asked by the Office of the President to update its enrollment, academic, land use, and space plans. Consequently, UCSD proposed increased enrollments during the regular academic year, which includes the fall, winter, and spring quarters, and the summer session. Because these enrollment targets and the associated projected space needs are greater than the projections presented in the previously approved 1989 LRDP, the campus drafted the 2004 LRDP and prepared a new Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Status of the 1989 LRDP

The 1989 LRDP described physical development goals and land use categories intended to support campus growth through 2005-06.

Population: The 1989 LRDP projected an enrollment of 26,050 and a faculty and staff population of 16,900 by 2005-06. In 2002-03, the baseline year for comparison and environmental analysis purposes, the three-quarter-average student population was approximately 23,000 and the faculty and staff population was approximately 10,100.

Building Space: The 1989 LRDP projected a potential total space need of approximately 15,856,000 gross square feet. As of October 2002, the campus occupied a total of 10,082,000 gsf.

Summary of the 2004 Long Range Development Plan

Adoption of the 2004 LRDP will not constitute a commitment to specific projects, construction schedules, or funding priorities. Each subsequent building proposal will require specific review and approval, as appropriate, in compliance with CEQA.

Population: The 2004 LRDP projects a regular academic year enrollment of 29,900 by 2020-21. In addition, UCSD projects substantial increases in summer session enrollment and anticipates a faculty and staff population of 19,900.

Building Space: The 2004 LRDP projects that the campus' space needs will increase to approximately 19,159,000 gsf.

Academic Goals

The instruction and research programs at the San Diego campus are organized into three major units: the General Campus, the Health Sciences, and the Marine Sciences. The 2004 LRDP summarizes the academic goals for each of these units.

General Campus comprises 24 undergraduate and graduate departments and three professional schools and is responsible for all undergraduate programs and most of the graduate education that occurs within the academic disciplines. The General Campus unit intends to complete the development of existing programs, expand the number and variety of programs offered to students, increase the scope of the research program, and continue the development of programs to encourage students to pursue graduate and professional training.

Health Sciences includes the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The Health Sciences departments engage in research, clinical activities, and instruction through professional medical and pharmacy programs and a graduate academic program. The Health Sciences unit intends to maintain a leadership role in the acquisition of basic knowledge and the conduct of applied research in the health sciences, provide the highest possible quality of patient care and medical services to the community, ensure that specialties important to evolving medical practices are

represented adequately, and meet the challenges of the post-genomic, technology-enriched era of the 21st century by bridging and integrating research laboratories with patient care settings.

Marine Sciences programs comprise the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and include an interdisciplinary graduate department that carries out research and graduate education in marine and earth sciences, ocean engineering, and related environmental sciences. The Marine Sciences unit intends to expand existing programs, including interdisciplinary collaborations with the Biological Sciences, Engineering, Management, Medicine, Pharmacy, and Physical Sciences; increase undergraduate instructional responsibilities in the earth sciences; and introduce new programs in global observation systems and activities that focus on problems unique to California.

Key Parameters

The 2004 LRDP provides a comprehensive policy and land use plan that addresses a number of associated goals: achieve an enrollment of 29,900; accommodate 50 percent of the student body in housing operated by the campus; and develop 9,077,000 gsf of new space to bring the campus total to 19,159,000 gsf from the baseline level of 10,082,000.

Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

To accomplish its long-standing goals of diminishing the use of single-occupancy vehicles, achieving maximum use of alternative modes of transportation, and reducing the impacts of campus growth on the community, the campus plans to continue to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, including campus-operated shuttles, public transit, ride sharing, van pooling, and bicycles. Further, the campus anticipates, and the LRDP would allow, future light rail trolley stations on both sides of Interstate 5 and is exploring the possibility of expanded public bus service.

The 2004 LRDP provides the basis for an extensive pedestrian and bicycle circulation network in an auto-free core environment that will link the campus neighborhoods with each other and with the proposed trolley stations.

The overall goals of the 2004 LRDP for vehicular circulation are to provide convenient and clearly identifiable campus entry points and effective movement of vehicles that minimize impacts on pedestrians. The plan maintains a loop road system, accessible to bicyclists, and proposes strengthening the link between the central and eastern campus areas by constructing a second bridge across Interstate 5.

The 2004 LRDP proposes continuing the transition away from surface parking lots to a mixture of peripheral surface lots served by shuttles, and parking structures within walking distance of key campus facilities. The campus has 17,650 parking spaces. The LRDP reserves land sufficient to develop approximately 27,200 spaces; however, ongoing support for alternative and mass transit services may make it possible to reduce the need and demand for parking.

Planning Concepts

The 2004 LRDP continues the five planning concepts that were central to the 1989 LRDP.

Neighborhoods: The geographic and architectural building blocks of the campus are defined as Neighborhoods. The continued development of compact, clearly demarcated Neighborhoods will facilitate efficient land use and give the campus a human scale.

University Center: One of the campus' Neighborhoods, the World War II era Camp Matthews area, is becoming a "town center" known as University Center. This central area just southeast of the Geisel Library is within easy walking distance of the other, more academically oriented neighborhoods. University Center provides a mixed-use area containing academic facilities, classrooms, administrative and student services, offices, social and cultural attractions, and may include some housing.

Academic Corridors: To facilitate the physical integration of the campus' academic programs and to provide a consistent basis for locating future academic facilities, five Academic Corridors are designated, related to existing disciplinary clusters.

Park: The campus' natural resources comprise an integrated open space system called the UCSD Park. The Park consists of three types of land reserves where development is restricted: ecologically valuable habitat areas, eucalyptus groves, and previously disturbed canyons that are targeted for improvement as open spaces.

Connections: The 2004 LRDP maintains an integrated system of campus entries, roads, pedestrian, bicycle, and shuttle routes, and view corridors that tie the campus together.

Land Use Designations

The 2004 LRDP focuses on UCSD's three main geographical areas: Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the portions of the campus west and east of Interstate 5. The plan describes land use categories that reflect activities that will be predominant in any given area. In addition, the 2004 LRDP affords a reasonable measure of flexibility by allowing other compatible uses to occur within a given area defined by a different predominant use, such as when a surface parking lot exists in an area used predominantly for academic activities. The following eleven land use categories are applied on UCSD's 1,152 acres.

Academic use areas serve primarily undergraduate colleges, graduate programs, and professional schools.

Academic/Community-Oriented use areas primarily contain facilities that are associated with or support academic programs that also are regularly used by the general public.

Academic/Science Research Park signifies a land use primarily intended to accommodate private research entities the activities of which are compatible with University-based research programs and entail collaboration with UCSD faculty and students. This land use designation also allows UCSD to use these and UCSD facilities in the Science Research Park.

Administrative land uses involve primarily general administrative and institutional support functions typical of office facilities.

General Service land uses primarily include facilities for personnel and equipment related to the operations, security and safety, and maintenance of University facilities. Examples include the central garage, shops supporting general maintenance activities, materials handling, police, utility plants, service yards, recycling areas, and storage.

Housing land uses primarily denote residential facilities intended to accommodate unmarried students, students with families, faculty, and staff.

Medical land uses include primarily clinical and medical research and teaching facilities associated with the UCSD Medical Center.

Mixed Use land areas include primarily facilities for academic and administrative activities that serve the campus as a whole, rather than a single college or professional school.

The Park denotes open space areas that have ecological or aesthetic value and are subject to special constraints on development.

Sports and Recreation includes major playing fields and other athletic facilities.

Surface Parking includes two areas designated for long-term surface parking, although parking structures and smaller surface lots are located throughout the campus in land use areas characterized by other predominant use designations. If it is determined in the future that these long-term surface parking sites may have a higher and better use, the campus will submit an LRDP amendment to The Regents.

Although the 2004 LRDP maintains the basic land uses described in the 1989 LRDP, a few changes are noteworthy: distinct land areas are designated for undergraduate housing in the 2004 LRDP, as opposed to being subsumed within academic zones in the 1989 LRDP; the four land areas that were defined in the 1989 LRDP as academic reserves to accommodate programs envisioned to be implemented beyond the 2005-06 horizon year

are defined for academic uses in the 2004 LRDP; and the Park open space concept implemented with the 1989 LRDP is maintained, but the 2004 LRDP will allow a light rail transit line to be implemented in a Park area disturbed by former military uses.

Environmental Sustainability

Environmental sustainability considerations are prominent in the planning of UCSD facilities to ensure appropriate measures to conserve natural resources. The 2004 LRDP promotes the principles of sustainability through the efficient use of water, solid waste recycling, energy efficient design, the use of clean-fuel vehicles, and providing and promoting alternative transportation. Systems such as cogeneration will be implemented campus-wide. Other measures will be incorporated into individual facility designs.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the San Diego campus 2004 LRDP. The first of its four volumes addresses the impacts of the physical developments of the proposed 2004 LRDP; the second contains associated technical appendices; the third addresses the project level impacts of the proposed Rady School of Management, the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and the Hopkins Parking Structure, which are proposed for immediate implementation under the 2004 LRDP; and the fourth contains the comments and responses on the Draft EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Programs. The three projects will be presented to The Regents as separate items.

On August 1, 2003, the University released a Notice of Preparation (NOP), including an Initial Study, that announced the preparation of a Draft EIR and describing its proposed scope. A revised NOP was released on December 5, 2003 to acknowledge that the potential environmental effects of the 2004 LRDP and the proposed Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion Project, and the Hopkins Parking Structure would be considered in a single EIR. The revised NOP was circulated to responsible agencies and interested groups and individuals for a 30-day review period beginning December 8, 2003 and ending January 7, 2004.

The Draft EIR was issued on May 25, 2004 and was circulated for public review and comment for a 45-day period ending July 9, 2004. Because a few groups and individuals asked for additional time to provide input, the comment period was extended to July 23, 2004.

Written comments were received from 12 agencies, 14 organizations, and 26 private citizens. In addition, comments were received from 10 individuals at a public hearing held on June 14, 2004 at the campus. The letters and the public hearing transcript and responses are included in the Final EIR. The following issues were raised by the public: noise, trash, odor, and parking related to the University's off-campus shuttle bus system; off-campus parking in residential neighborhoods by University employees and students; and traffic and circulation impacts in the general area.

The Draft EIR, which is part of the Final EIR, identified the potential environmental effects of implementing the proposed 2004 LRDP. In accordance with CEQA, the project analyzed in the EIR refers to the total level of development that could result from adoption of the 2004 LRDP. Each element of the 2004 LRDP, including the program, land use, open space, and circulation elements, is a part of this project because each can influence the environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the 2004 LRDP.

The Final EIR is a program-level EIR for the 2004 LRDP prepared in accordance with CEQA. It analyzes project impacts in 14 areas that could result from full development of the 2004 LRDP program elements. The Final EIR includes a variety of mitigation measures to address project impacts. It also analyzes four alternatives to the project, including alternatives that would result in no project, no further growth, less growth, and increased housing.

Implementation of the 2004 LRDP may result in significant impacts in a number of areas presented in the Findings and the Environmental Summary. Even after incorporating all feasible mitigation measures, the following environmental topics include some significant unavoidable impacts: Aesthetics (project level and cumulative), Air Quality (cumulative), Cultural Resources (cumulative), and Traffic-Circulation (project level and cumulative).

Regarding traffic impacts, responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures concerning off-campus, traffic-related roadway improvements reside with agencies other than the University. The campus has coordinated continuously with public agencies on traffic and transit matters and will continue to do so. Also, to reduce traffic impacts, the 2004 LRDP emphasizes the use of alternative transportation, including public mass transit, on- and off-campus shuttles by UCSD, carpools, and vanpools. The Final EIR is also accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's background, process of development, environmental review, mitigation measures, monitoring program, and alternatives. They also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant effects in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, and traffic-circulation.

Regent Hopkinson asked about the campus' academic goals as they relate to the Long Range Development Plan. Vice Chancellor Woods responded that each of the campus' three primary academic areas, Scripps, the School of Medicine, and the general campus, has an academic plan. The needs of these areas as reflected in the Long Range Development Plan are evaluated in the context of their academic plans. While there is no formal process for approving the academic plans, there is an understanding that the Vice Chancellors will provide regular updates to the Chancellor regarding them. Senior Vice President Mullinix suggested that academic plans be presented to the committee as

part of LRDP presentations. He believed that master plans, which are presented to the committee, should be kept separate from the LRDP process. He reported that five-year capital plans will begin to be presented to the committee in the near future.

Regent Hopkinson asked why gross square footage set aside for public venues and sports had been increased from 823,000 to 1,401,000 between 2002 and 2020. Assistant Vice Chancellor Steindorf responded that the campus hoped to develop a sports arena in the future.

Regent Montoya asked for a breakdown of the campus' 23,000 students and 10,100 faculty and staff. Vice Chancellor Steindorf responded that 85 percent of the student body are undergraduates, 15 percent are graduate students, about 30 percent are faculty and academic titles, including researchers, and the remainder are staff. He expected that the proportions would stand through 2020, with perhaps a small increase in staff, given the expansion of the medical center.

In response to a further question by Regent Montoya, Vice Chancellor Woods reported that, although there are no students on the campus' design review board, the Chancellor is considering adding some.

Vice Chancellor Steindorf described the campus' alternative transportation programs for Regent Montoya. He emphasized that the campus, which coordinates those and parking programs, has been aggressive in its emphasis on alternative transportation. In addition, the campus has been working with local transit agencies to expand mass transit and intends to expand its fleet of alternative fuel vehicles.

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

4. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN OF FACULTY AND SIERRA MADRE FAMILY STUDENT HOUSING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the project as indicated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the North Campus Faculty Housing project.

D. Approve the design of the Sierra Madre Student Family Housing project.

E. Amend the UCSB 1990 Long Range Development Plan to reflect changes indicated in the North and West Campus Long Range Development Plan Amendment, and authorize the President or his designee to make such changes as designated by the California Coastal Commission for the Amendment to be consistent with the California Coastal Act, provided that such changes do not substantially alter the scope and location of the housing projects.

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

It was recalled that the Santa Barbara campus is proposing an LRDP amendment to facilitate two third-party housing projects for faculty and family students and open space improvements in the North and West Campus areas. The University purchased the North Campus in 1995, and in 1998 The Regents approved an LRDP amendment to address the proposed development.

Although adopted by The Regents, the 1998 North and West Campus LRDP Amendment was never forwarded to the California Coastal Commission for certification, due to the extent and nature of the public and agency comments. The Chancellor convened the North Campus Advisory Group, composed of environmental science faculty and UCSB administrators, to advise him on the North Campus Plan. The proposed LRDP amendment and housing projects reflect the recommendations of this group, as well as collaborative planning with the local jurisdictions.

The proposed faculty and family student housing projects and open space improvements are planned as part of the Joint Proposal for the Ellwood-Devereux Coast (Joint Proposal), a collaborative planning effort of the Santa Barbara campus with the City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara. Under the Joint Proposal, proposed residential developments within University, City, and County jurisdictions are restricted to areas adjacent to existing development in order to protect and preserve a contiguous 652-acre coastal open space and natural reserve area that spans the three jurisdictions. UC owns 314 acres of the 652-acre total.

The campus, City, and County agreed to plan, process, and approve all of the residential development projects simultaneously so that the Joint Proposal projects can be submitted together to the California Coastal Commission as a regional plan for the Ellwood-Devereux coastal area. Each jurisdiction maintains land use authority over development within its boundaries.

The proposed projects would result in 236 units of faculty housing and 151 units of family student housing, while the overall reduction and relocation of development potential within the North and West campuses will create over 314 acres of contiguous open space and natural reserve within the University's lands and will avoid the fragmentation of open space and habitat allowed under previous plans. The 2004 LRDP Amendment would reduce the number of faculty housing units allowed on the West

Campus Mesa from 100 units to 50 units. No project is proposed for development of these units.

The North Campus Faculty Housing project is proposed as a third-party development to plan, finance, construct, and sell 236 units on the North Parcel of the Santa Barbara North Campus. The Sierra Madre Student Family Housing project is proposed as a third-party development to plan, finance, construct, and rent 151 units on the Storke-Whittier Parcel of the Santa Barbara North Campus. The open space improvements are comprised of both facilities and ongoing Resource Management Actions. The facilities include trail and beach access improvements, coastal access parking, and public amenities. Resource management actions include habitat restoration and enhancement, access and use restrictions, and storm water management. Coal Oil Point Reserve, a natural reserve, will continue to be managed under its Draft Management Plan.

Project Sites

North Campus Faculty Housing

The 26.3-acre project site is located at the terminus of Phelps Road and Cannon Green Drive, on the North Parcel of the Santa Barbara North Campus. The site is bounded on the west by the undeveloped northern portion of the Ellwood Mesa, within the City of Goleta; on the north by the Cannon Green condominium complex, Phelps Road, and a single-family residential neighborhood within the City of Goleta; on the east by an undeveloped nine-acre parcel and a single-family residential neighborhood within the City of Goleta; and on the south by the Ocean Meadows Golf Course within the County of Santa Barbara. The site has panoramic views of the mountains to the north and the Ocean Meadows Golf Course and open space to the south. It is largely degraded grassland habitat and includes fragmented wetlands resulting from prior grading within the main site, as well as a manmade drainage ditch that separates the main site from the eastern site. The proposed site plan places individual and clusters of units in a manner responsive to drainage systems, setbacks, existing circulation and access points, and views. The housing complex is divided into three smaller communities, each surrounding an outdoor gathering space. All housing is located within a five-minute walk of the central community building and pool area, located at the Village Center.

Sierra Madre Family Student Housing

The 21.5-acre project site for the Sierra Madre Housing is located on the Storke-Whittier Parcel of the Santa Barbara North Campus, adjacent to the existing West Campus Apartments. The site is bounded on the west by the Ocean Meadows Golf Course, which is the site of the Ocean Meadows Residences, a proposed private development of single-family homes and three-story apartments, within the County of Santa Barbara; on the north by Whittier Drive and apartment complexes within the City of Goleta; on the east by Storke Road and Storke Ranch, a single family neighborhood within the City of Goleta, and the Santa Barbara campus Francisco Torres Residence Hall; and on the south by the existing Santa Barbara campus West Campus Apartments. The project site is

within walking distance of the Isla Vista Elementary School. There are panoramic views to the mountains to the north. The primary natural features of the site are a wetland within the main site and a drainage swale that separates the main site from the northern site.

Project Design

North Campus Faculty Housing

The Faculty Housing project residential units are distributed in a combination of 122 one-story courtyard duplex and triplex units along the perimeter of the site, 88 two- and three-story town homes and 14 studios located over garages within the central portion of the site, and 12 two-story single-family homes along the eastern edge of the site. The variety of units complements the wide range of financial resources and living expectations of prospective faculty residents. The typical unit has an open living, dining, and kitchen space, 2 or 3 bedrooms, 2 full baths, and an office or den.

The site is adjacent to existing residential development, which has a variety of housing types built in the 1970s and 1980s. The Mediterranean architectural character of the project responds to Santa Barbara's Spanish Revival traditions, while its scale and density reflect the adjacent neighborhoods. On the east portion of the site, proposed one-story single-family homes reflect the existing single-family Marymount streetscape. The new development has courtyard units that become denser as it approaches Phelps Creek. On the western side of the site, at the Phelps Road entry, courtyard units abut the existing Cannon Green condominium neighborhood. From here, the development changes into higher density town homes as it moves toward Village Center, the community focal point.

The main community public space is centrally located next to a multi-purpose community building and pool. Secondary open spaces serve each neighborhood with picnic shelters, outdoor gathering space, and community gardens.

All housing types and the multi-purpose community building will be wood frame construction with an exterior plaster finish, clad wood windows, and wood-paneled exterior doors. Roofs will be a mixture of flat and pitched Spanish tile in a variety of forms.

In addition to meeting LEED equivalent policy standards, the campus will work with the third-party developer to achieve the highest LEED certification rating attainable within the project's budget.

The Design Guidelines of the Faculty Housing project have been reviewed in accordance with University Policy by the Campus Design Review Committee.

Sierra Madre Family Student Housing

The design for the Sierra Madre Family Student Housing project includes 151 married-student housing units, a community building, and support facilities. The project consists of 109 two-bedroom and 42 three-bedroom stacked, single-level apartments in mostly three-story buildings. The approximately 820 asf two-bedroom units and 1,050 asf three-bedroom units are designed with the flexibility to accommodate single-student residents or faculty, if not required for student families.

The open space program includes a community green, tot lots for the West Campus Apartments and new housing, a wetland area, and a drainage swale. For water quality management, bioswales are included in the project, and a new span culvert at the Devereux Slough crossing is proposed to mitigate drainage, detention, and flood plain impacts on the site.

The ground floor units are accessible from the public walkways through private gardens at each unit. The center building includes a community laundry and storage. All circulation corridors are covered and open-air. Each unit is naturally ventilated, and most bathrooms and kitchens with exterior walls have operable windows.

The community building provides approximately 4,800 asf for housing administration, a computer study, two multipurpose rooms with a warming kitchen, and an additional laundry room which is shared with the West Campus Apartments. An outdoor activity space is adjacent to the multipurpose rooms.

The primary pedestrian circulation for the community will be an extension of the existing West Campus Apartments circulation grid. Informal tree groupings along pedestrian and bicycle paths will visually delineate the location of the pathways. Raised crossing platforms at crosswalks will calm traffic flow and provide pedestrian links between the West Campus Apartments and the new Sierra Madre projects.

This project will reflect the Santa Barbara tradition of Spanish Revival architecture through its proposed Mediterranean character. Buildings will be mostly three-story, wood-frame construction. Exterior walls and soffits will be cement plaster and the roof will be concrete Spanish tile.

In addition to meeting LEED equivalent policy standards, the campus will work with the third-party developer to achieve the highest LEED certification rating attainable within the project's budget.

In accordance with University policy, the campus Design Review Committee has reviewed the design of the Sierra Madre Housing project.

Open Space Improvements and Facilities

Upon approval of the LRDP amendment, a number of physical improvements and facilities will be added to the open space area to protect resources and enhance the visitor experience. These improvements are not included as part of these third-party housing

projects. Facilities and improvements will be designed to maintain a predominantly rustic, natural character that is consistent with the preservation of natural open space and habitat values. Open space improvements will be made to trails, beach access, coastal access parking, and public amenities.

Resource Management Actions

In addition to the physical improvements listed above, the campus proposes a number of ongoing resource management actions to improve and maintain the open space resources. These include habitat restoration and enhancement, access and use restrictions, and storm water management. Coal Oil Point Reserve (COPR) Natural Reserve will continue to be managed consistent with the COPR Draft Management Plan to protect and enhance sensitive natural resources within its boundaries.

Project Statistics

Project statistics normally attached to UC project design items are omitted because the proposed projects are based on third-party development agreements that are not yet negotiated. Statistics will be provided when the projects are presented for ground lease and license approvals.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the proposed Faculty and Family Student Housing, Open Space Plan, and Long Range Development Plan Amendment. A Notice of Preparation was filed on July 29, 2003, and a scoping meeting was held on August 13, 2003. A Draft Environmental Impact Report was circulated to the public, responsible agencies, and to the State Clearinghouse for a 45-day review period ending May 24, 2004.

In addition to providing the customary analysis, the EIR identified potentially significant project impacts that could be reduced to less-than-significant by implementing the proposed mitigation measures. Some impacts in the following areas would remain significant and unavoidable: hydrology and water quality (cumulative impact), air quality (operation), noise (construction), and traffic and circulation (cumulative).

Four alternatives were evaluated in the EIR, including development on the South Parcel of the North Campus and Storke-Whittier site, no project-no development, North and South Parcel development, maximum housing development, and an off-site alternative. The Final EIR is accompanied by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

At a public hearing for the University Draft EIR held on May 4, 2004, ten individuals testified. Twelve letters were received from federal, State, and local public agencies, and ten letters were received from community organizations and eighteen individuals during the comment period. The issues and concerns raised included the proximity of faculty

housing to an airport approach zone; the loss of wetlands required for the faculty housing project; the protection and restoration of open space, public uses and amenities, trails and beach; the protection of the snowy plover habitat; and the impacts to water quality during construction and operation of both housing projects. The Final EIR includes a copy of all comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to all comments, and the mitigation monitoring program.

Findings

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

Associate Secretary Shaw drew attention to a Report of Communications that contained comments about this project.

Chancellor Yang reported that he had worked on the project for the previous ten years in close association with the City, the County, governmental agencies, and the community. He emphasized the dire need for housing on the campus.

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher presented slides of the projects.

Regent Johnson was impressed with the design. She was assured by Mr. Fisher that all three floors of the student housing were accessible to the disabled.

Regent Anderson also liked the overall appearance of the project. She asked whether any legal issues needed consideration. University Counsel Schmeltzer reported that the Environmental Defense Center, which opposes the project, and the University's General Counsel disagree about the applicable case law. The University maintains that the project is allowable under established legal precedent. The Coastal Commission must come to its own conclusion based on its legal counsel.

Regent Kozberg judged this to be a stunning set of projects that are especially sympathetic to environmental concerns. She appreciated the statements of support that had been made by Santa Barbara faculty.

Regent Hopkinson noted that a great deal of energy, focus, and cooperation had been required to make the project a reality. Because, as she recalled, local environmental groups had agreed to the way in which the plans were proceeding, she was surprised by the objections that had been raised. Mr. Fisher stated that the campus had worked with those groups for years and had believed they were in agreement about the plan to move housing northward in order to preserve lands to the south. Regent Hopkinson admired the north campus design, with the exception of the ranch-style housing of the single-family units. Regent Anderson agreed with her. Mr. Fisher responded that when work begins with the developer it may be possible to reexamine that portion of the plan. The determination that ranch houses would be appropriate was made in deference to requests

by the neighboring community. Regent Hopkinson was hopeful also that the Sierra Madre housing design could be embellished.

Regent Montoya asked about affordability. Mr. Fisher responded that the faculty and graduate student housing costs will be well under the market. The married family student housing is problematic. The initial estimates did not meet expectations. Senior Vice President Mullinix reported that his office would work with the campus to ensure that the economics for the student housing were in line before application is made to the Coastal Commission. When figures become available from developers, they will be presented to the Committee.

Regent Kozberg asked about the process for involving the third party. Mr. Fisher responded that the next step was submission to the Coastal Commission. Once the entitlements are secured, a developer will be hired. The entitlements will allow for some modifications of project details. Regent Kozberg asked whether the campus must build under prevailing wages when using a third party. Mr. Fisher responded that third-party developers tend to use union labor for projects of this size.

Regent-designate Juline asked what transportation options would be available for faculty. Mr. Fisher responded that bicycle was the favored mode for both faculty and students. A bike lane connects the eastern edge of the site to the core campus.

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

(For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the September 21, 2004 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

5. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SCIENCES BUILDING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the Education and Social Sciences Building project, Santa Barbara campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2002, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Education and Social Sciences Building, Santa Barbara campus in the 2003-2004 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2003-08 Capital Improvement Program at a cost of $63,179,000. The budget was amended in January 2004 to increase the scope and budget of the gift-funded component of the project, for a total cost of $66,470,000. In August 2004, the gift-funded component for the project was further increased and the project was amended by $4,300,000, for a total cost of $70,770,000. The revised total project cost will be funded from a combination of State funds ($56,254,000) and gift funds ($14,516,000).

In June 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Kallman McKinnell & Wood Architects of Boston as Executive Architect for the project.

Project Site

The 5.42-acre site is located on Parking Lots 20 and 21, south of Ocean Road and bounded on the east by the campus bus circle and on the west by Arts Lane. An existing swimming pool, the Old Gym, and Parking Lot 29 form the project's southern boundary. The site is in accordance with the 1990 Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The Education and Social Sciences Building project is designed to contain 124,439 asf within a total area of 205,850 gsf in three buildings. All of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE), including the Autism and Hosford clinics, is housed in one building of approximately 93,400 gsf. Selected departments of Letters and Science, including Sociology, Law and Society, and Communication and Film Studies, are housed in a second building (L&S), totaling approximately 96,950 gsf of space. The new Center for Film, TV, and New Media (CFTVNM) will have limited space in the L&S building and is housed primarily in the third building of approximately 15,500 gsf that includes a film theater, production suite, and support spaces.

The L-shaped, four-story L&S and GGSE buildings are similar in size and form and are sited with their east-west wings parallel to Ocean Road and their north-south wings parallel to the approximately 100-foot-wide pedestrian access corridor in the middle of the site. The wings of the two buildings form courtyards with meeting spaces, landscaping, and amenities that are unique to each building.

High traffic spaces such as class-laboratories, clinics, demonstration spaces, and classrooms have been located on the ground floors and are accessible from the courtyard arcades or from the pedestrian corridor between the buildings. The upper floors accommodate faculty offices, scholarly activities, and research space and administrative functions. The organization of the 70-foot-wide buildings is based on a standard office module that allows for perimeter offices with two interior corridors and a modular central core zone in the second and third floors. The fourth floors are set back from the courtyard façade, thereby providing exterior circulation and meeting space.

The two-story CFTVNM building is adjacent to the L&S building on the easternmost part of the site and is set back from Ocean Road to provide a forecourt entry to the building. A paved patio between L&S and CFTVNM will be convenient to the film theater lobby and café. With a roof form that is unusual for traditional clay tile, CFTVNM will be a distinctive presence by the large pedestrian mall that the campus master plan anticipates will replace the existing bus circle.

The L&S and GGSE buildings are steel frame construction on spread footings with cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab on grade and light-weight-concrete, suspended floor slabs above grade. The CFTVNM building is reinforced-concrete-wall construction on spread footings, a cast-in-place concrete slab on grade and, for theater seating, a cast-in-place, suspended, reinforced slab with built-up concrete steps.

The project's exterior architecture has been developed to relate to Santa Barbara's historic Spanish style. Building exterior finish materials include painted stucco, precast stone, ceramic tile, painted aluminum operable windows, wood ventilation panels, clay roof tiles, painted steel balcony railings, and wood trellises.

In accordance with University policy, the design of the Education and Social Sciences Building project has been reviewed by the campus Design Review Committee; an independent design review team including a cost consultant; and a mechanical, electrical, and plumbing consultant. Independent structural review will be conducted at each stage of project development. The project is consistent with the University of California Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards and the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards.

The Campus Office of Design and 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 July 2005, with completion anticipated in August 2007.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the project was submitted on April 22, 2004 to the State Clearinghouse, local agencies, utility providers, and other interested parties and was circulated for public review. The EIR concluded that transportation and traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable in the areas of Traffic Volume and Parking. Impacts in most other areas would be less than significant after incorporation of proposed mitigation measures. Five letters received during the review period addressed tree removal, tree replacement, cumulative loss of trees, monarch butterflies, fire protection services, road improvements, air emissions, cumulative development projects, cumulative traffic impacts, aircraft operations/noise, and transit service. The campus' written responses are included in the Final EIR.

In conformance with the 1990 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), 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 and associated mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Chancellor Yang mentioned that the Santa Barbara campus had raised approximately $10 million in gifts to fund the theater that will be part of the new Center for Film, TV, and New Media.

Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher presented slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson described the Education and Social Sciences building designs as spectacular, but she was less enthusiastic about the design for the film center. Mr. Fisher responded that the design of the building, which anchors the north end of a new mall, was iconic. He agreed that some more interesting elements could be added.

In response to a question by Regent Johnson, Mr. Fisher reported that the new film center would unite all elements of the growing film studies program in one location.

Regent Hopkinson noted at $236 per square foot, the construction costs for the main building, seemed very high.

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

6. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, COMMONS EXPANSION, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the Commons Expansion, Riverside campus.

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

It was recalled that in July 2002,The Regents approved the Commons Expansion, Riverside for inclusion in the 2002-2003 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2001-2006 Capital Improvements Program at a cost of $54,173,000. The project will be funded by a combination of external funds ($51,923,000) and student registration fees ($2,250,000).

In August 2004, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Kaplan, McLaughlin-Diaz, of San Francisco, as executive architect for the project.

The Commons Expansion will accommodate 103,204 assignable square feet (asf) in a building of 158,775 gross square feet (gsf). The project will provide student program spaces, meeting rooms and conference rooms, food services, retail, and multipurpose spaces.

Project Site

The site is directly south of the Bookstore and the Surge Building Learning Center. It is bordered by the Commons Mall to the east, Carillon Mall to the south, and Costo Hall to the west, and is consistent with the Student Services land use designation in the1990 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Project Design

The Commons Expansion Project will include the phased demolition of the existing central commons structure and the phased construction of three new structures around a new outdoor public space. The new structures are the main building, the adjacent activity center, and the coffee bar. An existing building, Costo Hall, will be renovated.

The first level of the main building contains food services, conference rooms, student programs, and retail space that open into outdoor public space. The food service area includes a large kitchen and dining area. The second level of the main building is dedicated primarily to student programs, a lounge, and meeting rooms. An outdoor terrace looks out on the public space. On the second level, across a pedestrian bridge from the main building is an activity center made up of a game room, grill, and sports bar. The coffee bar, also located on this level, has a computer lounge and outdoor lounge space. The third level of the main building is comprised of the multipurpose room, with pre-function space, various sized conference rooms, office space, and a lounge located at the south end of the building, with views to the inner campus.

The project is envisioned to be accessible from all directions of the campus. The primary entrance, which is a landscaped approach from the Carillon Mall, includes an open-air

central stair to the outdoor plaza level below. The materials for the building exterior are comprised of UCR brick, stucco, and glass.

The project, which is consistent with the University of California Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards and the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards, will be designed to achieve the equivalent of a LEED Certified rating.

In accordance with University Policy, the campus Design Review Board has reviewed the project. Independent cost analysis and independent structural and seismic review have been conducted. The Design and Construction office staff will manage the project, under the oversight of the Vice Chancellor of Administration.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Initial Study was prepared for the proposed Commons Expansion project to determine any potential environmental effects. It was tiered from the 1990 LRDP Environmental Impact Report and 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. A draft Initial Study was circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the State clearinghouse for a 30-day review period ending February 24, 2003.

Based on the impact assessment in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, it has been determined that the proposed project, as mitigated, would not, by itself, result in significant impacts, and that the cumulative impacts of the 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 in the area of Transportation/Traffic (short-term disruptions to traffic operations and pedestrian/cyclist safety during construction). Mitigation measures for these impacts would be monitored in accordance with the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

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

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson presented slides of the project.

Regent Montoya noted that students will pay an addition to their fees of $90 per quarter from the time the building is completed.

Regent Anderson asked about the role that students played in designing the building and whether they will influence what the retail space will house. President of ASUC Riverside Ms. Adi Davis reported that the Commons Board of Governors, which is made up solely of students, would make the final decisions concerning the types of retail that will be accommodated.

Regent Hopkinson was complimentary about the building's design. She recalled that the Committee had planned a future discussion of student referenda that commit the fees of future students to new projects.

Regent-designate Juline asked how student services would be addressed during the phases of construction. Mr. Johnson anticipated that many spaces, such as the cafeteria, would remain fully operational.

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

7. **CERTIFICATION OF ADDENDUM TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, JOSEPH EDWARD GALLO RECREATION AND WELLNESS CENTER, MERCED CAMPUS**

The item was withdrawn.

8. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF COASTAL LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, UC SANTA CRUZ MARINE SCIENCE CAMPUS, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend that upon review and consideration of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), The Regents:

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report for the UC Santa Cruz Marine Science Campus Coastal Long Range Development Plan (CLRDP).

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final EIR.

C. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations included in the Findings.

D. Adopt the Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

E. Adopt the UC Santa Cruz Marine Science Campus Coastal Long Range Development Plan.

F. Authorize the President or designee to modify the CLRDP, if required, in response to comments received from the California Coastal Commission, provided that any substantial changes in principles or policies of the CLRDP would be brought to The Regents for approval.

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

It was recalled that the Coastal Long Range Development Plan is a comprehensive physical development and land use plan that governs development, land use, and resource protection at the UC Santa Cruz Marine Science Campus, including Younger Lagoon Reserve (YLR). This plan has a dual identity as a University Long Range Development Plan and as a "Coastal" Long Range Development Plan prepared pursuant to the California Coastal Act. As the former, the adoption of the plan fulfills The Regents' aim periodically to develop plans to guide development on the campuses. As the latter, the adoption of this plan and subsequent certification by the California Coastal Commission results in the delegation to the University of the authority to undertake or authorize any development project consistent with the plan without a coastal development permit.

The CLRDP is a document separate from the Long Range Development Plan for the 2,000-acre main campus of UCSC, which is located approximately two miles to the north. The CLRDP building program proposes construction of new facilities within three development areas and the removal of several trailers and other temporary facilities. Under the proposed CLRDP, 561,100 square feet (sf) of new development would be constructed on the Marine Science Campus. This includes approximately 409,100 sf of

new building space and 152,000 sf of new outdoor uses. The largest part of the building program, 254,500 sf, is devoted to marine research and education. Other development components include 19,000 sf of support facilities, including a seminar auditorium, meeting rooms, and food service; 98,100 sf of support housing, in a variety of forms; 37,500 sf of equipment storage and maintenance facilities; and 152,000 sf of outdoor research area, laydown yard, and expanded seawater system capacity. Other supporting miscellaneous uses, including public access and recreation facilities and parking facilities, are included in the plan. The removal of several trailers and other temporary facilities involves the loss of 31,244 sf of existing building area. The CLRDP proposes to retain Younger Lagoon Reserve as a part of the UC Natural Reserve System and seeks to protect it through limiting public access and minimizing the effects of adjacent development.

History of Land Acquisition at the Marine Science Campus

In 1972, The Regents accepted 40 acres of land as a gift from Donald and Marion Younger of Santa Cruz, California, which enabled UC Santa Cruz to begin the planning and development of a marine laboratory at this coastal site some two-and-one-half miles from the main campus. The Joseph M. Long Marine Laboratory opened in December 1978 under the auspices of the Institute of Marine Sciences, an Organized Research Unit of UC Santa Cruz. In 1987, The Regents approved the inclusion of approximately 25 acres of the site into the UC Natural Reserve System as the Younger Lagoon Reserve, which is preserved for teaching and research. In 1997, The Regents acquired a three-acre addition to the site from the adjacent landowner, Wells Fargo Bank, upon which the Seymour Marine Discovery Center was opened to the public in March 2000. In 1998, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) acquired a two-and-one-half-acre parcel from Wells Fargo Bank adjacent to the University's site upon which it developed a fisheries laboratory under the auspices of the NOAA Southwest Fisheries Science Center. In 1999, The Regents purchased the remaining 55 acres of the Wells Fargo Bank parcel, bringing the University's total holding at the site to 98 acres.

Relationship to Prior Plans

Until 1999, the California Coastal Commission permitted development on the UC Santa Cruz Marine Science Campus without an approved Long Range Development Plan through the use of a master permit and amendment process. On August 11, 1999, at a Coastal Commission permit hearing regarding the Center for Ocean Health, the University was notified through the oral testimony of the Coastal Commission chairperson that the Commission wished not to consider any further development permits for this campus outside the context of a Long Range Development Plan, following which the campus began development of the Coastal Long Range Development Plan.

Upon adoption by The Regents, this CLRDP will supersede the most recent planning document for Long Marine Lab, the UCSC Institute of Marine Sciences Long Marine Laboratory Master Plan, which was adopted by The Regents in 1993. This CLRDP, upon

approval by the California Coastal Commission, will also supersede the UCSC/Long Marine Lab Campus Interim Access Plan of 2000.

The Function of the Coastal Long Range Development Plan

The CLRDP is a general plan for the physical development of the site and is intended as a commitment to plans and policies that relate to general land use, circulation and parking, public access and recreation, storm water and other environmental management, utilities and services, resource protection, habitat management, and transportation demand management, within the scope and timeframes set forth herein. The CLRDP is not intended, however, as a commitment to any specific building project, building construction schedule, or building funding priority. The anticipated horizon year for this CLRDP is 2023; however, this horizon year is intended only to establish a planning target to provide a finite project description for analytical purposes. It does not commit the University to achieve the projected level of development by 2023. Neither do the CLRDP and its associated EIR necessarily expire at that time.

Program Justification

Oceanography and marine sciences in the century ahead will be very different from the past. Due to the global scale and interdisciplinary nature of the problems and research questions now faced, it has become clear that, by themselves, individual scientists working in isolated laboratories cannot answer the questions and resolve the issues involved. Consortiums of marine institutions and scientists and integrated or interdisciplinary science have become necessary to deal with these complex local- and global-scale problems. The Center for Integrated Marine Technologies, the Ocean Drilling Program, the Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of the Coastal Ocean, and the Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education are a few examples of such groups. Scientists within the Institute of Marine Sciences at UC Santa Cruz are involved with these and other groups that are making important contributions to understanding Monterey Bay, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and the global oceans. Over the past decade the Institute of Marine Sciences has responded to these changes and issues and focused efforts in three directions: assisting in the development of excellent academic programs and outstanding marine instrumentation facilities; developing partnerships and collaborations with State and federal marine agency programs and the private sector to strengthen programs and expand capabilities at a time when University resources have been limited; and developing public education and policy related programs to complement and use fully its marine research capabilities and resources and share the results of research with the public at large and decision makers at all levels.

Nearly two-thirds of budget for the Santa Cruz campus comes from non-State sources. In the area of ocean research, the Institute's 46 marine faculty and approximately 30 researchers brought in approximately $60 million in external funds to the campus over the past five years to support marine research. That sum represents approximately 20 percent of the extramural funds brought to the entire campus. Marine sciences has been an integral part of the campus teaching and research efforts since the campus opened and

has become increasingly important as the campus has grown, as ocean issues and concerns have become more paramount, and as the research and teaching opportunities associated with the unique location on Monterey Bay have been developed. The Institute of Marine Sciences and Long Marine Laboratory have long recognized that campus resources were limited and that there are many benefits and opportunities available by working with State and federal agencies to develop cooperative programs and co-located facilities. Over the past decade they have successfully developed collaborative research programs with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the United States Geological Survey–Coastal and Marine Group, the California Department of Fish and Game, the Coastal Waters Program of The Nature Conservancy, and NOAA's Center for Marine Protected Area Science.

These partners have increased significantly the University's capabilities and ability to undertake broad-scale marine research and also train the next generation of scientists. UCSC has the foundation and the potential to become a world-class marine research and education center, and the Marine Science Campus site offers an ideal set of conditions to continue to pursue this goal. An oceanfront site with access to high-quality seawater on the margin of the nation's largest national marine sanctuary, the presence of a strong core of internationally recognized marine scientists, a cadre of intelligent and motivated graduate students, as well as all the attributes of a major research university have become magnets to which others continue to be drawn.

Planning Objectives

The purpose of the CLRDP is to facilitate the orderly, flexible, and environmentally sensitive expansion and development of the UCSC Marine Science Campus in support of the academic, research, and public service mission of the University of California. The UCSC Institute of Marine Sciences and the Younger Lagoon Reserve, which share responsibility for managing the UCSC Marine Science Campus, seek to promote the health of the oceans and their coasts by conducting and supporting marine science instruction and research and by facilitating the application of that knowledge for public education, environmental awareness, and decision making. Three categories of planning objectives guided development of the plan including Planning for 20 Years of Growth, Protecting Natural Resources on the Site, and Protecting Offsite Resources.

CLRDP Land Use Plan

Five land use designations have been created for the UCSC Marine Science Campus: research and education mixed use, resource protection, resource buffer, wildlife corridor, and open space.

Design Guidelines

The CLRDP contains design guidance for new development on the UCSC Marine Science Campus that is intended to implement the design principles, land use concepts, policies, and implementation measures of the CLRDP. The model for design of the Marine Science Campus is the rural-agricultural coastal landscape of Northern California. Located in the zone of transition from urban development to rural land uses, the campus is to echo characteristics of both natural and man-made elements that comprise the rural landscape to the north. The campus is to extend the visual quality of the rural landscape into the transition area, softening the transition and creating a visually pleasing environment. The guidelines address seven specific areas of design, including building design, campus street design, parking design, public trail design, landscape design, lighting design, and site signage design.

Prototype Site Plan

The CLRDP contains a chapter that sets forth a prototype site plan for the Marine Science Campus that embodies the design principles, land use concepts, and design guidance of the CLRDP. As a prototype, it is not intended to represent the only possible way to realize the concepts and provisions set forth in the CLRDP. The CLRDP as a whole is intended to allow the University flexibility to adjust the campus site plan and building designs to respond to ideas that may arise through more detailed design efforts and changing needs and conditions.

Among the building footprints depicted in the Prototype Site Plan are sites for five potential projects that could be constructed in the early phases of project development. While it is impossible to predict which projects are most likely to occur in the immediate future, these potential near-term projects were identified based on early project planning efforts. They include the Center for Ocean Health, Phase II; the United States Geological Survey Western Coastal and Marine Geology Facility; the Sea Otter Research and Conservation Center; the Shared Campus Warehouse and Laydown Facility; and 42 apartment and townhouse units. The CLRDP also contains an estimate of design capacity and average daily occupancy based on a full range of likely future building projects that could be built under the CLRDP building program. This estimate indicates that the CLRDP could result in an increase in design capacity of approximately 1,500 persons, with an increase in average daily occupancy of approximately 888 persons. The Marine Science Campus has an existing design capacity for approximately 766 persons, with an average daily occupancy of approximately 424 persons. These estimates represent an example of the increase in population that could result with full development under the CLRDP.

Development Procedures

The CLRDP sets forth procedures for approving development on the Marine Science Campus consistent with California Coastal Commission Regulations and standing procedures used by the University. The adoption of the CLRDP by the University and subsequent certification by the California Coastal Commission would result in the delegation to the University of the authority to undertake or authorize any development project consistent with the plan without a coastal development permit. The California Coastal Commission retains the authority to review development approvals issued by the University of California.

Capital Improvement Program

The CLRDP contains a schedule of programmed improvements for the Marine Science Campus. The Capital Improvement Program is intended to address the scheduling of certain infrastructure improvements and habitat enhancements that will be undertaken by the University in conjunction with the Marine Science Campus Building Program. With the exception of public access improvements, this Capital Improvement Program is not intended to address the scheduling of improvements contained in the Marine Science Campus Building Program. These improvements will be made as funding is available and as research and education partnerships are formed, and will be implemented by the University free from any scheduling constraints.

Resource Management Plan

The CLRDP contains a resource management plan for the Marine Science Campus (Appendix B) that augments the policies and implementation measures of the CLRDP, providing specificity and detailed guidance for protecting, maintaining, and, as feasible, enhancing the natural resources of the undeveloped areas as well as avoiding impacts to Younger Lagoon Reserve. The plan describes the physical and biological characteristics of the terrace portion of the campus, including the upland habitats and the permanent and seasonal wetland areas. It outlines overall goals for resource management and specific goals for each defined vegetation type or wetland area. Measures for protection and enhancement of biological resources, management of special-status wildlife, public access, long-term maintenance, and long-term monitoring are outlined, and performance criteria and implementation schedules are provided. While Younger Lagoon Reserve is included within the CLRDP, as part of the University of California Natural Reserve System managed by UC Santa Cruz's Natural Reserves Director the detailed management of Younger Lagoon Reserve is not addressed in the CLRDP.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared to analyze the environmental effects of the CLRDP, including project-level reviews of the following near-term projects:

- Shared Campus Warehouse and Laydown Facility
- 42 Apartment/Townhouse Units
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) Western Coastal and Marine Geology Facility
- Monterey Bay Aquarium Sea Otter Research and Conservation Center, now referred to as the Marine Mammal Research and Conservation Center, a joint project of UC Santa Cruz and the Monterey Bay Aquarium
- Center for Ocean Health Phase II Facility.

The five near-term projects will be submitted to The Regents or, consistent with delegation of authority by The Regents, the campus will consider approval of the projects at a future date. The EIR identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives for the CLRDP and the near-term projects listed above.

On November 1, 2001, the University issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was circulated to responsible agencies, interested groups, and individuals for a 30-day review period ending December 1, 2001. An EIR Scoping Meeting was held at the Long Marine Laboratory on November 14, 2001, to solicit input from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations regarding the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in the EIR.

Environmental Review Period Project Impacts

Implementation of the CLRDP has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A detailed summary of these impacts is included in the Findings in the Draft EIR. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures. Significant and unavoidable impacts from the CLRDP would remain, even after implementation of feasible mitigation measures, in the categories of Transportation and Traffic and Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy.

Mitigation measures could reduce the project level and cumulative transportation and traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, because these mitigation measures may be infeasible and/or are outside the jurisdiction of the University, implementation cannot be guaranteed. Mitigation measures are also included that would reduce cumulative impacts to water supply; however, even with mitigation, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Alternatives

In addition to the proposed CLRDP, the CLRDP EIR analyzed five alternatives to the proposed CLRDP, including reduced program, modified land use diagram, increased program, project-by-project development, and no project.

The Notice of Completion (NOC), CLRDP, and the Draft EIR for the CLRDP, including the projects listed above, were published on January 29, 2004, and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 50-day period ending on March 19, 2004. The Draft EIR was widely circulated, and a public hearing was held on February 19, 2004 at the Long Marine Laboratory to receive verbal comments it.

Eight individuals provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. In addition, seventeen comment letters or emails were received during the public review period. The campus received comment letters from the California Department of Transportation, Monterey Bay Area Unified Air Pollution Control District, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, City of Santa Cruz; Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, three neighborhood and other organizations, and nine interested individuals.

Following is a listing of some of the issues and concerns raised most frequently in the comments and testimony received by the campus:

- Concerns about cumulative traffic impacts and statements that the University should pay a fair share of traffic mitigation measures
- Questions about whether all of the elements of the CLRDP are coastal dependent, particularly the proposed housing
- Statements that housing for Marine Science Campus students and employees should be provided on the UCSC main campus or at other locations in the City of Santa Cruz rather than on the Marine Science Campus
- Concerns about whether funding would be provided for long-term stewardship of the natural resource areas on the campus
- Statements that the wetlands delineation performed for the CLRDP did not meet the appropriate standards of practice and that, as a consequence, areas that should have been identified as wetlands were not so identified
- Statements that the cumulative impacts analysis should consider recent proposals for large retail establishments in the vicinity of the Marine Science Campus
- Questions about procedures for mitigation monitoring
- Statements that the proposed wildlife corridor is inadequate
- Statements that the Draft EIR does not identify adequately the impacts associated with the loss of raptor foraging habitat
- Statements that the proposed CLRDP's provisions for public access to the coast are inadequate
- Statements that the Draft EIR does not identify or mitigate adequately for impacts on water supply

- Statements that the Draft EIR does not analyze adequately the impacts on traffic of trips between the Marine Science Campus and the UCSC Main Campus
- Requests for additional analysis of the impacts on water quality that would result from increased runoff
- Requests that a wider setback from Shaffer Road near Delaware Avenue be considered in light of a planned residential development on the property on the east side of Shaffer Road

The California Coastal Commission submitted a comment letter dated April 19, 2004, after the close of the public review period, that addressed several of the issues also raised by other commentors. The major additional concerns and issues addressed in the Commission's letter include:

- A comment that the analysis of impacts on visual corridors may not be adequate
- A comment that filling the small non-ESHA wetland on the Upper Terrace is not consistent with the Coastal Act
- Concerns that the buffer for one of the wetlands is inadequate
- A recommendation that a larger buffer or a solid berm should be provided to protect the Younger Lagoon Reserve
- Comments that additional details should be provided regarding public access facilities and policies, parking procedures, the design of stormwater drainage facilities, architectural materials, the Resource Management Plan, and protection of existing facilities near the coastal bluff.

The Final EIR responds to the Commission's comments to the extent feasible, given the late receipt of the letter, focusing on recommended changes to the CLRDP. Following approval of the CLRDP and certification of the Final EIR by The Regents, the University will continue to work with Coastal Commission staff to address the remaining comments and to refine the CLRDP in preparation for consideration of the plan by the Coastal Commission.

The Final EIR, dated September 2004, includes Volumes 1, 2, and 3. Volume 1 of the Final EIR has been revised and reprinted to include refinements of the project description, changes made in response to comments, corrections of typographical errors, and addition of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Volume 2 of the Final EIR contains the technical appendices. Final EIR Volume 3 contains changes made to the EIR in response to comments, the comment letters received on the Draft EIR, transcripts of the public hearing, and detailed responses to the comments received.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Santa Cruz campus would be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents, and all CLRDP policies and implementation measures that serve to reduce potential environmental impacts analyzed in the EIR. To assure that all measures and policies are implemented in accordance with CEQA, a

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared and is included in the Final EIR.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, mitigation monitoring program, and alternatives, and set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant impacts.

Vice Chancellor Vani recalled that the Mayor of Santa Cruz had written to The Regents commenting on three matters with respect to the CLRDP and EIR. The Mayor had requested that time be scheduled to meet separately with City representatives, which the General Counsel advised against. The other two comments pertained to paying for road improvements and handling emergency 911 calls originating from the Marine Science campus. Mr. Vani reported that the campus police department extends service to the area and coordinates with the City for mutual aid.

Regent-designate Juline noted that the project involves collaboration among a number of entities. He asked about the specific desirability of the site and the benefits expected from the multi-entity plan. Mr. Vani responded that the site has seawater access and is proximate to the campus. Together the entities' collaborations bring in a substantial amount of funding through contracts and grants.

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

8. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, MCHENRY ADDITION AND RENOVATION PROJECT, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Final Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

A. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report.

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

C. Approve the design of the McHenry Addition and Renovation Project, Santa Cruz campus.

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

It was recalled that in October 2002, The Regents approved the inclusion of the McHenry Addition and Renovation Project, Santa Cruz campus, in the 2003 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2003-2004 Capital Improvement Program, at a cost of $74,000,000. In July 2003, and increase to $75,382,000 was approved.

In June 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of BOORA Architects of Portland, Oregon as Executive Architect for the project.

Project Site

The project is located near the geographic center of the Santa Cruz campus, north of the Arts area and the Academic Resource Center, southeast of Kerr Hall and Science Hill, and southwest of Hahn Student Services. It consists of an addition to the south side of the McHenry Library and the seismic and life-safety upgrade and remodeling of the existing library building. The site is in accordance with the 1988 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), in an area designated Campus Core.

Project Design

One of the earliest buildings on the Santa Cruz campus, McHenry Library, designed by John Carl Warnecke and Associates, was constructed in two phases that were completed in 1968 and 1975; it currently includes 114,830 asf and 161,600 gsf. When completed, the McHenry project would result in an expanded building containing 196,430 asf within a total area of 278,250 gsf to provide space for the University Library. The project will also upgrade the existing building from a Poor to a Good seismic rating, undertake other life-safety improvements, improve disabled access, renovate existing library space, and provide instruction and research space to accommodate growth in campus enrollment.

The project will consist of several components to be built in three phases. The first phase will construct an 81,600 asf (116,650 gsf) addition to the existing McHenry Library building. When library functions are relocated from the existing building into the new addition, the older building will undergo ADA, seismic, and other life-safety improvements and programmatic renovations. The final phase of the project will complete the fit-out of those areas in the addition which were not completed earlier due to their interim use. Planning and design of all phases of the project have occurred simultaneously.

About one-half of the net new space planned will be assigned to the University Library, while the other half will help meet instruction and research space needs caused by recent and projected enrollment growth. Over time, this instruction and research space is intended to be released for library use. The addition has been designed for floor loading adequate to accommodate heavy compact shelving and primarily would house library collections. After renovation, the existing library building will house instruction and research space for the Mathematics and Art History Departments, the Writing Program, and the Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs in Arts. The expanded building will also house instructional development support and campus-wide academic offices.

The addition will be a poured-in-place concrete structure, five stories high, connected to the eastern half of the south elevation of the existing building. The structural system was selected to be compatible with that of the existing building and to allow the floors of the new addition to align with those of the existing building. The lowest level will be below grade on the north and west sides of the addition. The addition has been designed to complement and blend with the existing architecture. The exterior skin on the west elevation, facing a new public entry plaza, will consist of a window wall with exterior solar screening. The south and east elevations will consist of cement plaster in-fill panels within the concrete structural frame. Punched windows have been arranged to reflect adjacent interior functions.

Sustainability features proposed for the project include exterior solar screening at south and west facing glazing; native, drought-tolerant landscaping; and low-flow toilets and waterless urinals. It is anticipated that the project will include a chilled water storage system which would allow cooling water to be generated at night, taking advantage of lower energy rates, and used during the day.

A new exterior plaza would be developed west of the addition and south of the existing building, resulting in a new south entry court to the library.

The design of the McHenry Addition and Renovation Project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by the campus Design Advisory Board. A value engineering session was conducted during the design development phase. Independent structural review has been conducted at each stage of project development.

The UCSC Physical Planning and Construction Department will manage the project. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The campus Office of Physical Planning and Construction Department will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the project. A Notice of Preparation announcing the preparation of the EIR was circulated for a 30-day review period ending January 16, 2004. An EIR Scoping Meeting was held at the UCSC Campus and Community Planning Office on January 7, 2003, to solicit input from interested parties regarding the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in the EIR.

The Notice of Completion and the Draft EIR for the McHenry Library Addition and Renovation Project were published on April 30, 2004, and circulated for review and comment for a 45-day period ending on June 14, 2004. A public hearing was held on May 19, 2004, at the UCSC Barn Theatre to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR. No individuals provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. A letter was received from the City of Santa Cruz Water Department in which it was suggested that the existing library facilities be retrofitted with low-consumption fixtures to reduce future

water demand and cumulative impacts on the City's water system, which the campus intends to do.

The Final EIR, dated August 2004, includes the Draft EIR, changes made in response to comments, comment letters received on the Draft EIR, transcripts from the public hearing, and responses to the comments received.

The project EIR, which is tiered to the LRDP EIR, identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives for the McHenry Library Addition and Renovation Project. Implementation of the project has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment, many of which can be reduced to less-than-significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, the McHenry Library Addition and Renovation Project would result in significant and unavoidable temporary construction noise impacts. Although mitigation measures are available that would reduce these impacts, including scheduling the use of power tools during periods of low library use and the use of absorptive materials placed around the construction site, due to the duration of construction and the proximity to sensitive receptors, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the Final EIR provides a reporting mechanism for mitigation measures. To the extent that the McHenry Library Addition and Renovation Project incorporates relevant 1988 LRDP EIR mitigation measures previously adopted by The Regents, implementation of these mitigation measures will be monitored pursuant to the existing 1988 LRDP EIR MMRP previously adopted by the Regents in connection with its approval of the 1988 LRDP.

Findings

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

Vice Chancellor Vani and Director Hooker presented slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the integration of the old and new portions of the library was first rate.

In answer to a question by Regent-designate Juline, Mr. Hooker noted that libraries are undergoing systems changes, including expanded wireless capability, that can be accommodated by the new project.

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

9. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES UNIT 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

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

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the Biological Sciences Unit 3, Irvine campus.

It was recalled that in November 2002, The Regents approved the 2003-04 Budget for Capital Improvements, which included the Biological Sciences Unit 3 project at a sum of $63,022,000. In May 2004, a project cost of $77,384,000 was approved in order to accommodate expanded animal-based research and support space. The project will be funded from a combination of State funds ($56,862,000), campus funds ($3,150,000), and external financing ($17,372,000).

In July 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Esherick Homsey Dodge & Davis Architects, Professional Corporation of San Francisco, as executive architect for this project.

Project Site

The facility is proposed for development on an approximately 2.57-acre site located at the northern portion of existing Parking Lot 13 and adjacent to land and tree areas to the north. The site, which conforms with the 1989 Long Range Development Plan, is bounded by the Science Library to the north, Natural Sciences Unit 1 to the south, the Ring Mall and McGaugh Hall to the east, and the western edge of Parking Lot 13 and Campus Village administrative office and apartment units to the west.

Project Design

The School of Biological Sciences will occupy 44,186 assignable square feet for research laboratories and academic and administrative offices. A total of 24,624 asf will be provided for an animal facility, 15,400 asf will provide interim academic and

administrative office space for the School of Humanities, and there will be a separate, freestanding 400-seat lecture hall.

The project program for the main laboratory building has been divided into wet laboratory space, animal facility space, and academic and administrative office space. This division in program is reflected in the design of the building, which has three distinct components consisting of a main laboratory block flanked by two office wings. The main laboratory building is designed using laboratory modules to accommodate future flexibility for various types of academic research.

The laboratory block and office wings will be constructed of poured-in-place concrete that will complement the adjacent Natural Sciences building in mass, scale, and color. Color accent at doors, windows, and cap flashing will relate to the adjacent Natural Sciences building. The design has been developed to reinforce the contextual design of the campus and to support the character of the Biological Sciences quadrangle.

The front entrance into the building's lobby is off the Campus Ring Mall. The second primary entrance, which is located on the west end of the laboratory wing and near the loading dock, will be used by people working in the animal facility, which will have a dedicated service elevator. Biological sciences laboratories will occupy the first- and second-level laboratory block. The animal facility will be located in the basement below. The office wings will accommodate the associated academic office space. The School of Humanities program will occupy the open office space on level three.

The design of Biological Sciences Unit 3 has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant, independent seismic-structural consultant, and an independent cost estimator. The project will be designed for LEED certification.

The campus Office of Design and Construction Services will manage the project. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Design and Construction Services will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

During a 30-day public review period that ended on July 9, 2004, local, State, and federal agencies and service providers, as well as interested individuals and organizations reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Written comments received and the Irvine campus responses to these comments are included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Implementation of the project would have no impact or a less-than-significant impact in most areas. Its potential for significant impacts in other following areas will be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures, which will be monitored through the Mitigation Monitoring Program established for the LRDP.

Findings

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

Assistant Vice Chancellor Gladson presented slides of the project.

In response to a question by Regent Montoya, Ms. Gladson explained that the vivarium, which has a biological laboratory that handles contaminates, has its own security system.

Regent Kozberg admired the design. She noted that the cost was higher per square foot than normal. Ms. Gladson noted that vivarium space runs from $600 to $800 per square foot. The lecture hall also adds to the building's cost. Together they account for about $23 million. Market factors also contributed to the cost, as did the increasing cost of steel and concrete.

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

10. **UPDATE ON MEDICAL CENTER REPLACEMENT HOSPITAL DESIGN, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Gladson provided an update on changes to the design of the UCIMC Replacement Hospital that have occurred subsequent to the Committee's design approval at the December 2002 meeting.

Ms. Gladson recalled that bids for the project came in very high. Several changes were made to the design in order to bring costs down. The stacking of the building remains the same, although the icon that was over the public elevators was reduced. In working with the general contractor design-build teams, it was decided to change the building foundation system from drilled caissons to a foundation which requires grading more dirt and creates a shell basement space. Although this will increase the square footage of the building, it is being done in order to reduce the risks caused by excessive drilling during excavation. The administrative space on the first floor has been turned into shelled space and the corridor configuration has been changed. On the second floor, two operating rooms and interventional suites will become shell space. On the pediatrics floor, the public elevator tower has been incorporated further into the building and the waiting area has been moved. Through making these changes and redistributing the uplift and lateral loads in the structural system, it became possible to remove 1,600 tons of steel from the project. That translates to a savings of about $10 million. The floor-to-floor heights have been lowered by one foot, and the exterior cladding stone has been replaced with aggregate and form liner that looks like stone. Some mechanical systems that would have provided future flexibility were removed.

In response to a question by Regent Johnson, Ms. Gladson reported that, through value engineering changes, the overall cost of the project was reduced by $35 million.

Regent Kozberg found the redesign very appealing.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the color scheme seemed too yellow and gray. Ms. Gladson responded that the colors are more attractive in daylight.

Ms. Gladson anticipated that the project would be resubmitted at the November Regents meeting.

11. **DISCUSSION REGARDING EFFORTS TO REDUCE COSTS OF UC BUILDINGS**

It was recalled that the President had proposed that the University conduct a study to facilitate the most cost-effective implementation of the University's capital program so that future University needs can be addressed with limited capital resources. The study will articulate the overarching University goals, values, and design standards for the built environment; analyze completed UC projects, focusing on the most frequently constructed building types, both current and projected to be built over the next five years, and the entire delivery process; compare UC projects to comparable California educational and research facilities; and recommend opportunities for reducing project costs. Results of the study will be reported to this Committee.

Senior Vice President Mullinix commented that reducing the cost of University buildings, which had been a subject of previous studies, had become increasingly important as market conditions had changed. He reported that past studies concerning cost and process will be reexamined in order to assess the effect of the implementation of past recommendations. The goals and values that translate into design standards need further articulation and comparison with other universities. The cost of construction and soft costs associated with the design of buildings, as well as the efficiency of the buildings and the timing of the process, will be studied with a view to forming recommendations, some of which could be adopted internally and others of which may need regulatory relief prior to implementation. He believed it would be beneficial to create a high-level committee to evaluate information received from others. The committee could have an institutional building owner, an architect who is recognized as good at project delivery and cost consciousness, a building contractor who does full-scale building with major trade work, and a construction project manager who is used to looking for cost savings. The committee will become informed as to how the University proceeds with construction – the design process, how it is staffed, the cost structure – by selecting four different building types within which three typical projects will be chosen. Two of the simpler types are parking facilities and housing. More complicated are research facilities and educational buildings. The chosen building projects would be compared to similar projects at educational institutions within California, possibly including Stanford, University of Southern California, and Cal Tech. For housing, a third-party developer would be sought, possible one that has built student housing. Lastly, an external

developer would be sought to provide information on parking facilities. Discrete cost and timing information will be needed in order to make true comparisons. It will be necessary also to find buildings that were constructed at the same time. To do the comparison work, an outside firm would be engaged to delve into the required detail. The data could be shared with participants willing to share their cost information.

Mr. Mullinix reported that there would also be an internal committee that would include campus and Office of the President staff who could attempt to identify issues and concerns they have had with the University's building process. He anticipated beginning the process within a month. The ideal target, which would be to finish the review process by summer, will be dependent on how quickly data can be obtained from other parties willing to share that information.

Regent Ornellas asked why event centers were not included as a building type of interest. Mr. Mullinix responded that the University does not build them sufficiently often and they tend to be idiosyncratic. It would be a challenge to try to compare their costs.

Regent Kozberg supported the idea of a study. She asked whether an urban land institute could help with the reporting. Although Mr. Mullnix believed it would be preferable to involve people who were very close to the construction process and familiar with the local institutional market, he agreed to consider her suggestion. She suggested also that The California State University may have applicable experience that could be helpful.

Regent Anderson asked whether life-cycle costs would be a focus of the committee. Mr. Mullinix noted that he intended to focus on efficiency ratios such as assignable to gross square footage. Examining design standards and values would include determining what short- and long-term tradeoffs are made in investing in buildings. It is alleged that institutional builders spend more money because they build for the longer term and lower maintenance cycles. The rationale is that they tend not to invest in subsequent years in their building projects, where, by contrast, developers will return to the building at ten and twenty years to repair and renovate. He believed it would be beneficial to assess the University's approach.

Regent Hopkinson suggested that there be no preconceived notions when approaching the project. She believed it would be important to find a non-institutional construction expert to serve on the committee. Mr. Mullinix hoped to get architecture and construction representatives who do both government and non-government work. They need to be familiar with the way in which governmental entities try to build. Regent Hopkinson advised looking at the design process in the same way. The criteria that the University uses for design, and how it designs, when people get involved and for how long, and what its change orders are should be part of the analysis. She noted that the costs that most disturb her are for buildings that are more by rote, such as administrative buildings. The process for pre-qualifying bidders also needs to be examined.

Regent Ruiz emphasized the importance of obtaining an outside consultant to help with the evaluation and to offer an objective opinion. Mr. Mullinix noted that all parties on

the committee would be external, with only the steering group being internal. A consultant entity would present the information to the senior panel and collaborate on a report.

Regent-designate Rominger was concerned that it might not make sense to reduce construction costs at the expense of ongoing operating and life cycle costs. Mr. Mullinix responded that he expects the committee to determine whether the tradeoffs that the University is making are worthwhile.

Regent-designate Juline asked whether the report would encompass all of the discretionary alternatives that are available to a constructor of buildings and the associated risk factors rather than just the ultimate recommendations. Mr. Mullinix expected that one area looked at would be whether the University's costs for consultants in the building process is a worthwhile expenditure.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary