The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**
January 18, 2005

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

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

In attendance: Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, University Counsel Schmeltzer, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Vice President Hershman, Chancellors Birgeneau, Tomlinson-Keasey, and Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 11:05 a.m. with Committee Chair Hopkinson presiding.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Regent Hopkinson conducted a public comment period for the purpose of hearing from those who wished to comment on University-related matters and matters on the Committee's agenda. She announced that the session would be extended due to the number of people who had indicated their wish to appear. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the subjects noted:

***Item 103, Annual Report on Green Building and Clean Energy Policy***

A. Mr. Christopher Congleton, a UC student representing the California Student Sustainability Coalition (CSSC), thanked the Committee for adopting a green building policy last year. He was hopeful that the goal of reducing traffic on campuses could be attained also.

B. Ms. Bridgit Van Belleghem, representing CSSC, commented that strategic sourcing could affect the green building policy and advised the Committee to offer input to the administration concerning the University's strategic sourcing initiative.

C. Mr. Scott Mueller, representing CSSC, applauded the University's green building policy and the establishment of the position of sustainability specialist. He urged that the policy as it concerns LEED certification be made more stringent.

***Item 112, Certification of the Environmental Impact Report and Approval of the 2020 Long Range Development Plan, Berkeley Campus***

D. Mr. Gordan Wozniak, a UC Berkeley graduate and member of the Berkeley City Council, requested more time for the City to negotiate with the University over issues raised by certification of the LRDP EIR. He noted that, although the University occupies 40 percent of the city and is its biggest employer, it pays no taxes; therefore, the City should be reimbursed for the extra services it must provide. He advocated developing a more comprehensive transportation plan.

E. Ms. Linda Maio, a Berkeley City Council member, also requested more time to address problems with the EIR. She reported that Berkeley, which provides fire services for the campus, has been forced to give up its tallest fire truck because of State budget cuts. She believed that the fire department should receive funding from the University.

F. Mr. Darryl Moore, a member of the Berkeley City Council and a representative of west Berkeley residents, requested more time for analysis of the EIR. He believed that the campus needs to develop a workable traffic plan that would alleviate car travel between Interstate 80 and the campus that is cutting through neighborhoods.

G. Ms. Pamela Sihvola, representing Summit Road, Grizzly Peak Road Watch, stated that the Berkeley campus is overcrowded and that it would be unwise to build more facilities near the Hayward Fault. She believed that the Strawberry Creek watershed should become dedicated open space.

H. Ms. Andrea Pflaumer, representing Summit Road, Grizzly Peak Road Watch, recalled the ability of neighborhood groups to prevent past development. She suggested the campus should expand by building satellite facilities in nearby cities. She also advocated making Strawberry Canyon permanent open space.

I. Ms. Janice Thomas, a resident of Strawberry Canyon, believed that the LRDP EIR was inadequate in that it did not describe the inevitable expansion of the campus' athletic programs and evaluate their impact.

J. Ms. Anne Wagley, a Berkeley resident, reported that campus neighborhoods are suffering from heavy traffic. She believed that instead of building more parking spaces, the University should develop a comprehensive transportation plan. She observed that Berkeley's limited tax base could not support city services to the campus.

K. Mr. Carl Friberg, representing Berkleyans for a Livable University Environment, supported the City's opposition to the LRDP, which he described as inconsistent with the Master Plan. He urged the Regents to become fully engaged concerning the local issues related to development.

L. Mr. Jim Sharp, a Berkeley resident, was opposed to what he described as relentless UC expansion.

M. Ms. Daniella Thompson, representing the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, expressed concern about preserving the campus environment. She was opposed to the location of the new Tien Center because it will encroach on an attractive natural area on campus.

N. Ms. Lesley Emmington Jones, representing the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, presented a letter in which the association asserts that the LRDP EIR is inadequate in that the plan document neglects to describe and disclose fully the University's programmatic development and its subsequent effects upon the city.

O. Mr. Jesse Arrequin, an ASUC representative, supported the campus' intention to increase housing near the campus, but because he had concerns about the plans to increase parking, he requested more time in which to consider the LRDP. He urged the Regents to establish a sustainable transportation policy.

P. Ms. Liz Hall, an ASUC representative, objected to the limited time students were given to respond to the LRDP. She also supported increasing housing but was concerned about increasing parking and believed that Regental approval of the LRDP should be delayed.

Q. Mr. Robert Tjian, a UC Berkeley professor, urged the Regents to approve the LRDP, which is important to teaching and research on the campus. He stressed the importance of having flexibility in planning for the future in order to meet new challenges. It was his view that the LRDP was a responsible approach that would protect the future of the campus.

***University-Related Matters***

R. Mr. Duane De Witt, a Berkeley graduate student, advocated preference in admissions for disabled veterans, whom he believed should be considered before nonstate residents. He advocated the establishment of a veterans' memorial on the Berkeley campus.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of September 21 and November 4, 2004 were approved.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**

***Certification of Addendum to Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Design, Joseph Edward Gallo Recreation and Wellness Center, Merced Campus***

The President recommended that the Committee:

A. Certify Addendum No. 4 to the Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

C. Approve the design of the Joseph Edward Gallo Recreation and Wellness Center, Merced campus.

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

Regent Montoya questioned the use of student fees to support the project. Vice Chancellor Desrochers noted that a new Recreation Fee for the Merced campus had been approved by The Regents in 2003 in anticipation of the arrival of the first students and explained that the fee is $292 per year, $220 of which will be applied to the 30-year debt service term for the center. The remaining amount will be used for the operations of the recreation program in the building.

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

4. **MULTI-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, DAVIS CAMPUS**

Chancellor Vanderhoef introduced the first in a series of integrated multi-year capital plans to be presented to the Committee by the campuses. The presentation addressed the future capital improvements proposed for the Davis campus in a comprehensive plan reflecting all State-funded and nonState-funded capital resources, with an emphasis on how the capital plan addresses the campus' academic strategic plan. The plan covers capital needs for the period 2004-05 through at least 2009-10.

Chancellor Vanderhoef reported that there were two fundamental objectives in making the presentation: first, to explain how two major documents the Committee receives as part of the Universitywide budget process–the State-funded and nonState-funded five-year capital improvement programs–are merged to support the objectives of the campus; second, to describe how the campus develops these budgets and makes funding decisions, and how these investments advance the campus' strategic objectives. The distinction between State and nonState needs has blurred as a result of the campus' growth and the fiscal challenges of recent years. He noted that the amount of State capital funds

available to the University represents about half of the funding needed to sustain just the core mission. The shortfall in State funding has required the campuses to seek other sources of funds to meet core capital needs. Among the sources that the Davis campus has tapped are funds that are derived from its research contracts and grants, known generally as Garamendi funds, gifts, and campus funds that are discretionary, such as Opportunity Funds, which in normal circumstances would be used for operations. The campus also has developed partnerships with other public and private entities to develop new capital investments. The change in the State's fiscal situation relative to the needs of the campus and its reliance on other fund sources means that the successful programmatic and financial return on investments for all capital funds is critical. The campus can afford to meet only its highest priority needs, and multiple strategies must be devised to ensure that the needs of the entire organization are being met. He noted that the campus has not built a major administrative building in 40 years. As the student population has quadrupled, both academic and administrative space needs have expanded. As a result, the campus has had to relocate administrative units to leased space off campus, which is not efficient. The academic programs have become more space-consumptive and technologically demanding, which has driven up the cost of new facilities, further eroding the purchasing power of the limited capital funding available. Finally, the campus is aging. Most of the considerable number of buildings constructed in boom years are about 50 years old. The lack of adequate maintenance funding has pushed deferred maintenance backlogs on the campus to more than $350 million. As buildings are renovated, the demand for this same kind of technologically sophisticated space has exacerbated the situation. Capital planning is no longer a function of what is provided from State and nonState fund sources alone. Planning does not start with the funds available; rather, planning starts with the capital investments that are needed for the campus to succeed. For its ten-year capital improvement plan, the campus has created funding strategies that will satisfy its needs effectively and economically.

Chancellor Vanderhoef believed that the planning process that has been developed by the campus results in a thoughtful consideration of all alternatives. Choices may not always be easy, but they will be well informed.

Chancellor Vanderhoef introduced Assistant Vice Chancellor Keller, who provided details of the planning process and an overview of the capital investments the campus proposes for meeting its objectives. Mr. Keller noted that the campus' highest-level objectives with regard to capital needs are related to its mission of teaching, research, and service, as well as to enriching campus life, which involves maintaining a safe environment and considering the projects appropriate to the mission and stewardship of campus assets, where all the investments need to be of good value for the University. The academic program is informed by the UC Davis Strategic Plan.

Mr. Keller described the capital planning process. He reported that as program and physical context needs and physical objectives are accumulated, the campus provides an analysis of all the proposed investments in the capital program and sets priorities in establishing a ten-year capital plan in which not all projects can be funded. From that plan, the campus prepares five-year State capital and nonState capital programs.

Mr. Keller commented that a ten-year capital plan allows priority setting and decision-making to be based on a comprehensive rather than a compartmentalized view of the capital program. He reviewed four fundamental categories of capital investment needs: teaching and enrollment needs address facilities that deal with scheduled instruction; the academic program needs cover the facilities that accommodate the broader academic program of teaching and research; the auxiliary and self-supporting programs include parking, housing, and the hospitals; and the infrastructure needs are building needs and basic utility infrastructure. In assessing the teaching needs, the campus focuses on construction that is scheduled for teaching laboratories and lecture space. Guidelines are followed to ensure that the spaces are being used effectively. Academic program growth determines the needs for accommodating future enrollments. The Davis campus plan makes teaching investments associated particularly with the biological and physical sciences programs. Classrooms and lecture inventory are being expanded to meet projected needs. Departmental support space has been added because of enrollment growth. In the general area of academic program needs, the campus considers the kind of research being conducted and follows the driving forces that are in the vision document. To remain competitive, investments must be made on a timely basis. In academic programs it is important to have flexibility in facilities to meet ongoing research and teaching needs. In the campus plan, the academic program initiatives include areas in genomics, medical sciences, and neurosciences. There are a number of professional school projects. In the undergraduate area, the campus is investing in the fine arts, agriculture, and environmental sciences. The area of auxiliary and self-supporting activities must have a program vision. The strategic plan for the hospital, for instance, maps where the program is headed, and the capital decisions must support that plan. The self-supporting operations have their own financials, and therefore their ability to invest in capital is dependent upon the financial analysis for those programs. The Davis campus is investing substantially in the hospital and its infrastructure. New faculty and staff housing projects and parking facilities are proposed, as well as a hotel and conference center facility and expanded student activity and recreation facilities. In the category of infrastructure needs, the physical needs of the campus must keep pace with growth, and the buildings must be functionally appropriate. Considerations include maintaining a pleasant, safe environment. Finally, the Davis campus has some unique investing opportunities because it provides its own utility services. Current projects, in addition to the renovation of buildings and expansion of utility systems, are renovations that address the issue of retaining the flexibility in buildings that is necessary for meeting programs.

Mr. Keller described how capital needs are dealt with relative to the available funding sources. The four categories of capital needs are supported with State capital funds, debt, and other fund sources in terms of equity and capital reserves that are associated with self-supporting operations which accumulate a component of capital on their rates. The campus also relies on gift funds. If the projects cannot be accommodated in any of these categories, there will be a funding gap. Under each category, the campus analyzes how compatible the needs are with the fund source. In the State-funded capital program, teaching and enrollment needs are very compatible with State funds as a fundamental component of the mission. Also, infrastructure is important, because it is the basic

building that the State should be supporting. In other areas, funding is conditioned on how well it can be accommodated in terms of convincing the State of the merits of the project. To the extent that the self-supporting category includes auxiliary enterprises and the hospitals, it is State-supportable, and State support has been secured for SB 1953 seismic correction projects.

Mr. Keller reported that, on the issue of debt financing, the campus must establish a basis for paying back the debt whenever it proposes to invest capital in these categories. The ability to use debt financing to meet particular needs depends on that analysis and therefore has a conditional compatibility. It is the most flexible component with respect to equity and capital reserves. The campus must be nimble in terms of meeting capital needs, because often there is a long lead time to obtaining funds. The capital reserves used for self-supporting auxiliaries depend upon the fact that those organizations have to develop financial reserves in order for the campus to invest that capital. Under the gift category, campus investments in academic programs seem the most viable because they are attractive to donors. Teaching is sometimes viewed as being more appropriate for alternative fund sources. It is very hard to use gift funds to invest in infrastructure. In the category of public-private partnerships, the campus looks for business arrangements where there is shared risk and shared reward in the development of key assets that support the campus. That is difficult in terms of the core campus mission of teaching and related enrollment projects. Partners may be found occasionally in academic programs and in self-supporting auxiliaries. All projects in these categories are analyzed to establish the best opportunities. The campus' total aspirations always exceed the amount of funds that are contemplated.

Mr. Keller showed how this ten-year planning process gives rise to the State and nonState five-year plans. Those plans include projects in the teaching and research category. He showed how the diversity of fund sources that exists among these projects could include State funds, equity funds, and occasionally debt financing to accomplish important objectives in capital investment. In the category "self-supporting capital investment need" in the five-year plans, the campus' investment to address SB 1953 seismic correction is coming from multiple fund sources. The campus also has a variety of projects where not only the capital reserve funds are being provided, but gift funds are used for leverage. Finally, under infrastructure, the five-year plans contain projects that are mostly utility distribution systems and the renovation of buildings.

Noting the extent to which the Davis campus relies on gift funds, Regent Johnson expressed concern about past instances where these were promised but never secured. Although he did not anticipate a repeat of these instances, Chancellor Vanderhoef stated that the Davis campus had decided to go into a comprehensive fundraising campaign. It is putting a greater investment into fundraising, which garners a return of $8 for every $1 invested.

Regent Montoya noted that students are concerned with sustainability in buildings and transportation. Vice Chancellor Meyer noted that, because the community is so compact, 20 percent of all trips in the city of Davis and on campus are taken by bicycle. The

Associated Students provides a bus system for both the city and the campus that is approaching 3 million trips per year. Students pay for it through their registration fees. Also, the campus has two-and-a-half freeway interchanges that serve the campus only, ensuring that travelers do not drive through the community. The campus takes advantage of alternative transportation such as shuttles when possible. It is increasing the supply of parking, given the forecast for an increased campus population, but in such a way as to make the campus more dense, which enhances the efficiency of alternate transportation systems. Chancellor Vanderhoef added that the campus' West Village neighborhood will be constructed in such a way that frequent bus service and direct bike paths will make driving to campus unnecessary.

Committee Chair Hopkinson acknowledged that the Davis campus had taken a thoughtful, organized strategic approach to planning. She believed campus planning must begin with an academic plan as the basis for the LRDP and the capital plan and that in order for them to understand the entire process, the Regents needed to hear more about the integration of the various planning components. With a view toward laying some ground rules for future campus presentations on capital planning, she suggested distributing the information contained in the presentation in hard copy in advance of the meetings so that the discussion would be more meaningful. She believed that the Committee needed to examine resources in the context of the University as a whole. She found the document that was distributed at the meeting, *Ten-Year Capital Improvement Plan 2004/05 to 2013/14*, to be too detailed and not sufficiently contextual, and she had questions about when academic and capital plans get approved and by whom.

Senior Vice President Mullinix responded that the ten-year capital plan is built on two components: the State capital plan, which is approved in its totality, and the nonState plan, within which the Regents approve the projects one at a time because of the complexity of their funding. Regent Hopkinson believed that the Regents should be given the opportunity of approving a strategic plan before a campus proceeds to go forward with it, although she acknowledged that the issue of starting with the academic goals and plan for each campus was appropriate to the Committee on Educational Policy.

Regent Montoya suggested that it would be helpful to have a brief description of the vision the Chancellor and his or her associates have for the campus, because that dictates the demands that follow.

Regent Ruiz observed that each campus should have a plan for growth and should be able to provide information about student capacity.

In response to Regent Hopkinson's suggestions, Chancellor Vanderhoef stated that the campus has an academic plan, a strategic plan, and a comprehensive plan that form the basis for determining the direction the campus will take. The capital plan had been the last step in the planning process. He suggested that the campus bring forward all the plans together, discuss the conclusions that have been reached based on academic planning, and show how the plans fit together. Mr. Mullinix noted that the purpose for

presenting the capital plans was to focus on understanding sources of funds and how they are integrated. Although he acknowledged the importance of understanding the academic planning as a basis for the capital plan, he observed that it would be a challenge to present in the short time available the whole academic plan and provide the context to illustrate how all the pieces fit together. Regent Hopkinson stressed the importance of understanding that integration and of having the Committee on Educational Policy understand the academic plan.

Regent Ruiz asked when the Committee could expect the presentation of a master plan that covers the development of the University as a whole. Regent Hopkinson believed that first the Davis presentation should be completed as suggested. She asked that within 30 days Mr. Mullinix inform the Committee of when that could be expected, following which the larger focus could be addressed. Mr. Mullinix commented that because academic planning is focused on the campuses, a way in which the information can be integrated will need to be determined. He noted that, while it may seem to be an obvious question as to what student capacity is at each campus and the campus' status relative to that, there are many different views on that issue and the question has substantial legal and other implications. Regent Hopkinson recalled that the Regents had been made aware of pieces of planning that have been done, but they have not looked at the matter in a consolidated way, such as learning how growth is to be accommodated by campus.

In response to questions about capacity, Vice President Hershman noted that the University does have an enrollment plan that takes into account the Master Plan and the number of high school graduates projected annually. The enrollment plan, which has been presented to the Regents, began in 1999 and is set to 2010. Many campuses are very close to the ten-year enrollment capacity envisioned by the plan, while others are growing by about 1,000 students per year. Enrollment exceeded the planning goal for several years but is coming back in line in the next few years. He agreed to provide data on the subject. Regent Hopkinson requested an overview of each campus with respect to capacity.

Regent-designate Rominger emphasized the importance of differentiating among the campuses in terms of their specializations.

5. **ANNUAL REPORT ON GREEN BUILDING AND CLEAN ENERGY POLICY**

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio presented the first annual report on steps to implement the Green Building and Clean Energy Policy. Initial procedures have been developed for the Green Building Policy, and campuses have submitted proposed baseline implementation plans. Campuses have also drafted preliminary Clean Energy Standard Implementation Plans.

Highlights of first-year achievements include receiving several large grants to assist implementation work and recognition from federal officials for the University's leadership.

It was recalled that at the December 13, 2002 meeting, the Committee requested that the President undertake a feasibility study for the adoption of a Green Building Policy and Clean Energy Standard for all proposed construction and renovation of buildings. At the July 17, 2003 meeting, The Regents approved "as University policy for all capital projects, the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability in the planning, financing, design, construction, renewal, maintenance, operation, space management, facilities utilization, and decommissioning of facilities and infrastructure to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements." On June 16, 2004, the President formally issued the Presidential Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards (Policy).

The development of the Policy was informed by a committee made up of State government officials from the California Energy Commission and the State Consumer Services Agency, faculty members with expertise in these disciplines, and administrators from each of the ten campuses and the Office of the President. The committee met at five separate, all-day meetings with numerous subgroups and held ad hoc meetings to complete the work within a five-month time frame. In late February 2003, student representatives from each campus that had passed referenda requesting that the University develop policies for integrating sustainability into its energy purchasing practices and building guidelines met with the committee to share information and provide input about the draft sustainability policy.

The final feasibility studies and policy recommendations of the committee were presented to the Committee on Grounds and Buildings in June 2003 and to the Board in July 2003, where they were approved unanimously.

***Status of Green Building and Clean Energy Policy***

Actions undertaken to implement the Green Building Policy include finalizing UC's green building application guidelines, developing campus baseline information, and arranging with the investor-owned utilities to provide documentation and financial incentives for energy efficiency in new construction. Among other requirements, the Green Building Policy mandates that new UC buildings outperform Title 24 energy parameters by 20 percent and achieve a level of sustainability equivalent to at least a Leadership in Energy and Environmental (LEED) certified rating.

The UC green building application guidelines outline the use of LEED standards in UC buildings with additional requirements for laboratory buildings that were derived from the Labs21 Environmental Performance Criteria. The guidelines outline the procedures for establishing campus green building baselines, which have been developed, primarily based on the U.S. Green Building Council's standards, to streamline the administration of the green building certification process. The University modified these to address the unique character of its campus communities. These baselines allow each campus the opportunity to highlight past efforts towards sustainable development, such as storm-water drainage systems, energy generation efforts, and sustainable land use planning, as well as commit to future efforts for every new construction project.

Effective July 1, 2004, projects approved for inclusion in the University's capital improvement program must meet the Policy's requirements and must provide the following commitment: "As required by this policy, the project will adopt the principals of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. Specific information regarding energy efficiency and sustainability will be provided when the project is presented for design approval." Nine new projects approved by The Regents in November as part of the State-funded 2005-06 Budget for Capital Improvements include this formal commitment. In addition, many projects with budgets approved before 2004-05 have incorporated sustainable features in order to comply with the spirit of the new policy.

Implementation of the Clean Energy Standard began with the campuses producing initial drafts of Clean Energy Standard Implementation Plans. The plans project energy consumption growth at the campuses over the next decade and the amount of energy efficiency and renewable energy that will be required to offset this load growth in order to comply with the Policy.

***Highlights of First Year Accomplishments***

*Energy Efficiency in New and Existing Buildings*
A partnership program with investor-owned utilities and The California State University (CSU) provides $15 million towards implementing energy efficiency projects in the UC and CSU systems. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) selected the UC-CSU program in a competitive solicitation, in part due to UC's far-reaching Clean Energy Standard. In addition to funding energy efficiency retrofits and existing building tune-ups through "monitoring-based commissioning" projects, the program also provides extensive training to UC staff in project management, facilities, and other related campus units.

A second grant from the CPUC provides the nonprofit organization Alliance to Save Energy with $2.5 million to manage pilot student energy conservation programs on the Berkeley, Santa Barbara, and San Diego campuses. UC and CSU have also received additional funding of approximately $3 million from the California Energy Commission for demonstrating emerging energy technologies.

*Onsite Generation and Procurement of Renewable Energy*
In 2004, graduate students at UC Berkeley completed a solar site assessment for their campus, identifying priority buildings for solar projects and analyzing possible financing approaches. Also at the Berkeley campus, the Associated Students (ASUC) and the Graduate Student Assembly allocated $300,000 for a solar photovoltaic (PV) system on the Martin Luther King Student Union, which earned an additional $300,000 in State rebates. The ASUC has now secured $500,000 from Follett, the Campus Bookstore operator, for energy efficiency retrofits and to install additional solar PV systems. Three UC sites participated in a California Power Authority pilot program to bid out solar PV projects, as part of the goal of seeking cost-effective solar PV projects. Solar projects are

still prohibitively expensive in most cases but are expected to become more cost effective during the next decade.

*Staff and Student Participation in Sustainability Activities*
With resources from the grants described above, the Facilities Administration Department created the position of Sustainability Specialist to manage portions of those grant programs and to coordinate communications with students, faculty, administrators, and external representatives in further development and implementation of the Policy. For example, in addition to ongoing communication and campus visits, the Sustainability Specialist and other Division of Business and Finance staff held several meetings with the leadership of the California Student Sustainability Coalition. The Sustainability Specialist serves as a member of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability at UC Berkeley and a parallel committee at UC San Francisco. With leadership and support from the Division of Business and Finance, staff, students, and faculty are working to create similar committees on other UC campuses to better coordinate and promote implementation of the Policy.

*Partnerships with Government and Nonprofit Organizations*
The Department of Energy invited the University to become a partner in its Rebuild America program, which provides resources and expertise for further implementation of the Clean Energy Standard as well as providing structure for ongoing collaboration between students and the University on sustainability. The University has also developed a working relationship with the U.S. Green Building Council to assist campuses going through the LEED certification process and to comment on green building standards under development. The University actively participates in the California State Green Building Task Force and the California State Energy Policy Advisory Committee.

*Training*
The University continues to promote excellence through training. The third annual UC Green Building-Sustainability Conference, hosted by the Santa Barbara campus in June 2004, attracted over 300 attendees from the UC and CSU systems. This conference highlighted and shared best practices in energy efficiency, green buildings, and sustainability on UC and CSU campuses. The conference was sponsored in part by the California Public Utilities Commission grant mentioned above. In November 2004, the UC Project Management Institute launched a series of monthly trainings sponsored by the CPUC grant. More than 50 UC staff attended the first course, "Exceeding Title 24," which focused on meeting the policy goal for exceeding Title 24 energy standards by at least 20 percent in new building construction. In December 2004, a second course, "Laboratories for the 21st Century," trained another 45 UC staff in high-performance laboratory design. Additionally, the U.S. Green Building Council has offered training for its new green building standard for existing buildings, with a total of about 70 UC staff attending special training sessions held at the Santa Barbara and Berkeley campuses.

*Procurement*
The University successfully used "buying power" to encourage manufacturers of laboratory-grade refrigerators and freezers to build more efficient units. In addition, the

University obtained funding and issued a contract to test more energy-efficient fume hood technology for possible use in UC laboratories. The University is also joining the Environmental Protection Agency and the Alameda County Waste Management Authority to provide expert technical assistance to begin an Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Program in conjunction with the Strategic Sourcing Program under the direction of the Vice President–Financial Management.

*External Recognition for UC*
The Regents continues to receive extensive recognition for approving the Green Building and Clean Energy Policy. Federal officials praised the University's Policy at a September ceremony dedicating an Energy Star plaque earned by the Office of the President building in Oakland. Articles chronicling the Policy have appeared in several local, state, and national publications. University staff have been invited to give speeches and other presentations on the Policy at numerous national and international fora, such as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Annual Meeting, the International Environmental Management for Sustainable Universities Conference in Mexico, the North American Conference on Sustainability in Higher Education, and the Laboratories for a 21st Century Annual Conference.

*Future Action*
This first Annual Report describes the initial steps towards implementation of the Policy. At the November 2005 meeting, the second annual report will analyze the impact of the University's sustainability efforts on energy use and building design and the effects on the overall capital program and University operating costs.

Regent Montoya noted that there had been an emphasis on reducing costs by taking advantage of changes in technology. She asked whether changes in energy pricing reflecting the cost of use at the time had been considered. Mr. Bocchicchio responded that time of use provisions are considered. Some campuses have energy storage systems that permit demand to be shifted to the least expensive times of the day.

Regent Ruiz asked that at a future meeting the savings by campus from the implementation of the policies be described. He noted that energy efficiency comes at a cost. Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the University anticipates a five-to-seven year payback period for energy conservation. Since the policy has been in place, eleven projects have received budget approval. By the time they are constructed, it will be possible to measure their precise operating costs.

Regent Anderson acknowledged the University's preeminent position concerning the development of green buildings and clean energy policies. She asked that the annual report be made available on the University's website and distributed to all Regents. She asked also that indications of progress be added to the report when it is posted on the Internet, that information on energy efficiency and sustainability be provided during the design approval phase of buildings, and that sustainability be considered when implementing strategic sourcing initiatives. Mr. Bocchicchio reported that energy efficiency and sustainability cut across University operations. The strategic purchasing

director has formed working groups on all campuses to provide education about green products.

Regent-designate Rosenthal noted that many faculty are focused on sustainability. Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the sustainability committees on campuses have participation from the principal stakeholders as well as faculty, staff, and students. The University's policy is to have all new buildings reach LEED certification with a goal of achieving higher levels. Three campuses have made Silver rating their standard. It has yet to be determined whether that should be the future strategy for all campuses, given the higher costs involved.

Regent Hopkinson asked that the next annual report contain a running list of the efficiency level every new campus building reaches.

6. **STATUS OF UNIVERSITY BUILDING COST REDUCTION OPPORTUNITIES STUDY**

It was recalled that at the September 2004 meeting, The Regents initiated a study on building cost reduction opportunities to address the following:

- 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.

- Recommend opportunities for reducing project costs.

It was suggested that to direct the study, a committee of outside experts (Committee) be formed comprised of acknowledged leaders in their respective fields. Members of the Board, campus, and Office of the President staff proposed Committee candidates, and six members eventually joined the Committee, including architects, a construction-program manager, a developer, a contractor, and an institutional owner. Assisting the Committee are professional consultants providing meeting facilitation, data collection and analysis, and report-writing services. Additionally, a group of campus and OP staff (Internal Resource Group) was formed to facilitate information gathering and provide staff support for the Committee.

Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the selectees from the candidate pool for the Committee are as follows: Mr. Robert Kain, Chairman of the Board of HMC Architects; Mr. Patrick MacLeamy, Chief Executive Officer of Helmuth, Obata & Kassabaum Architects; Mr. Wayne Twedell, a program construction manager; from the Urban Land Institute

Mr. Michael Covarrubias, Chairman and CEO of TMG Partners; for the general contractor Mr. Carter Chappell, a leader in California construction and President of McCarthy Builders; and as the institutional owner representative Mr. Stuart Eckblad, National Director for Project Administrative Services, Kaiser Permanente. The Cost Engineer is Mr. Peter Morris of Davis Langdon Associates. The facilitator scribe is Mr. Steven Westfall, President of Tradeline Inc., trainers in the industry. He also publishes a database of design and construction projects nationally. The internal resource group includes the budget and administrative vice chancellors and General Counsel staff.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio reported that the Committee's inaugural meeting was held in December, at which time the members discussed and approved the study's work plan and were provided with detailed background concerning UC's organizational structure, capital project approval process, contract methods, and reform proposals submitted to the California Performance Review. The Internal Resource Group also met in December to discuss the highest-level goals, values, and design standards that guide development of UC's built environment and to propose candidate facilities for the study. The cost consultant is confirming the feasibility of the data collection for the proposed facilities and preparing the lists and definitions of data categories to be included in the study. The Committee is to meet in late January to finalize the subject facilities and data categories so that the cost consultant may begin the comprehensive data analysis.

Mr. Bocchicchio suggested that members of the Committee join future meetings of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings. He reported that, unlike past studies, although comparisons would be made with other universities and outside entities, the emphasis would be on the opportunities and not necessarily on the cost comparison itself.

In response to Regent Montoya's request for clarification between opportunities and costs, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the University is seeking recommendations for changing ways in which it builds or designs buildings, its process for construction, and its process for approval and design that could provide opportunities for reducing capital costs. Mr. Mullinix noted that there may be opportunities that the University would not find desirable as a public agency. Regent Hopkinson believed the study should analyze construction costs, as they may be affected by design or construction processes and procedures.

In response to a question asked by Regent Hopkinson, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that many of the members had been involved in construction for the University. Regent Hopkinson suggested inviting a non-union contractor to participate.

The expert Committee will articulate the goals, values, and standards guiding the development of the built environment. It is necessary to look at opportunities such as cost reduction in the context of the University's high-level goals and core values, including sustainability. The Committee will compare UC and similar California projects in four categories: offices and classrooms, research laboratories, housing facilities, and parking structures. The next step will be to identify opportunities and develop recommendations. Mr. Mullinix noted that in each category not only California educational institutions but

private components will be examined. The Committee is being asked to identify the tradeoffs in achieving the goals and values and present findings and recommendations by the July meeting.

The internal resource group identified 32 potential candidate projects that are being evaluated. The candidates will be narrowed to three UC projects and three external comparison projects in each of the four categories. The external comparisons are both California universities and outside private corporations. Regent Hopkinson advised picking one or two that had big cost overruns.

In response to a question about its schedule, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the Committee would meet once a month until the report is complete. He noted that there are two paid consultants, but the other members of the Committee are volunteers.

7. **STATUS REPORT ON THE CONDITION OF UC FACILITIES**

This item was postponed.

8. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, ADOPTION OF FINDINGS, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOR MULTI-USE STADIUM, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend to The Regents that, subject to the concurrence of the Committee on Finance:

A. The 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements for the subject project be amended as follows:

From: Davis: Multi-Use Stadium – preliminary plans and working drawings – $2,794,000 funding comprised of preliminary plans from campus funds ($1,416,000) and working drawings from gifts ($1,378,000)

To: Davis: Multi-Use Stadium – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment – $29,750,000 to be funded from external financing ($20,795,000), Facilities and Campus Enhancement and Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program net revenues ($2,950,000), and gift funds ($6,005,000).

B. Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the 2003 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR), the Committee recommend that The Regents:

(1) Adopt the Findings and Statement of Overriding Consideration and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(2) Approve the design of the Multi-Use Stadium, Davis campus.

The Committee was informed that Davis' existing stadium, Toomey Field, which was built in 1948, has grown outdated and obsolete for current campus requirements. The Multi-Use Stadium project would replace the existing facility of 5,000 seats, as well as provide an additional 5,000 seats. The stadium would be designed to accommodate the possible future build-out of an additional 20,000 seats, which would be presented to The Regents as a separate project, subject to future availability of funds. The project would be home to UC Davis Football, Women's Lacrosse, and regulation soccer programs, and is planned to meet current and future needs of the Intercollegiate Athletic Program.

At the meeting of January 2003, The Regents authorized the campus to proceed with preliminary plans. At the May 2004 meeting, The Regents approved the campus to continue with the working drawings phase of the project, with gift funds in the amount of $1,378,000, for a total of $2,794,000.

In December 2004, the appointment of Ellerbe Becket, of San Francisco, California, as executive architect for this project, was approved by the Office of the President.

***Project Description and Design***

The Multi-Use Stadium will be built on a site north of the Health Science District, southeast of Hutchison Drive, and west of La Rue Road. The project is consistent with the Physical Education/Intercollegiate Athletics/Recreation land use designation in the 2003 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

The Stadium field will be approximately 16 feet below grade, with seating located on both sloping sides. The complex will contain enclosed stadium support facilities totaling 24,185 assignable square feet within a total area of 30,231 gross square feet, which would include public restrooms, concessions, a press box, operations space, separate areas for the home team with 120 lockers, a visitors' team section with 60 lockers, an equipment storage room, and a sports medicine room. Seating for persons with disabilities and their companions will meet or exceed regulatory requirements. Support space buildings will be clad primarily with concrete block in colors and textures that are compatible with recently completed nearby buildings, including the Aquatics Center and the Activities and Recreation Center.

The design of the Multi-Use Stadium has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant and value engineering teams.

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

Construction of the project will begin in May 2005 and be completed in September 2006.

***Environmental Impact Summary***

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act to analyze the environmental effects of the 2003 LRDP, including project-level review of the Multi-use Stadium found in Vol. III, section 4.0 of the LRDP EIR. The Regents certified the EIR in November 2003.

***Environmental Impact Report Organization***

In December 2003, a Davis neighborhood group filed a lawsuit challenging the sufficiency of the UC Davis 2003 LRDP EIR. In June 2004, the Alameda Superior Court denied the petition and found that the LRDP EIR was adequate under CEQA. In September 2004, the neighborhood group filed a notice that it would appeal the Superior Court decision.

Implementation of the Multi-use Stadium Project has the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A detailed summary of these impacts is included in the Findings and in the Summary Chapter of Section 4.0, Volume III of the Draft EIR. Cumulative Impacts are included in the Findings and in the LRDP Summary Chapter of Volume I of the Draft EIR. Many of these impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels following implementation of proposed mitigation measures; however, significant and unavoidable impacts from the Multi-use Stadium and the 2003 LRDP would remain in the following categories:

- Aesthetics – Adverse effects on scenic vistas west across agricultural lands to the Coast Range.

- Air Quality – Construction activities would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants.

- Hydrology and Water Quality – Increased water extraction and increased impervious surfaces could result in a net deficit in the deep and/or shallow/intermediate aquifers and could contribute to local subsidence.

- Noise – Increases in noise levels due to increased traffic would result in substantial temporary noise levels in excess of standards for noise-sensitive land uses.

***Cumulative Impacts Summary***

In addition to the project-specific impacts, the project will contribute to cumulative impacts in the following areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation. Mitigation measures are available that would reduce many of these regional cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level; however, because these mitigation measures are outside the jurisdiction of the University of California, implementation cannot be guaranteed.

***Public Review of Draft LRDP EIR***

The Draft 2003 Long Range Development Plan EIR, which includes this project, was issued on May 5, 2003. The initial comment period of 60 days was extended an additional 30 days. The Draft EIR was widely circulated, and three public hearings were held: two on June 2, 2003 and a third on July 28, 2003. Approximately 150 comment letters or emails were received during the public review period, and 13 individuals provided oral comments on the Draft LRDP EIR. Comment letters related specifically to the Multi-Use Stadium project generally raised concerns about impacts associated with traffic, noise, and lighting during events. Several comments were received expressing the opinion that the site should be used for housing instead of for a stadium. Responses to all comments on the 2003 LRDP EIR are located in Volumes IV and V.

***Alternatives***

In addition to the alternatives proposed for the 2003 LRDP project, the LRDP EIR analyzed four alternatives to the proposed Multi-use Stadium project:

- A smaller stadium.
- An alternative site north of Interstate 80 along Old Davis Road.
- Two alternative sites on the west campus west of State Route 113.
- No project.

In addition, alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible included enlargement of the existing stadium and including a track around the field in the new stadium.

***Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program***

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

***Findings***

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

***Project Budget***

The total project cost of $29,750,000 will be funded from external financing ($19,900,000 of long-term debt and $895,000 of short-term debt), Facilities and Campus Enhancements and the Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program net reserves ($2,950,000), and gifts ($6,005,000). Pending approval of this action by the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, approval of external financing will be requested from the Committee on Finance at its January 2005 meeting.

***Gift Campaign***

As of December 2004, the campus has raised gifts for the project totaling $2,315,000. The fundraising status is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Gifts received | $ 951,000 |
| Pledges received | 1,364,000 |
| Gifts to be raised: | 3,690,000 |
| Total | $6,005,000 |

In compliance with Regents' policy that all funds necessary to complete construction be to be in hand, campus funds have been encumbered to cover pledges to be collected and gifts to be raised. The campus will be repaid as additional gifts are received.

Project Manager Halliday presented slides of the design.

Regent Montoya expressed her opposition to the University's procedures for allowing approval of student-fee-funded properties. Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that the matter was scheduled for discussion at the March meeting.

In response to a question asked by Regent Anderson, Mr. Halliday acknowledged that the Davis campus has comparatively high student fees, but he noted that the student initiative that approved the stadium assessment includes a return to aid.

Regent-designate Rosenthal was concerned about the likelihood of filling the planned stadium seats. Mr. Halliday reported that projections indicate that, as the campus moves into Division I and interest grows, the seats will fill up.

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Mr. Halliday reported that the stadium will be rented out for non-University athletic events.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, Regents Anderson and Montoya abstaining.

9. **ENGINEERING UNIT 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

It was noted that this item would be addressed by the Committee on Finance at its meeting of January 19.

10. **EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SCIENCES BUILDING, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

It was noted that this item would be addressed by the Committee on Finance at its meeting of January 19.

11. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project, the Committee:

A. Adopt the Findings.

B. Approve the design of the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, San Diego campus.

It was recalled that in November 2004, the Regents approved the inclusion of the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, San Diego campus, in the 2003-2004 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2003-2006 Capital Improvements Program, for a total project cost of $41,738,000. The project will be funded with campus reserves ($1,000,000) and external financing ($40,738,000). The debt service will be paid by the San Diego campus' share of the University Opportunity Fund.

In December 2004, the appointment of EHDD as executive architect for the project was approved by the Office of the President.

***Project Site***

The site is a surface parking lot located directly east of the existing San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC). It is bordered on the south by the site for the Hopkins Parking Structure (construction beginning February 2005), on the north by the existing Recreation, IntraMural Athletic Complex, and on the east by Hopkins Drive. Views from the site are to the east, looking into and across from the protected open space known as the Grove. The project site is consistent with the campus 2004 Long Range Development Plan.

***Project Design***

The SDSC Expansion will contain 50,265 asf (79,680 gsf) and connect physically to the existing facility. The expansion will serve the ongoing mission of the San Diego Supercomputer by providing an additional 7,000 asf of computer machine room space and 43,265 asf of offices, an auditorium, computer laboratories, conference rooms, administrative support space, and two classrooms. The SDSC Expansion is composed of two five-story wings forming a "V" and joined by a central lobby. The building wings form an entry courtyard leading to the central atrium space. The lobby serves as a new entry for both the existing building and the expansion and provides horizontal and vertical links to other areas of the facility.

The SDSC Expansion is proposed to use a cast-in-place concrete column and beam structure. Cast-in-place concrete shear walls are used to resist seismic forces and are located in the interior of the structure. The primary exterior materials are architectural concrete, exterior cement plaster, kynar coated metal sun shading devices on the south and east facades, and aluminum curtain wall and windows. The massing, materials, and glazing patterns of the San Diego Supercomputer Expansion relate to the existing building.

Some of the sustainability considerations include a system of natural ventilation that reduces the need for mechanical heating and cooling; recycling of construction waste; individual airflow, temperature, and lighting controls; Energy Star roof compliance; maximum day lighting; and use of best practice commissioning procedures. The project will comply with the University's policies on green building design and clean energy standards.

The technological nature of work conducted at the SDSC requires significant electrical power. To meet both SDSC's increasing demand for electrical power and the demands that will be generated by the continuing growth of the North Campus, the project will rely on a new 12 kV switching station, which will be housed in a small concrete masonry unit building (2,250 gsf) on the West Campus near the intersection of Voigt Drive and Justice Lane. This project was approved by the UCSD Chancellor in March 2004 and will be ready to serve the needs of the SDSC Expansion at the time the project demands it.

The University of California, San Diego, Design Review Board has reviewed and approved the design of the SDSC Expansion in accordance with University policy. An independent cost estimate and a seismic review are complete. The Office of Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project. Independent testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction, will perform project oversight.

***Environmental Impact Summary***

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the San Diego Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), and the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion was evaluated in the Volume 3 of the LRDP EIR at a project level. The 2004 LRDP EIR was certified by The Regents on September 23, 2004.

On August 1, 2003, the University released a Notice of Preparation (NOP), including an Initial Study, announcing 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 LRDP and the proposed Rady School of Management, the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion Project, and the Hopkins Parking Structure would be considered in a single EIR volume. The revised NOP was circulated to responsible agencies and interested groups and individuals for a 30-day review period ending January 7, 2004.

The University issued the Draft LRDP EIR on May 25, 2004 and circulated it for public review and comment for a 45-day period ending on 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. A public hearing was held June 14, 2004. Written comments were received from 12 agencies, 14 organizations, and 26 private citizens. In addition, comments were received from 10 persons at the public hearing held June 14, 2004 on campus. The letters and the public hearing transcript are included in the Final EIR. No substantial issues were raised by the public with regard to the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion.

The Final LRDP EIR for the San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion analyzes the project impacts in fourteen areas that would result from development of the program. All identified project-level environmental impacts were mitigated to a level below significance; however, the cumulative impact or consistency with air quality standard is

considered significant and unavoidable. 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, an on-site alternative design, a smaller footprint alternative, and a reduced scale alternative. The Final EIR is accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

***Findings***

The Findings discuss the project's impacts and associated mitigation measures as contained in the certified LRDP EIR.

In response to a question asked by Regent Montoya, Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann recalled that the project was tiered off the Long Range Development Plan. Comments received during the public comment period were related to the LRDP and not to the Supercomputer Project.

Regent Hopkinson had several observations about the design. She believed the service drive needed to be screened more substantially from the adjoining area. The addition appeared to be at a strange angle, the two buildings did not appear to be well integrated, and the exterior elevations looked dated and unattractive.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio reported that the building had posed serious challenges. It is surrounded by buildings of a similar vocabulary. He believed the design was reasonable for a very functional building and represented the best job possible within that vocabulary. Senior Vice President Mullinix commented that the budget for the building precluded designing anything dramatic.

Regent Hopkinson remained opposed to the design. She stressed the importance of bringing designs to the Committee in early stages in order to receive input before the project had gone too far to be changed.

Vice Chancellor Woods recalled that in 1985 the campus took advantage of an opportunity to join with General Atomics to construct the original building, which because of time and budget constraints was a simple design. He believed that the addition represented a compromise in that it looked better than the original building but was related to it. Regent Hopkinson objected to compromising design to match something existing that is not laudatory.

Mr. Hellmann showed slides of adjacent buildings, which have similarities relative to the context and exterior finishes. He agreed to consider making slight design changes where possible, including the sun shades, based on the comments of the Committee.

In response to a question asked by Regent-designate Rominger, Mr. Hellmann reported that the building has many sustainability features, including the shading devices. Based

on an evaluation of the criteria, it is anticipated that the building will receive at least a LEED Silver rating.

Regent Hopkinson suggested that, as there is little flexibility regarding the design, the Committee approve the recommendation but revisit the design after the campus has attempted to improve the appearance of the window shading devices and the end wall.

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

12. **MAJOR CAPITAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT, 2003-04 FISCAL YEAR**

This item was postponed.

13. **UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY LAND COMPANY, LLC, MERCED CAMPUS**

This item was postponed.

14. **CERTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE 2020 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the EIR for the UC Berkeley 2020 Long Range Development Plan.

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 2020 Long Range Development Plan, Berkeley campus.

[The 2020 Long Range Development Plan EIR, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Findings were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Chancellor Birgeneau emphasized that the Long Range Development Plan is built on an academic plan which was developed over many years to cover the same time frame. The LRDP represents the physical infrastructure that is needed in order to achieve the academic goals. He noted that a recent *London Times* survey ranked UC Berkeley as the best public research campus in the world and that the campus ranked first in the country in educating Ph.D.s and in the number of its undergraduates who go on to receive Ph.D.s. In order to continue its leadership role, the campus must maintain its educational and

research facilities. He commented that at Berkeley, education and research are not separable. There has been an evolution in the research enterprise in that increasing responsibility is falling on universities to create new knowledge. He believed the LRDP presented a realistic framework on which to base the future of the campus.

Professor Knapp, Berkeley Division Chair of the Academic Senate, commented on the faculty's views. He recalled that he had been involved for two years in the discussion and planning that have resulted in the LRDP. The faculty is committed to creating and maintaining facilities that will maintain UC Berkeley's high quality while at the same time working with all interested parties to be sure that the quality of life on and off campus is also maintained at the highest possible standard. The LRDP has its origins in the UC Berkeley Strategic Academic Plan, created in 2002 by a committee of 24 campus leaders. It represents what the faculty and administration deem the essential blueprint for maintaining and expanding Berkeley's excellence. The Academic Plan identifies the key challenges the campus must meet in the 21st century. He noted that Berkeley is the oldest campus in the system. Many of its buildings need renovation or replacement. Berkeley must be a part of meeting the demands of a growing population for a college education. He believed that the LRDP exhibits a strong ethic of environmental quality and a respect for the unique character of both the campus and the city. He urged support of the plan, because it provides the decision-making tools needed to ensure that every future project the campus undertakes is the best possible use of public resources and makes an extraordinary place even better.

Associate Director O'Banion provided an overview of the 2020 Long Range Development Plan, recalling that it provides a framework for land use and capital investment to meet the academic goals and objectives of the campus through the year 2020. It describes both the scope and distribution of capital investment anticipated within this time frame as well as policies to guide the location, scale, and design of individual projects. The 2020 LRDP does not commit the University to any specific individual project but rather provides a strategic context and procedures for decisions on those projects. The 2020 LRDP is not a separate document, but is fully contained in Chapter 3.1 of the LRDP EIR.

It is a fundamental principle at UC Berkeley that its capital investment strategy should align with and promote the academic goals of the campus. Toward this end, the Chancellor formed a campus committee in fall 2000 to prepare a Strategic Academic Plan, which was completed in 2002. The scope of the Strategic Academic Plan is much broader than the 2020 LRDP, but many of its provisions have significant implications for land use and capital investment and serve as a foundation for the objectives of the 2020 LRDP.

***Integrate Research and Education***

Research is fundamental to the educational mission. As a research University, UC Berkeley strives to provide its students with a unique experience, one in which critical inquiry, analysis, and discovery are integral to the coursework. Students expect to play

an active role in research, under the guidance of faculty who are themselves engaged in creating, not merely imparting, new knowledge. The integration of research-based learning with undergraduate education is a goal of the campus Strategic Academic Plan. In order to achieve it, the campus must expand the scope of its research programs to accommodate more direct, mentored participation by undergraduates and must also provide adequate and suitable space to house those programs.

The 2020 LRDP describes the scale of capital investment required to accommodate recent and future expansion of the education and research programs of the campus.

***Pursue New Academic Initiatives***

The State provides the University with incremental operating funds to support enrollment growth. The Strategic Academic Plan recommends that these resources be used not only to expand current high-demand programs but also to extend current programs in promising new directions and create interdisciplinary programs to pursue new areas of inquiry. In 2003, the campus selected its first set of new academic initiatives: Computational Biology, Nanosciences, Metropolitan Studies, and New Arts Media. These were selected not only because work to date already shows extraordinary promise but also because the initiatives are broad in scope, are explicitly collaborative, and have significant potential to engage students in research.

The 2020 LRDP describes how capital investment can expand as well as renew the space inventory through selective replacement and more intensive land use.

***Maintain Research Leadership***

Research is also fundamental to the public service mission. The direct public benefits of the research and scholarship undertaken at UC Berkeley range from advances in human and environmental health, to new insights into personal and social behavior, to improved agricultural and industrial productivity. UC Berkeley, however, is the oldest campus of the University of California; over two-thirds of the central campus space is more than 40 years old. Both instruction and research have undergone dramatic change during this period, and its students, instructors, and researchers struggle with space and systems compromised not only by age but also by decades of underinvestment. The Strategic Academic Plan urges new capital investment both to renew the campus' existing facility inventory and to expand it to support new initiatives.

The 2020 LRDP includes a rigorous project review process to ensure that each new investment represents the optimal use of University land and capital.

***Stabilize Enrollment***

The large size of the Berkeley campus allows for great academic breadth and variety and enables it to offer the advantages of a UC Berkeley education to more students; however, UC Berkeley is located in a densely developed city. Its capacity to grow is constrained both by land and by the age of the facility inventory. In order to maintain its standard of excellence, UC Berkeley has an urgent need to focus limited capital resources on the renewal of buildings and infrastructure rather than further enrollment growth. The Strategic Academic Plan recommends that enrollment during regular terms be stabilized at 33,000 students.

The 2020 LRDP recommends a slightly higher two-semester average headcount to stabilize at 33,450 students, an increase of 14 percent over the 2005 enrollment projected in the previous LRDP.

***Build an Interactive Campus***

A great research university requires a vital and dynamic intellectual community, one that provides exposure to a wide range of cultures and perspectives and generates the encounters and interactions that lead to new insight and discovery. For such a community to thrive requires a campus designed to foster those interactions. Because the potential for synergy is everywhere at UC Berkeley, the Strategic Academic Plan recommends that the first principle of land use should be to retain and reinforce the contiguity of the academic enterprise, in order to encourage interaction and exchange both within and across disciplines.

The 2020 LRDP includes a land use plan to ensure that over 90 percent of new academic space is located on the 300-plus acres of Campus Park and adjacent blocks.

**Invest in Housing**. The ability of UC Berkeley to recruit, retain, and support outstanding individuals is fundamental to academic excellence. Many of its best student and faculty candidates cite the scarcity of good, reasonably priced housing and child care near campus as key factors in their decisions about attending UC Berkeley. The problem of housing is particularly acute for students. Expanding and improving the supply of housing near campus is critical not only to ensure that students are housed adequately but also to provide the community of peers and mentors and the access to campus resources they require to excel. The Strategic Academic Plan recognizes the critical role of housing and defines a set of long-term goals for students and faculty.

The 2020 LRDP includes an ambitious set of objectives for new University housing, based on the long-term goals of the Strategic Academic Plan.

***Status of the 1990-2005 LRDP***

The 1990-2005 LRDP proposed a program of physical development to support the mission and operations of the Berkeley campus through 2005-2006.

**Population**. The 1990-2005 LRDP proposed a slight decline in average regular term student headcount, from 30,576 in 1988-1989 to 29,450 in 2005-2006. In fact, the average regular term student headcount grew to 31,800 in 2001-2002, the base year for the 2020 LRDP, and to 32,500 in 2002-2003. This reflects the Universitywide increase in enrollment in response to "Tidal Wave 2" and the substantial growth in the number of college age Californians, which is projected to continue through 2010. The figures represent enrolled headcount; on-campus headcount is slightly lower due to off-campus programs.

**Building Space**. The 1990-2005 LRDP proposed an increase in academic and support space, excluding housing and parking, of up to 723,000 net gsf over existing and approved space. A 2002 amendment to the LRDP increased this envelope by another 325,000 net gsf to allow the replacements of Stanley and North Davis Halls, both of which are under construction.

The 1990-2005 LRDP also proposed an increase of 2,350 to 3,410 student bed spaces of University housing over existing and approved bed spaces. Since then, the University-owned housing inventory has increased by roughly 520 net new bed spaces, and another 880 are under construction. The new master plan for University Village Albany, approved by The Regents in July 2004, includes another 1,300 net new bed spaces.

The 1990-2005 LRDP also proposed an increase of 1,010 University parking spaces over existing spaces. Since then, University-owned parking inventory has declined by roughly 200 net vehicle spaces, but another 690 net new spaces are in design.

***Summary of the 2020 LRDP***

**Scope and Organization**. While the campus functions as a single academic enterprise, the areas that comprise it differ significantly in terms of physical capacity and environmental sensitivity. To allow more precise analysis of both, the 2020 LRDP is organized in terms of the land use zones described below.

**Campus Park**. The historic 180-acre Campus Park contains 56 percent of UC Berkeley's built space. Although intensively developed, the Campus Park retains a distinctive park-like environment of natural and formal open spaces, as well as an outstanding beaux-arts ensemble of historic architecture.

**Hill Campus**. The Hill Campus includes roughly 800 acres of mostly steep terrain east of the Campus Park. An additional 200 acres in this area are managed under the separate jurisdiction of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and are not within the scope of the UC Berkeley 2020 LRDP. While the primary use of the Hill Campus is natural open space, including the 300-plus-acre Ecological Study Area, the Hill Campus contains roughly 2 percent of UC Berkeley's built space.

**City Environs**. The City Environs include the remaining scope of the 2020 LRDP and subdivide further into the Adjacent Blocks, Southside, Other Berkeley Sites, and the Housing Zone.

**Adjacent Blocks**. This includes the blocks adjacent to the north, west, south, and east of the Campus Park. The "blocks" to the east are owned entirely by the University but are separated from the Campus Park by Gayley Road. The blocks adjacent to the north, west, and south contain a mix of University and non-University sites. The adjacent blocks contain 14 percent of UC Berkeley built space.

**Southside**. It includes the approximately 20-block district south of the south Adjacent Blocks, as well as the 50-acre, University-owned Clark Kerr Campus. The Southside contains 10 percent of UC Berkeley's built space, primarily in student housing, and students comprise over 80 percent of Southside residents.

**Other Berkeley Sites**. These include all other campus properties in or partly in the City of Berkeley and comprise 5 percent of UC Berkeley's built space.

**Housing Zone**. This overlays the other land-use zones and defines the area within which new University housing under the 2020 LRDP would be located. It includes all sites which have suitable municipal general plan designations for multifamily housing and are within a one-mile radius or a 20-minute transit trip to Doe Library.

**Outside 2020 LRDP Scope**. As in the 1990-2005 LRDP, the scope of the 2020 LRDP excludes University Village, Albany and the Richmond Field Station; it also excludes remote field stations and other campus-operated properties lying entirely outside the City of Berkeley. The sites in Albany, Richmond, and elsewhere together comprise 13 percent of UC Berkeley's built space. The Regents approved a new master plan for University Village Albany in July 2004.

**Campus Population**. Due to the projected growth in the number of college-age Californians, by 2010-11 the University as a whole must increase its enrollment by 63,000 students over base year 1998-1999 to continue to meet its targets under the California Master Plan for Higher Education. As part of this strategy, UC Berkeley has been requested to evaluate its capacity to grow by 4,000 full-time-equivalent students over base year 1998-1999 by 2010. While UC Berkeley can accommodate some of these new students through growth in summer programs and education abroad, to meet this target requires an increase in on-campus student headcount during the regular terms.

By 2020, total campus headcount during the regular academic year may increase by up to 12 percent over the 2001-2002 EIR base year. The estimates for academic and non-academic staff reflect the impacts of both enrollment growth and growth in research programs through 2020.

**Campus Space**. Enrollment is only one of many drivers for growth at UC Berkeley. Continued growth in research programs and new academic initiatives also create demand for more space on and around campus. While some of this demand can be met through the renovation of existing buildings, new buildings are also required, particularly for programs that demand high-performance infrastructure and other advanced features renovated space cannot provide. By 2020, the space demands of campus academic and support programs may grow by up to 18 percent over current and approved space. The projected increase in parking spaces is due to both demand from future growth and current parking space shortages resulting from recent growth in enrollment.

**Campus Land Use**. As described above, the contiguity of the academic enterprise is a fundamental principle of the Strategic Academic Plan. In support of this principle, 90 to 100 percent of the estimated future space demand for academic and support programs is planned to be accommodated on the Campus Park and its Adjacent Blocks. As the Strategic Academic Plan also recommends, Campus Park space is prioritized for programs that directly engage students in instruction and research, while space on the Adjacent Blocks is prioritized for other research, cultural, and service programs that require Campus Park proximity. The 2020 LRDP includes Location Guidelines to optimize space use.

**Campus Housing**. The Strategic Academic Plan defines the long-term goals for housing at UC Berkeley. The 2020 LRDP includes targets that are feasible within the 2020 time horizon. The 2020 LRDP proposes to increase University housing by up to 32 percent over current and approved bed spaces, as follows:

- Increase single, undergraduate bed spaces to equal 100 percent of entering freshmen plus 50 percent of sophomores and entering transfer students by 2020.

- Increase single graduate student bed spaces to equal 50 percent of entering graduate students by 2020.

- Maintain and upgrade the current supply of University housing suitable for students with children.

- Provide up to 3 years of University housing to new, untenured, ladder faculty who desire it by 2020.

To ensure that University housing improves access to the academic life and resources of the campus and supports a vital intellectual community, all new housing built under the 2020 LRDP will be located within a Housing Zone defined as sites with suitable city General Plan designations and located within a one mile radius of the center of campus,

defined as Doe Library, or within one block of a transit line providing trips to Doe Library in under 20 minutes.

**Campus Access**. Access to campus is vital to the work and culture of UC Berkeley. Faculty, students, and researchers depend not only on the academic resources of the campus but also on their interactions with colleagues that lead to new insights, concepts, and methods. For those who live beyond walking distance or good transit service, the time and inconvenience of travel to and from campus, exacerbated by the shortage of parking, has become a significant disincentive to on-campus presence. While UC Berkeley would continue to expand its many alternate-mode incentives under the 2020 LRDP, the 2020 LRDP also proposes to increase University parking by up to 30 percent over current and approved spaces. As described below, however, UC Berkeley would reduce this increase to 23 percent if construction begins on a proposed new rapid transit system to the campus by 2010.

**Campus Open Space**. The UC Berkeley campus is a unique synergy of natural and formal elements. The organic forms of the creek and the sloping terrain contrast with the axial geometry of historic places such as Campanile Way and Esplanade. Together these elements provide the campus with a rich variety of open spaces for both quiet contemplation and active recreation, and a peaceful counterpoint to its urbanized environs. The 2020 LRDP includes policies to invest in restoring and renewing the campus landscape and creating open spaces independently or in conjunction with building projects. The Design Frameworks described below include further policies and guidelines to ensure that new investment preserves and enhances the image and character of the campus.

**Design Framework**. The 2020 LRDP is organized based on three distinct zones of the campus – Campus Park, City Environs, and Hill Campus – which differ significantly in terms of physical form, character, capacity, and environmental sensitivity. In order to guide UC Berkeley toward capital investment decisions that preserve and enhance the unique qualities of each, the 2020 LRDP includes a Design Framework for each zone which prescribes land use and design policies and provides guidelines to shape future individual projects.

In recognition of the extraordinary visual and cultural legacy of the Campus Park, the 2020 LRDP includes general Design Guidelines for the Campus Park as a whole, as well as more prescriptive guidelines for areas of particular contextual sensitivity, such as the classical core and the city interface. The guidelines also designate preservation areas of the Campus Park landscape where no new structures may intrude. While the design of each new project should reflect its own time and place, it should also reflect the enduring values of elegance, quality and durability, and contribute to a coherent and memorable image for the Campus Park.

**Sustainable Campus**. As one of the world's great research universities, UC Berkeley has a special obligation to serve as a model of how creative design can both minimize resource consumption and enhance environmental quality. Each new capital investment at UC Berkeley has the potential to advance the state of the art in responsible, sustainable design and thereby contribute to its mission of public service. In July 2003, The Regents adopted a Universitywide approach to Green Buildings and Clean Energy practices. The 2020 LRDP includes policies to implement its provisions, including the explicit consideration of life cycle costs in the analysis of alternative investments.

**Strategic Investment**. Given the scarcity of both land and capital in relation to the future needs of the campus, UC Berkeley must ensure that each investment decision represents the best possible use of these limited resources and the best long-term solution for the campus as a whole. Capital investment decisions are often strongly influenced by the magnitude of first cost. Seismic retrofits, for example, are often less expensive than new buildings. Seismic retrofits alone do not improve other inadequate building systems, dysfunctional layouts, or insensitive design, however. In fact, they perpetuate and often exacerbate them. The 2020 LRDP includes a detailed Project Approval Process that ensures that a full range of alternate solutions is considered and used to inform investment decisions.

***Summary of Environmental Review***

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the 2020 LRDP. The 2020 LRDP also includes a project-specific evaluation of the proposed Tien Center for East Asian Studies. The Draft EIR consists of two volumes: Volume 1 includes a program-level analysis of the 2020 LRDP as well as the project-specific analysis of the Tien Center; Volume 2 includes technical appendices in support of Volume 1. The Final EIR includes Volumes 3a and 3b, which contain the comments on and responses to public comments received on the Draft EIR, a summary of changes to the Draft EIR made in response to those comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

At the early stage of formulation of the 2020 LRDP, UC Berkeley held two informal open house workshops in March 2003, to which the public was invited. Staff presented a general overview of concepts under consideration for the 2020 LRDP and invited questions and comments. A Notice of Preparation and Initial Study, published on August 29, 2003, notified the public of the preparation of a Draft EIR and described its proposed scope. UC Berkeley held a scoping meeting on September 22, 2003, at which the public was invited to comment on the scope of the EIR.

The Draft EIR was published on April 15, 2004, and was circulated for a 61-day comment period ending June 14, 2004. The Draft EIR incorporated the 2020 LRDP in its entirety as the Project Description. At the request of the City of Berkeley, the comment period was extended to June 18, 2004. UC Berkeley staff presented a preview of the Draft EIR to City of Berkeley staff on April 12, 2004, in advance of formal publication.

Public hearings were held on May 5 and May 11, 2004 at which oral comments were recorded from 53 speakers. Written comments on the Draft EIR were received from 4 federal and state agencies, 6 regional and local agencies, and 300 organizations and individuals. The comment letters and public hearing transcripts, as well as the University's responses to all substantive comments, are contained in the Final EIR.

In August 2004, the Chancellor of UC Berkeley met with the Mayor of Berkeley to discuss the City's concerns over the pace of 2020 LRDP approval and over three particular aspects of the 2020 LRDP: faculty housing in the Hill Campus, the magnitude of the proposed increase in University parking, and the fiscal impacts of campus operations on the City. The Chancellor agreed to request consideration of the 2020 LRDP by The Regents be postponed from November 2004 to January 2005, to allow for further consideration of these topics.

***Environmental Impact Summary***

Implementation of the 2020 LRDP would have the potential to result in several significant impacts on the environment. A summary table of these impacts is included in Volume 1, Chapter 2, of the 2020 LRDP EIR. As shown in the table, many of these impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of Continuing Best Practices and Mitigation Measures; however, several significant and unavoidable impacts in the following areas would remain even after these Best Practices and Mitigations:

**Air Quality**: Operational emissions from implementation of the 2020 LRDP may hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan. With the incorporation of diesel particulate matter into air risk analyses, implementation of the 2020 LRDP would contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in toxic air contaminants from stationary and area sources.

**Cultural Resources**: Projects developed under the 2020 LRDP could, in some instances, cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of historical and/or archaeological resources.

**Noise**: University housing developed under the 2020 LRDP could expose UC residents to excessive noise levels. Noise resulting from demolition and construction activities necessary for implementation of the 2020 LRDP could, in some instances, cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels at property lines, in excess of standards prescribed in the City of Berkeley noise ordinance.

**Traffic**: The 2020 LRDP would increase vehicle trips and traffic congestion at seven intersections to unacceptable levels and would exacerbate unacceptable conditions at an eighth. These impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels, but implementation of the measures required is outside the jurisdiction of The Regents.

The 2020 LRDP would increase vehicle trips and traffic congestion at two intersections, leading to substantial degradation in level of service that cannot be mitigated.

- The signaled University Avenue-Sixth Street intersection is projected to operate at Level of Service (LOS) F, the least favorable rating, during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 7 percent during the AM peak hour, and 6 percent during the PM peak hour.

- The signaled University Avenue-San Pablo Avenue intersection is projected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 8 percent during the AM peak hour, and 6 percent during the PM peak hour.

Development under the 2020 LRDP would cause the following roadways to exceed the level of service standard established by the Congestion Management Agency:

- Ashby Avenue eastbound, between College Avenue and Domingo Street
- Ashby Avenue westbound, between Adeline Street and San Pablo Avenue
- University Avenue westbound, between MLK Jr. Way and I-80
- San Pablo Avenue northbound, between Gilman Street and Marin Avenue
- Shattuck Avenue southbound, between Dwight Way and Adeline Street
- Shattuck Avenue southbound, between Hearst Avenue and University Avenue
- Dwight Way westbound, between MLK Jr. Way and Sixth Street

***Key Public Concerns***

Several topics of concern regarding implementation of the 2020 LRDP were raised by the City of Berkeley and by numerous other commentors:

**Hill Campus Faculty Housing**. The Draft 2020 LRDP proposed the potential construction of up to 100 new faculty housing units in the Hill Campus. Two areas were designated as potential sites for some of this housing, pending further study. UC Berkeley received 165 letters in which new faculty housing in the Hill Campus was a topic of concern. Commentors cited potential traffic, wildfire hazard, emergency egress and access, and ecological and hydrological impacts.

After further analysis, the 100 units of faculty housing has been deleted as a prospective land use in the Hill Campus. The modest targets for faculty housing established by the Strategic Academic Plan can be met with new housing on flatland sites and at University Village Albany.

**Expansion of University Parking**. The Draft 2020 LRDP proposed an increase of up to 2,300 net new parking spaces on the Campus Park and Adjacent Blocks. UC Berkeley received 19 letters which directly address the magnitude of this increase, along with many others which address the issues of traffic and inadequate investment in alternative modes of travel.

Further analysis confirms the estimated future demand for 2,300 net new spaces by 2020, if campus growth occurs as projected and UC Berkeley's current drive-alone rates continue. As part of this analysis, UC Berkeley compared its parking ratios with several other urban research universities suggested by EIR commentors as having exemplary transit incentive programs and found its parking ratios are comparable to ratios at those other universities and would continue to be comparable even after implementation of the 2020 LRDP; however, if current drive-alone rates could be further reduced in the future through a combination of transit incentives and improvements in transit service, parking demand would also be reduced.

**Fiscal Impacts**. UC Berkeley received several letters expressing concern about the impact of campus operations on the city budget. The City of Berkeley also prepared an economic study on the topic. The fiscal impacts of University campuses on local jurisdictions are a matter of statewide law and policy. UC Berkeley staff have met regularly with City staff since June 2004 in an effort to identify ways to minimize these impacts, consistent with existing law.

***Findings***

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR for the 2020 LRDP, in conformance with CEQA. The Findings also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in light of its unavoidable significant impacts in the areas of air quality, cultural resources, noise, and traffic.

At the invitation of Committee Chair Hopkinson, Berkeley Mayor Tom Bates addressed the Committee. Mayor Bates commented on important issues he believed needed to be resolved concerning the LRDP. He reported that the City was not opposed to the plan overall. The City had provided a large number of comments during the review period and the campus had responded to them, but he believed that the period between the publication of those responses and the date for LRDP approval was insufficient and that it had prevented any students from having input. He stated that the City has attempted to negotiate with the University over issues that needed further discussion. The first problematic issue, in the City's view, was the program EIR, which refers to future projects without describing them. He believed that each large project should have an extended EIR. The second issue was that parking for 2,300 cars is planned, which seemed unreasonably high. The third issue was that the City has legitimate costs associated with the campus that should be recognized and for which the City should be compensated, including fire and emergency medical services. If the Regents ratify the LRDP, he believed the City would be at a disadvantage in negotiating these issues. He

requested a postponement to mid-March to try to come to a unified agreement. Otherwise, he reported, the City will be placed in a position of having to sue the University.

Committee Chair Hopkinson acknowledged Mayor Bates' concerns and thanked him for bringing them to the Committee's attention.

Regent Montoya asked about the extent of the campus' transportation programs. Mr. O'Banion reported that a discount bus pass program for faculty and staff had been instituted the previous fall, students receive passes to ride public transit for free, faculty and staff receive discounted bus passes, there is a campus shuttle system, and there are incentives for van and car pools. The campus and the City hope to pursue additional transportation programs together. He noted that while subsidy programs are important, surveys indicate that people drive because it is convenient; thus, travel time and convenience are the issues that need to be addressed. A bus rapid transit service for students and staff has the potential to attract a large ridership.

Regent-designate Juline noted that the LRDP projects growth in academic staff and only a slight change in the student-faculty ratio. He asked whether the campus' academic plan envisions more teaching by academic staff and a reduction in the number of professors. Mr. O'Banion responded that the projection corresponds to increases in postdoctoral fellows and research associates. The mix moves towards greater interaction with non-faculty personnel as part of the educational experience and recognizes greater integration of education with research.

Regent Johnson was concerned about the town-gown relationship, but she believed that the request to postpone consideration of the LRDP was based not on needing time to review the LRDP itself but only to negotiate specific issues. She was doubtful that these issues could be resolved in a few months; therefore, she supported approval of the LRDP as recommended, with the knowledge that President Dynes had made a commitment to continue working with the City to reach agreement.

Regent Anderson asked about the nature of the concerns of State and federal agencies that had commented on the LRDP. Mr. O'Banion responded that the issues raised were not substantive. Regent Anderson noted it appeared that the campus planned to increase the ratio of parking spaces to people in the future. Mr. O'Banion responded that the 1,800-space increase produced a ratio to the campus population that was unchanged from the 1990 LRDP proposal. There are provisions in the plan to monitor annually the campus' permit sales and to assure that those with permits are using the appropriate facilities. Drive-alone rates will be monitored, also, to ensure they do not increase.

Regent Ornellas doubted whether, in a multi-jurisdictional interaction such as this, extending the approval period for the LRDP would be effective. He noted that LRDPs are fluid by nature and are revisited regularly.

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary