The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
November 15, 2005
Open Session

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Hopkinson, Johnson, Juline, Kozberg, Ruiz, and Schilling; Advisory members Ledesma, Oakley, and Miller

In attendance: Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Acting Provost Hume, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Vice President Hershman, Chancellor Córdova, and Recording Secretary Bryan

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

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Committee Chair Hopkinson conducted a public comment period for the purpose of hearing from those who wished to comment on University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Committee:

A. Mr. Nicolai Linesch, a UC Davis student, addressed the development of a University sustainable transportation policy. He thanked the Regents for supporting the students' efforts to put a policy in place. He suggested that the new policy be clearly defined, state measurable goals, and focus on reducing transportation costs.

B. Mr. Ted Buhler, a UC Davis graduate student, believed the passage of a strong sustainable transportation policy is necessary to make campuses safer. He encouraged the Committee to ask the Office of the President for a policy that will direct campuses to work with their communities to make transportation between cities and campuses easy and economical.

C. Ms. Jeannie Biniek, representing the UC Student Association, believed that the number of hours of work a student is expected to do under the University's budget proposal was excessive and that increased fees were causing students to build up large debts. She believed that upon graduation students were making less than has been reported by the University. She advocated increasing the return to aid to 33 percent.

2. **APPROVAL OF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 2006-2007 BUDGET FOR STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, AND DISCUSSION OF ACADEMIC CONTEXT FOR CAPITAL PLANNING AND FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM – STATE AND NON-STATE FUNDS**

The President recommended that, subject to concurrence of the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to The Regents that the 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements be approved as presented in the document titled, *2006-2007 Budget for State Capital Improvements*, which was mailed in advance of the meeting.

It was recalled that the State-funded program is based on the Compact with the Governor, which specifies the Governor's support for $345 million annually for UC State capital outlay projects, to be funded through either general obligation bonds or State lease revenue bonds. The Governor has not yet indicated which fund source he will support for 2006-07. A decision about a GO bond measure needs to be made by summer of 2006 to qualify for the November 2006 ballot. The State capital budget document includes the projects and budget proposed for approval in 2006-07, along with future State funding plans by campus for the next four years, 2007-08 through 2010-11. In addition, both the five-year State and non-State capital plans are summarized in the document, *Five-Year Capital Program Non-State and State Funds 2005-2006 to 2009-2010.*

Five-Year Capital Program – State and Non-State Funds

The report *University of California Five-Year Capital Program Non-State and State Funds 2005-2006 to 2009-2010* provides an overview of longer-term capital plans. In developing the five-year program, the campuses took into account current fiscal realities, debt capacity constraints, and their assigned State capital funding targets. Specific projects to be funded from non-State sources will continue to be brought to The Regents for approval at its regular meetings, when the scope and cost of projects are made final and the feasibility of funding plans is confirmed. It is anticipated that the scope, cost, and funding plan of these future projects will change to some degree by the time they are presented for project and funding approval.

The report includes a chapter for each campus that includes the following information:

- An overview of the campus planning context in which the projection of capital projects have been developed.

- A table that displays the list of projects that the campus estimates it will bring forward for approval during the five-year period, followed by a summary of the total project costs and anticipated fund sources that will support the Capital Program.

- A brief narrative description of each capital project proposed for funding from non-State sources during the five-year period. Descriptions of State-funded projects can be found in the 2006-2007 Budget for State Capital Improvements.

The Capital Program is based on the campuses' best estimates of non-State and State fund sources that will be available for defined capital projects over the five-year period. These fund sources include debt financing, campus resources, gifts, capital reserves, and federal and State funds. The State capital funds displayed in the project tables include both fully-funded and jointly funded State and non-State sources.

Some campus capital development has taken place through land lease agreements and other development arrangements with third-party entities, and these projects are not normally included in the capital budget but rather are approved through a variety of contractual agreements. Potential third-party developments on the campuses are included in this report, however, in order to display the full range of capital development activities expected to take place on the campuses over the next five years.

It should be noted that while campus projects address a wide range of facilities needs, the campus capital programs outlined in the report do not meet all identified capital needs. The campuses have included only those projects that they believe can be sufficiently defined in terms of scope and cost at this time and for which a reasonable funding plan can be defined. For example, potential projects to meet identified needs may not be included in the program because alternative solutions are still being evaluated or funding sources cannot be identified. Some campuses are evaluating the feasibility of capital campaigns to raise gift funds for capital purposes or are in the process of identifying the priority projects to be included in a future gift campaign and, therefore, have not included all projects that might be funded from future gifts.

University of California
2005-06 to 2009-10 Capital Program

Summary by Program Category and Fund Source
($000s)

Program Category	Debt	Equity	Gifts[1]	Capital Reserves	Federal	Total Non-State Funds	State Funds
Education & General							
General Campus	143,317	291,523	413,022		19,157	867,019	[1,270,035]
Health Sciences	114,365	226,105	139,210	12,185	3,200	495,065	[193,395]
subtotal	257,682	517,628	552,232	12,185	22,357	1,362,084	[1,463,430]
Infrastructure	22,855	136,689	0	0		159,544	[169,919]
Auxiliary Enterprises & Fee-Supported	902,023	98,992	20,670	170,571		1,192,256	
Medical Center	65,000	612	79,124	487,304		632,040	
TOTAL	1,247,560	753,921	652,026	670,060	22,357	3,345,924	[1,633,349]
	37%	23%	19%	20%	1%	100%	

[1] Funding summary does not include potential gift-funded projects (Category 2) that will move forward only when when funding is available.

In the summary table by program category and fund source, the projected total for all fund sources for the ten campuses is $3.3 billion, with approximately $1.2 billion identified as debt financing. Last year, the approximate amount of debt financing was projected at slightly over $2 billion.

Academic Context for Capital Planning

Acting Provost Hume discussed the way in which campus capital programs are dependent upon and driven by academic planning. Academic planning is an ongoing process, continually being reassessed as the academic environment changes. Translating academic priorities into a capital program is complicated by several factors. Academic planning is a process that is run by or for the chancellor on each campus. The process informs the chancellor of academic priorities and needs. It is a consultative process that involves deans, department chairs, individual faculty, student representatives, senate committees, and other informed staff and administrators. Sometimes it has a very high profile, with specifically appointed committees around specific tasks; at other times, it may have a lower profile, but it is continuous at campuses. The academic priorities that this planning produces form the basis of the chancellors' decisions about new buildings and about renovation projects. Some things other than academic priorities have to be factored into these decisions. There are other campus needs such as life safety, infrastructure development, capital renewal, student housing, and staff and student amenities. A major

consideration is the availability of funds; the potential sources, the amount of funds available, and the timing of their availability. Building a capital program is therefore an informed balancing act for each chancellor. It is such a complex process that campuses have established formal committees to advise the chancellor on priorities, funding, and sequencing. The unique nature of both programs and fundings make it necessary for each campus to have ultimate control over its own priorities and sequencing. As an example of the process, Mr. Hume reported that the Life Sciences Replacement Building at UCLA was to replace an obsolete and unsafe group of laboratories. The existing building, which was 40 years old and had never been upgraded, housed a discipline that has changed tremendously. The project was to meet changing needs in the life sciences, not just to renew an out-of-date building. The review recognized that the quality of the life sciences needed to be strengthened to meet the standards of modern science. Because the life sciences and medical sciences were developing a closer relationship, improving this program became the highest priority of the campus. UCLA had the combined circumstances of a high-priority academic program and a building that was not only inadequate to help the campus achieve its academic goals, it was also unsafe. The new building allows for various academic initiatives, including genomics, informatics, and stem cell biology. It will help UCLA attract high-quality faculty and graduate students to further improve the quality of the program. Its 45 new laboratories will provide a venue for involving undergraduates in research, another key aspect of the campus' academic priorities.

Mr. Hume discussed how funding and academic planning interact. Availability of funding does not change academic priorities, but it does affect the timing and sequencing of how priorities are implemented. For example, if a campus decides that a new physics building is needed for its academic priorities but it cannot afford it through other fund sources, then construction probably will be deferred until a donor can be found to support it. Another way funding affects the capital program is that some fundings may be used only for specific programs; for example, student fees from referenda must be dedicated to student projects, whatever the academic priorities.

In summary, Mr. Hume commented that the ongoing academic planning process is managed by the chancellor. It is consultative, involving a wide spectrum of the campus community. The capital program is a response to academic needs and priorities and is further shaped by other campus needs and by terms and availability of funding. It is therefore unique to each campus' particular set of circumstances.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that the campuses, the Academic Senate, and the Office of the President are working intently on academic planning. She anticipated hearing more about how it interacts with the capital planning process.

As background for discussing the capital budget, Vice President Hershman provided an overview of the capital planning and budgeting process from the perspective of the Office of the President. He reviewed the 2006-07 request to the State for capital funding as well as the University's planning for the next five years with respect to State funds and non-State funds. He provided a brief overview of the five-year State capital budget plan for the University for each campus for 2006-07, and the five-year capital State and non-State funds, with a time frame to 2009-10.

Mr. Hershman reported that campuses' capital budget totals $340 million. He noted that the University's efforts with respect to the State over the last 25 years have been very successful. The governors and legislators have supported The Regents' priorities for capital outlay and have funded every project. The University submits detailed project planning guides to the State to support each project. The Compact with the Governor involves $345 million a year that the State has committed for UC capital outlay, which does not meet the University's total need. Each year, the University submits a report, required by legislation, to demonstrate the total need calculation, which is close to $700 million a year for State supportable capital, which does not include auxiliary enterprises. This process works well in terms of establishing an amount of money each year. Until recent years, the program was funded from a combination of general obligation bonds and lease revenue bonds. Beginning in 2000-01, lease revenue bond funding from the State supported hospitals, seismic work, the Merced campus, and the Science and Innovation Institutes. The agreement for the future is for $345 million a year.

Vice President Hershman described what has driven the capital budget for the last few years. He recalled that the University has been growing at a rate of about 5,000 students a year. The need to accommodate students and faculty has been the highest priority at some of the campuses. There is also a significant need for seismic corrections, particularly at the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses. Renewal and upgrade of buildings is the final area driving the budget. One of the measures of these needs is to compare total space to California Postsecondary Education Commission guidelines. In the early 1990s, the University met the guidelines, but in recent years, with enrollment growth, the level declined substantially and at the growth campuses is 70 percent below standard. Progress is being made, however; it is hoped to return to 100 percent of standard within five years, depending upon new bond issues.

Mr. Hershman mentioned some of the challenges the University is facing with respect to its capital budget. These include State and federal budget problems and a crisis in the construction market caused by global economic growth, the cost of materials, and the increase in construction volume. In order to meet academic priorities, the University is struggling to contain costs on every project.

Concerning the capital planning process, Mr. Hershman reported that a five-year allocation is made to each campus for its State capital budget. This helps with respect to planning and setting priorities. Campuses are permitted to keep any money they can save through cost cutting. He described briefly the degree of focus on seismic corrections and program enhancements of each campus.

Vice President Hershman discussed what might be funded over a five-year period from non-State funds. The fund sources include debt, equity, and gifts, and the program categories include basic educational general campus and health sciences programs, infrastructure, auxiliary enterprises, and academic medical centers. The five-year budget is $3.3 billion, which is slightly less than what was projected last year. He noted that most of the money is projected to be spent for the capital needs of auxiliary enterprises and the hospitals. Gift campaigns and other campus funds are used to help support the capital program, including funding for infrastructure.

Regent Juline asked what had changed in the budget that had not been anticipated the year before. Mr. Hershman responded that most of the projects had been envisioned, although the dollars or time frame may have changed.

Regent Ruiz asked whether during the planning process there is an opportunity to question projects. Mr. Hershman responded that the Office of the President reviews every project to ensure that it is justified and likely to be approved by the Department of Finance. Even within their targets, campuses tend to want their projects to proceed quickly. The timing must be considered to ensure that the program will be balanced over a period of years. Debt financing and gifts are closely scrutinized. New programs are not incorporated into the budget request until they have been reviewed and approved by The Regents.

Faculty Representative Oakley asked whether there is systematic adjustment of the projected cost of capital projects as new information on inflation is obtained. Mr. Hershman responded that cost estimates are revised as the market changes. The cost of each project must be defended before the Legislature.

Regent Kozberg asked about the University's level of debt. Mr. Hershman responded that general obligation bonds involve the credit of the State. State lease-revenue bonds count against both the State's and the University's debt levels. The growth rate in debt has been dramatic over the past ten years, due mainly to the amount of student housing the University has built.

Committee Chair Hopkinson believed that, as the Committee is becoming more involved in the process, the five year-plan should be as comprehensive as possible. She suggested that the plan receive some level of Committee approval.

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

3. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR CANCER CENTER EXPANSION, DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend to the Regents that the 2005-06 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include the following project:

> Davis: Cancer Center Expansion – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment – $35.4 million to be funded from hospital reserves ($10 million) and gifts ($25.4 million).

It was recalled that the Davis campus proposes to construct a $35.4 million facility adjunct to the existing Cancer Center with a courtyard separating the two spaces which would provide natural light between both buildings. The two facilities would be linked by a second-floor bridge.

Entering its second decade, the Cancer Center has achieved an important milestone. The National Cancer Institute (NCI) designated it an NCI Cancer Center in July 2002 and in August 2005, renewed the designation for five years. As it is the only NCI designated cancer center between San Francisco and the Oregon border, patients consider UC Davis to be the best place for cancer detection, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and education. Since opening in 1991, the Cancer Center has provided increasingly progressive leadership to, organization of, and support for cancer investigation.

The Cancer Center's organization takes full advantage of UC Davis' strengths in biological and medical research. On the Davis campus, there are numerous laboratories engaged in cancer research: the Center for Comparative Medicine, the Primate Center, the School of Veterinary Medicine, the Division of Biological Sciences, the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (with numerous laboratories engaged in cancer research across the campus), the Center for Functional Genomics and Bioinformatics, the laboratories of the Rowe Program in Genetics, the Institute for Environmental Toxicology, laboratories for the School of Medicine, and a fully-developed veterinary hospital with both outpatient and inpatient services.

The UC Davis Cancer Center has an active, cross-disciplinary clinical program offering patients access to novel and standard therapeutic interventions as well as chemo-preventive measures against disease recurrence. Regular multidisciplinary conferences that evaluate eligibility for clinical trials, novel surgical approaches, and adjunctive

therapies, and nutritional, genetic, and psychosocial support are offered as part of patient support management. UC Davis is a strong participant in NCI-sponsored national cooperative group trials, investigator-initiated studies, and collaborative efforts between UCD investigators and industry sponsors.

Affiliations

The UC Davis Health System (UCDHS) and regional health systems in Merced and Yuba City-Marysville joined to build community cancer centers to serve cancer programs and patients by developing satellite centers in these outlying areas. These facilities are the result of collaborations between UCDHS, Mercy Hospital and Health Services, and the Fremont-Rideout Health Group. Both facilities deliver complete outpatient chemotherapy and radiation oncology services, and both are linked to the Cancer Center by telemedicine systems, allowing for patient consultations, radiological diagnostics, and radiation therapy planning.

The Cancer Center has joined with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) to form a unique partnership to fight cancer. LLNL has a portable laboratory at the Sacramento campus, and the two groups work together every day. The institutions have created an integrated cancer research program to accelerate discoveries that help prevent, diagnose, and treat cancer. The affiliation brings together the research and development strengths of Lawrence Livermore scientists and engineers, particularly in biomedical technology and genomics, with the basic science capabilities of patient-centered clinical researchers at the Cancer Center. This partnership gives cancer researchers immediate access to the fastest, biggest, and best technology in the United States. Moreover, the addition of LLNL scientists to departments at UCD has been a tremendous intellectual infusion, enhancing all aspects of departmental research activities.

A combination of accomplished senior investigators and highly promising young investigators recruited in association with the Cancer Center gives these programs considerable scientific depth and momentum. Since NCI designation, the impact of the program throughout the campus and region has greatly increased.

The Cancer Center coordinates the work of more than 200 scientists actively engaged in over 317 cancer research projects. As such, the UC Davis Cancer Center research program brings together scientists from seventeen schools, divisions, and programs on three campuses: the UCDMC campus, the main UC Davis campus, and LLNL. This blend of institutions and disciplines gives the research program a unique personality and the potential to contribute to the national cancer agenda in important ways.

Need for Project

The Center provides facilities that support a variety of services for cancer patients. Based on current workload, all sections and departments serving and supporting the clinical enterprise operate at capacity. Because patient volume has increased so rapidly, additional staff have been employed, resulting in the need for work and exam spaces to be shared by multiple physicians, nurses, and administrative support staff, which reduces effectiveness and affects the quality of care. With increased volumes, additional consumables, supplies, and patient care items must be accommodated, yet the existing space fails to meet the demand as dictated by patient care standards and the State Department of Health and Human Services. For example, because there are insufficient infusion spaces, the clinic must occasionally refer outpatients to the hospital for long infusions, rather than accommodate them within the outpatient zone of the Cancer Center. Consequently, the infusion, clinical, administrative, and support components are extremely short of authorized program space.

This project would address a number of space as well as functional deficiencies that have had a negative impact on both the clinical and infusion services at the Cancer Center. The lack of sufficient treatment, exam, and support space has been exacerbated by the steady increase in patient encounters, external referrals, and the number of patients enrolled in the clinical trial program.

Receiving NCI designation in July 2002 has led to an increase in contracts and grants. With the Cancer Center's redesignation in August 2005, additional contracts and grants are expected in conjunction with the NIH guaranteed funding of $14 million through the year 2010. Several program enhancements that have been undertaken since NCI designation have consumed any and all clinical space. In addition, the expansion of drug and clinical trials has not only added research subjects but also additional staff to provide the necessary services mandated by the grantors. These events have further intensified the space shortage situation. Failure to remedy this situation would result in program stagnation, require patients seeking services to turn elsewhere, affect the Medical Center's ability to attract highly-qualified faculty, and lead to a reduction in contracts and grants.

Project Description

The proposed three-story structure will include 23,600 asf, with a building total of 46,415 gsf, taking into consideration space for general circulation, public restrooms, common areas, mechanical, electrical and telecommunications areas, and other non-assignable areas.

An additional 6,715 asf (9,016 gsf) of existing Cancer Center space on the first and second floors will be remodeled. Site development will include extension of campus utilities, an extended main-entry drive with a drop-off area, and landscaping. A courtyard between the new and existing buildings is proposed to take advantage of natural light and the mild Sacramento climate. A second-floor bridge will link the new addition to the

existing Cancer Center. Space below this link will also serve as the new main lobby entrance, facilitate circulation between the two buildings, and provide better directory signage for visitors and patients.

The table below summarizes the major elements of the space program:

Cancer Center Expansion Program
Assignable Square Feet (asf)

	asf
Expansion Elements	
Pediatric Hematology-Oncology Clinic	1,740
Pediatric Infusion	2,985
Pediatric Shared Support	2,175
Adult Clinic	7,070
Adult Infusion	6,330
Infusion Pharmacy	1,350
Clinic Administration	250
Shared Common Areas	1,700
subtotal	**23,600**
Remodel Elements	
Clinical Laboratory	1,995
Outpatient Pharmacy	1,810
Academic & Cancer Center Administration	2,550
Shared Common Areas	360
subtotal	**6,715**
Total asf	30,315
Total ogsf	55,431

The proposed site is a 1.5-acre, rectangular parcel. It is located northeast of the intersection of X and 45th Streets, due north of the existing Cancer Center. To the south is the site for the new Education Building, and a cluster of three research buildings. The hospital zone starts on the northwest corner of the intersection. The new hospital main entrance will be approximately 300 feet from this intersection when the Surgery and Emergency Services Pavilion project is completed in early 2009. The Administrative Support Building, which houses the main UCDHS computer center and telecommunications, is directly southeast of the proposed site, and the Lawrence Ellison Ambulatory Care Center is a two-minute walk to the east.

The campus anticipates returning for design approval in March 2006, with a bid date no later than spring 2007 and construction to begin shortly thereafter. The project is expected to be completed in April 2009.

Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards

This project will comply with the *Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards* dated June 16, 2004. As required by this policy, the project will adopt the principles 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.

CEQA Classification

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and University procedures for implementation of CEQA, a Tiered Focused Environmental Impact Report will be prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts of this project.

Financial Feasibility

The total cost of $35,400,000 at CCCI 4735 will be funded from hospital reserves ($10 million) and gifts ($25.4 million). Of the $25.4 million in gifts, $5 million has already been received from the Wayne and Gladys Valley Foundation.

As of September 2005 the status of gifts is as follows:

Gifts in Hand	$ 5,000,000
Gifts Pledged	50,000
Gifts to be Raised	20,350,000
	$25,400,000

The campus expects the balance of funding to be available in cash or pledges prior to going to bid or the bidding will be deferred. If all of the gift funds are not in hand at the time of construction bidding, the campus will provide the funds necessary to comply with Regental policy regarding bid and award, so that the project may proceed, and will fund any shortfall of the gift collections during the construction period.

Regent Johnson supported continued development of the UC Davis Medical Center Cancer Center, which has become the facility of choice for the population of the Central Valley area.

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio noted that as of the first quarter of the fiscal year, the University has experienced a 10 percent escalation in costs, and the trend is expected to continue to increase, perhaps to 20 percent. While costs have increased, there has been a decrease in bid activity.

Committee Chair Hopkinson asked for a report that would disclose how the campuses determine their allocations for the campus administration budgets in their projects. Senior Vice President Mullinix responded that he would provide the report at the January meeting.

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

4. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ENGINEERING UNIT 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

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

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

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of Engineering Unit 3, Irvine campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2003, The Regents approved the 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements, which included the Engineering Unit 3 project at a sum of $63,184,000 at CCCI 4100. In November 2004, The Regents approved, as an element of the 2005-06 Regents' Budget for Capital Improvements, an inflationary increase of $2,546,000 for C and E portions of the Engineering Unit 3 budget. In January 2005, The Regents approved external financing for the project of $8,591,000. The budget for this project now totals $65,730,000 at CCCI 4328, to be funded from a combination of State funds ($53,963,000), campus funds ($3,176,000), and external financing ($8,591,000).

In June 2005, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum, Inc, as executive architect for this project.

Project Site

The proposed project site is in the campus core within the Engineering-Information and Computer Science (ICS) Quadrangle, adjacent to the Computer Science Unit 3 building that is in construction. This location is occupied by two wood-framed buildings, the ICS-Engineering Research Facility (IERF) and the Computer Science-Engineering (CSE) building, which will be removed as part of the project. The site is in conformance with the campus' Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Project Design

The Engineering Unit 3 project will construct 86,895 asf of space. Of this total, 68,795 asf will be for the Henry Samueli School of Engineering to provide teaching and research laboratories and academic and administrative office space, 5,400 asf will provide a 350-seat general assignment lecture hall, and 12,700 asf will be for surge space to address other high-priority academic needs.

The project program has been divided into the wet-dry laboratory spaces and the 350-seat lecture hall-administrative-faculty office space. This division is reflected in the L-shaped design of the building, with a laboratory wing and lecture hall-office wing. The elevator, stair tower, restrooms, and utility core are located in the space between the two wings.

The five-level building will be constructed of poured-in-place, integral colored concrete, with brick and tile accents, textured and precast concrete elements, and clear vision windows that will complement and be a visual bridge between the CAL IT2 and CS3-Bren Hall buildings. The materials and colors will reinforce the contextual design designated for the Engineering Quad.

The primary entrance to the building is located off the Ring Mall and a breezeway that opens up to the common areas for CAL IT2 and CS3-Bren Hall. The 350-seat lecture hall is situated directly off the building's main entry on the ground floor and has direct access to the Ring Mall.

The building's entry lobby consists of the five-story, glass-enclosed stair tower or "lantern," elevator, restroom, and utility core. This is situated at the axis of the two wings of the building and is repeated on each of the five floors.

This project will comply with the President's Policy for Green Building and Clean Energy Standards. The approach to site sustainability development focuses on both preserving and enhancing the natural site ecology. The sustainable design will use the simplest and most durable technologies appropriate to the functional need and to incorporate passive energy-conserving strategies responsive to the local climate.

Sustainable design strategies for this project include the following: low-impact site development, natural storm water strategies, passive solar design, effective use of daylight, energy efficient design, renewable energy strategies, indoor environmental quality, water conservation measures, environmentally preferable building materials, waste reduction, and recycling. The project will seek to attain a LEED rating of Certified at 27 points.

The design of Engineering Unit 3 has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by an independent design consultant, independent seismic-structural consultant, and an independent cost estimator.

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

Environmental Impact Summary

A Tiered Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the Engineering Unit 3 project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and University Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. The 30-day public review period for the Draft Tiered Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration began on September 15, 2005 and ended on October 15, 2005. During that time, various local, State, and federal agencies and service providers, as well as interested individuals and organizations reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Comments and responses are included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The primary concern about this project relates to the demolition of one of the two facilities on site, the Information & Computer Sciences Engineering Research Facility (IERF). The IERF facility was designed by Frank O. Gehry and Associates in the 1980s. While the IERF is representative of Mr. Gehry's work at the time, it is not representative of the work for which he is widely known. The facility has not held up well over time. Its roof leaks extensively and there is widespread water damage. The HVAC system is inadequate. The IS-MND found the IERF facility to not meet the criteria for an historic resource; however, UCI will preserve the record of the IERF through architectural photography, preservation of architectural drawings, and written history of the building.

Implementation of the project will have no impact or a less than significant impact in the following environmental impact areas: aesthetics, agricultural resources; biological resources; hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; mineral resources; population and housing; recreation, transportation, and traffic; and utilities and service systems. It has the potential to have significant impacts to the following environmental impact areas unless the recommended LRDP EIR mitigation measures described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are incorporated into the project: air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; noise; and public services. After adoption of the recommended mitigation measures, all impacts will be

reduced to less than significant levels. All mitigation measures will be monitored through the Mitigation Monitoring Program established for the LRDP.

Findings

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

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

Committee Chair Hopkinson commented that the structure and process for developing the Irvine campus are among the University's best. She also complimented the design of this project.

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

5. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE 2005 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Final EIR for the UC Riverside 2005 Long Range Development Plan.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

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 2005 Long Range Development Plan, Riverside campus.

[The Final EIR, 2005 Long Range Development Plan, 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.]

It was recalled that campus development has been governed by the 1990 LRDP and associated Final EIR since July 1990. Changes in the academic programs, anticipated increases in student enrollment, and changes in related space requirements have necessitated an update to the 1990 LRDP.

The 2005 Long Range Development Plan is a policy and land use plan to guide physical development of the main campus in Riverside. Based upon academic and student-life goals, the 2005 LRDP identifies institutional and development objectives, delineates campus land uses, and estimates the new building space needed to support program expansion to accommodate 25,000 students through the planning horizon year 2015-16. The 2005 LRDP updates the previous plan, adopted by The Regents in 1990.

Summary of the 2005 LRDP

The 2005 LRDP provides for the following:

Population: The 2005 LRDP projects a regular academic year enrollment of 25,000 (three quarter average headcount) by 2015-16. In addition, UC Riverside projects modest increases in summer session enrollment and anticipates that the faculty and staff population will increase to 7,916.

Building Space: The 2005 LRDP projections indicate campus space needs increasing to approximately 11.8 million gsf, an increase of 7.1 million gsf by 2015-16. Adoption of the 2005 LRDP does not constitute a commitment to specific projects, construction schedules, or funding priorities. Each subsequent building proposal will require specific environmental review and approval, as appropriate, in compliance with CEQA.

Academic Planning

UC Riverside has a total of 82 baccalaureate programs, 19 M.A. programs, 24 M.S. programs, an M.B.A. program, a M.Ed. program, 3 M.F.A programs, 6 types of educational credential programs, the first two years of medical school instruction, and 39 Ph.D. programs. The agricultural programs are integrated with the general campus programs in biological and physical sciences through the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS); the balance of the campus is organized into a College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS); Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE); A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management (AGSM), a Graduate School of Education (GSOE), and a Biomedical Sciences Division. Each of these major academic units is expected to experience growth that is concomitant with the total campus population growth, although there will be some modifications to curriculum offerings and departmental structures within them over time.

Over the ten-year horizon of the 2005 LRDP, it is also likely that new professional schools or colleges will emerge that will respond to the changing educational, research, and commerce needs of the region, state, or the nation. While the nature of expansion or new programs cannot be predicted, the 2005 LRDP provides opportunities for at least two new colleges in its assumptions about land use to account for this possibility. For example, UCR has a growing Division of Biomedical Sciences, which may develop into a full-scale school or college. It has existing connections to programs in CNAS, BCOE, and CHASS. Major new research and teaching curricula may focus on public and environmental health amd new disciplines related to the health sciences, genomics, or genetics. As these areas develop, the need to create new organizational and physical structures to accommodate related academic activities may be desirable. Other new professional schools could include law or public policy.

In general, research at UCR will be characterized by increased collaboration across all disciplines. It will be important to develop opportunities for use of very high-tech and costly equipment that can be easily shared by diverse groups of researchers and students. Total contract and grant activity on the campus is expected to increase dramatically by 2010; thus, there will be significant concurrent growth in the numbers of post-doctoral students and research assistants. In recognition of the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of instruction and research across all areas, the 2005 LRDP proposes a single, open-ended designation for academic land use versus the 1990 LRDP designation of individual college specific precincts.

Key Parameters

The 2005 LRDP provides a comprehensive policy and land use plan that addresses a number of associated parameters:

- Achieve a student enrollment of 25,000 (three quarter average headcount).
- Accommodate 50 percent of the student body in on-campus or campus controlled housing.
- Develop 7.1 million gsf of new space to bring the campus total to 11.8 million gsf, from the baseline level of 4.7 million gsf

Planning Concepts

The 2005 LRDP continues the following planning goals that were central to the 1990 LRDP:

- Create a state-of-the-art plan that conveys the University's excellence.
- Develop land use elements to strengthen academic, cultural, and social interaction.
- Preserve, enhance, and restore the natural environment.
- Strengthen and clarify circulation systems.
- Maintain planning flexibility.

In addition, the 2005 LRDP adds the following goals:

- Accommodate planned growth for UCR to 25,000 students while maintaining flexibility for unanticipated additional needs in the future.
- Recognize teaching and research changes, and encourage interdisciplinary endeavors by identifying a flexible academic zone rather than individual college precincts.
- Increase the size of the on-campus residential community and thereby improve opportunities for social interaction and socialization – a living and learning environment.
- Improve University-town interactions and synergy; encourage new development and intensification of activity on University Avenue.
- Emphasize strong connections and ease of access within campus and with the surrounding community.
- Create a regional model of planning, design, and environmental stewardship, protecting the natural environment, and incorporating sustainable planning and design practices.

In order to achieve campus goals and to accommodate the programs anticipated to be associated with an enrollment of 25,000, expansion of the campus and its facilities will be guided by the following general land use planning strategies:

- Achieve academic core densities of 1.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) or higher on both the East and West Campuses in order to achieve a balance of academic land area versus other required uses.
- In order to achieve densities of 1.0 FAR, infill sites in the partially developed East Campus academic core and expand to the West Campus academic zone immediately adjacent to the I-215/SR 60 freeway, maintaining a compact and contiguous academic core.
- Maintain the teaching and research fields on the West campus south of Martin Luther King Boulevard.
- Pursue a goal of housing 50 percent of the student enrollment in on-campus or campus-controlled housing.
- Replace existing student family housing units on the East Campus with additional units of family housing on the West Campus.
- Provide expanded athletics and recreation opportunities to concentrations of student housing.
- Over time, relocate parking from central campus locations to the periphery of the academic core and replace surface parking with structures, where appropriate.

Land Use Designations

The 2005 LRDP divides the campus into UCR's two main geographical areas: the East Campus east of the I-215/SR 60 Freeway with 600 acres, and West Campus west of the I-215/SR 60 Freeway with 512 acres. The Plan describes land-use categories that reflect activities that will be predominant in any given area but will occur on both campuses. In addition, the 2005 LRDP affords a reasonable measure of flexibility by allowing support services such as administration, libraries, child development centers and dining facilities to occur within a given area defined by a different predominant use, for instance, the Student Commons within the Academic land use designation. The following twelve land use categories are applied to UCR's 1,112 acres:

Academic: Instruction and research uses comprise the vast majority of academic uses on the UCR campus. These uses will be filled in within the East Campus academic core area and will expand with a contiguous academic core area on the West Campus. Specific uses include classrooms, class and research laboratories, and faculty and college administration offices. In addition to instruction and research, the Academic land use would include support uses such as campus administration and student services such as the Registrar and Financial Aid and the Student Commons with dining and meeting rooms. Also located in the Academic land use would be public oriented uses such as an Alumni Visitor's Center, museum and art gallery, conference center, and University Extension.

Special Academic Building Area is proposed within the center of the West Campus as a signature open space and would include buildings of particular campuswide significance or high activity appropriate to its prime location.

Housing: This land use is located on the perimeter of the academic core. Support uses within the Housing land-use designation include Child Development Centers, housing-related parking, dining, housing maintenance support facilities, and student services. Housing is divided in two types: Apartments and Residence Halls. Apartments on the East Campus target upper-division students. Apartments on the West Campus are targeted for graduate students and families. Two new student family housing neighborhoods will replace the existing family housing on the East Campus. Residence halls are located on the East Campus in proximity to existing Aberdeen-Inverness, Lothian and Pentland Hills residence halls.

Athletics and Recreation: This land use includes existing fields and indoor facilities on the East Campus. Additional recreation fields and facilities will be provided on the East and West Campus in conjunction with future housing developments.

Open Space: The Open Space land use includes naturalistic open spaces, such as the arroyos and their edges; the Botanic Gardens; Malls, setbacks from adjacent uses such as the freeway, Martin Luther King Boulevard traffic and between Housing and Recreation Fields and Valencia Hill Drive.

Open Space Reserve: This land use includes the natural steep hillsides of the Box Springs Mountains which extend into the southeastern quadrant of the campus. This area will be protected from future development with the exception of sensitively placed infrastructure projects.

Campus Reserve: The Campus Reserve is an area of 40 acres at the northeastern corner of Martin Luther King Boulevard and Chicago Avenue, at the western edge of the West Campus not currently needed for projected uses. Interim use will continue as Agricultural Teaching and Research Fields. Any proposed project within the Campus Reserve would require an LRDP amendment as a prerequisite for development.

Agricultural Teaching, and Research Fields: This use will continue on the West Campus south of Martin Luther King (MLK) Boulevard. West Campus areas currently used for agricultural and teaching north of MLK Boulevard are slated to be developed for academic, student housing, and support purposes. This was first anticipated in the 1990 LRDP.

Non-Institutional Agencies: This land use includes site leases with agencies with which UCR has research relationships, including the USDA Salinity Lab and the Citrus Germplasm Repository.

Campus Support: Campus Support uses primarily include facilities for personnel and equipment related to the operations, security and safety, and maintenance of University facilities. Examples include: Corporation Yard and Maintenance; Grounds Maintenance; Central Utility Plant and Satellite Plants; Electric Substation; Materials Management; Fleet Services; Environmental Health and Safety; Campus Police; and Transportation and Parking Services. Some of these uses are located in the Academic land use area and will, if appropriate, be relocated over time to a Campus Support land use area.

Parking: Parking is identified as areas designated essentially for future parking structures. Limited surface parking will continue in the campus interior for special needs, disabled motorists, and for service, emergency, and delivery vehicles, but major visitor and commuter parking will occur at the periphery of the campus and academic core proximate to major entrances to the campus.

Transportation Circulation and Parking

To accomplish its long-standing goals of diminishing the use of single-occupancy vehicles and reducing the impacts of campus growth on the community, the campus plans to continue to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, including campus-operated shuttles which link to public transit, ride sharing, van pooling, car pools and bicycles.

The 2005 LRDP provides the basis for an extensive pedestrian and bicycle circulation network in an auto-free core environment that will link the campus program activity centers with each other.

The overall goals of the 2005 LRDP for the vehicular circulation system are to provide convenient and clearly identifiable campus entry points and effective movement of vehicles that minimize impacts on pedestrians. The plan proposes the current loop road system in a limited access context to reduce overall congestion and pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile conflicts.

The 2005 LRDP also proposes continuing the transition from surface parking lots to peripheral parking structures served by shuttles or within walking distance of key campus facilities. Baseline data (March 2001) indicated 8,832 spaces in the campus inventory, including parking at on-campus student residential areas. The LRDP reserves land sufficient to develop a total of 15,868 structured and surface spaces; however, ongoing support for alternative and mass transit services may make it possible to reduce the overall need and demand for parking in the future.

The campus completed a Multi-Modal Transportation Management Strategy-Implementation Plan in July 2004 which outlines the various modes of transportation on and around campus. The plan identifies issues and solutions to traffic congestion, access, and accessibility within the context of a transportation-demand management plan stressing pedestrians at the top of the transportation hierarchy with bicycles, transit and emergency, service, and delivery vehicles next. The private single occupancy vehicle is at the bottom of the hierarchy.

Environmental Sustainability

Environmental sustainability considerations are prominent in the planning of the UCR campus and facilities to ensure appropriate measures to conserve natural resources. The 2005 LRDP promotes the principles of sustainability through the efficient use of water, solid waste recycling, energy efficient design, the use of clean-fuel vehicles, and providing and promoting alternative transportation. Systems such as thermal energy storage (chilled water) will continue to be expanded as technically and financially feasible to increase the efficiency of campuswide utilities infrastructure.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and university procedures for implementation of the CEQA, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the Riverside campus 2005 LRDP. The EIR is comprised of three volumes. The first addresses the impacts of the physical developments of the proposed 2005 LRDP; the second contains technical appendices; and the third contains the comments and responses on the Draft EIR, the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and changes to the Draft EIR.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible and trustee agencies, and other interested parties on December 14, 2001. Distribution of the NOP established a 30-day review period for the public and agencies to identify environmental issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIR (DEIR). During the scoping period, several meetings were held to discuss the range of issues,

alternatives, and potential mitigation measures to be addressed in the DEIR. A public scoping meeting was held on January 8, 2002, to solicit input from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations. In addition, consultations were held in January, 2002, with the California Department of Fish and Game; the County of Riverside; the City of Riverside; the South Coast Air Quality Management District; and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The DEIR was issued on April 28, 2005 and was circulated for public review and comment for a 45-day period ending June 13, 2005. The comment period was extended to July 28, 2005, based on public request. Public hearings were held on May 19, 2005 and June 11, 2005.

Written comments were received from 11 agencies, 2 organizations, and 36 private citizens. In addition, a petition signed by 143 people was received. Comments were also received from 60 persons at two public hearings. The letters and public hearing transcript and responses are included in the Final EIR (Volume III of the EIR). The following issues were raised by the neighborhood residents: students living in single-family homes causing noise, affecting parking, and inadequately maintaining property; increased strain on Riverside police services; light and noise pollution from recreation fields; potential impacts from a proposed parking structure adjacent to a residential area; traffic congestion; and fear of eminent domain of private land.

Implementation of the 2005 LRDP may result in significant impacts in a number of areas, as presented in the attached Findings and the Environmental Summary. Even after incorporating all feasible mitigation measures, the following environmental topics include some significant unavoidable impacts: Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Noise, Transportation, and Traffic.

The Final EIR includes the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's background, process of development, environmental review, mitigation monitoring program, and alternatives. The Findings also set forth overriding considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant effect on the areas of agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation, and traffic.

Chancellor Córdova and Vice Chancellor Bolar discussed the Long Range Development Plan and showed slides of the campus.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that it appears that, unlike other UC campuses, the Riverside campus has decided to separate graduate, professional, and undergraduate program locations. Vice Chancellor Bolar responded that the campus is divided by a freeway, forcing expansion to the west. There was considerable campus debate about

how to expand. It is not proposed to move the academic graduate programs but more the professional programs such as the School of Education, the Anderson Graduate School of Management, and others to be developed in the future. An asset of being on the west side of the campus is that it is more accessible to the community with which many of the professional schools have strong relationships. Also, they do not use many of the central campus resources. Major activities for undergraduates, including libraries and student unions, are maintained on the east campus.

Regent Kozberg noted that the campus has a vast extension program, which is on the west campus. In answer to her question as to whether the professional schools and graduate program were envisioned using a classical model or oriented more toward meeting workforce demands, she was informed that the professional schools centered on the meeting the needs of the region. The campus hopes to develop a school of public policy oriented toward issues of importance to the region and the state, including environmental and immigration policy. In response to a related question asked by Regent Juline, Ms. Bolar reported that there was extensive campus debate about the housing goal. It was viewed as desirable to develop a community environment for the students that would involve them in campus activities. Studies have indicated higher success rates for the academic performance of students living in residential halls than those living off campus. The campus plans to have all types of undergraduate housing adjacent to each other.

Regent Juline expressed concern about the agricultural land conversion addressed in the EIR. He asked whether the system or individual campuses have long-term plans for such open space. Ms. Bolar responded that the campus acquired additional agricultural property in the Coachella Valley that remains for potential future expansion. Mr. Mullinix added that the impact of reductions of agricultural land on campuses is considered carefully. He noted that the University's overall agricultural holdings have expanded.

Faculty Representative Oakley believed that, although the University should continue its policy of offering access to qualified undergraduates, care must be taken that expansion does not harm quality.

Regent-designate Ledesma noted that one stated goal was to improve the town and gown relationship. She recalled that local residents had expressed concerns about a lack of public notice concerning expansion. Ms. Bolar responded with an example of the campus' close relationship with the City of Riverside, which donated $1.2 million for a downtown center for the arts in partnership with the University. She believed that despite extensive efforts to engage all members of the neighborhood, including holding many open forums, there would always be some individuals who oppose expansion. The campus has worked extensively in conjunction with the community leaders to improve public safety in the area adjacent to the campus.

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

6. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, ARROYO STUDENT HOUSING, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

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

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

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

C. Approve the design of the Arroyo Student Housing, Riverside campus.

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

It was recalled that in May 2005, The Regents approved the Arroyo Student Housing, Riverside campus for inclusion in the 2004-2005 Budget for Capital Improvements at a total project cost of $54,671,000 at CCCI 4590. The project is funded by a combination of external financing ($50,276,000), University of California Housing System net revenue funds ($3,147,000), and recreation reserves ($1,248,000).

In October 2005, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Sasaki and Associates, of San Francisco, as executive architect for this project.

Project Site

The 11.5-acre site for the proposed new housing project and playing fields is located at the most northeastern quadrant of the campus, within the existing Housing Quadrant (see Location Plan). It is bordered by existing resident halls to the west, single family residential neighborhoods to the east (across Valencia Hill Drive), and married student housing to the north. On the south side the new buildings are located at least fifty feet from the edge of an arroyo. The three recreation fields are located towards the northeast. Though the site is perceived as a gentle slope, there is a vertical grade change of almost 40 feet across its length. The site development is consistent with the land-use designation (Housing and Athletics and Recreation) of the 2005 LRDP update proposed for approval at this meeting and all other master plans completed for this location.

Project Design

The Arroyo Student Housing project at UC Riverside will accommodate 166,799 asf in a building of 209,300 gsf. The project provides new apartments for 504 students plus 7 beds for a resident director and assistant directors. Community functions including a computer lab, study lounges, a laundry facility, and a convenience store and grill are also part of the project, as are three illuminated recreation fields to support the university's

intramural sports program (see attached Site Plan/Floor Plan). The project will be the first phase in implementing a precinct plan that uses community facilities to link existing and future student housing communities along the arroyo.

The housing community consists of 117 four-bedroom, 7 two-bedroom, and 1 one-bedroom apartment units – all based upon a modular four-bedroom unit. The four residential buildings consist of two types – a linear four-story, double loaded corridor building that will be built along the playing fields, and an angular four-story, double loaded corridor building to be built along the arroyo edge. All of the apartment buildings and common facility entries are arranged around outdoor plazas. The major plaza level is edged by the convenience store and grill, the study lounge, and a major apartment building entry. Landscaping and trees located here will shade outdoor dining areas.

The buildings will be wood framed with stucco exteriors accented with areas of UCR-blend brick at the major plaza, and all units will be stacked vertically. The residential buildings will have low-slope roofs, but the convenience store and grill will have a pitched roof.

This project will comply with the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards dated June 16, 2004. 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. The project will seek to attain a UC Certified equivalence rating level of approximately 27 points. Of these, 22 will be campus baseline points and 5 will be points earned through additional initiatives. Strategies for achieving compliance include the following features:

- Compact site planning to reduce built footprint and maximize natural filtration and infiltration of storm water. Playfields are designed so that all runoff will be recharged into the ground before it can exit the site.
- Site-sensitive layout, including fundamental solar and climatic orientation.
- Building screening, overhangs, and massing that limits the impact of solar heat gain.
- Mechanical systems designed with an optimized, energy efficient, thermal building envelope. Insulation values for walls and roofs are maximized, and window performance is enhanced through the use of double-glazing and low-e coatings.
- Energy Star tm appliances, low-flow shower heads, high efficiency light fixtures, and low-VOC finishes.
- Balance of cut and fill, eliminating the need for off-hauling and deferring spoils from any landfill.
- Low-water, drought-tolerant landscaping.

The campus has conducted a peer design review and independent cost and structural engineering reviews of the Arroyo Housing Project. The Office of Design and Construction staff will manage this project, under the supervision of the Vice Chancellor

for Administration. Construction of the project is anticipated to begin in January 2006 with completion targeted for July 2007.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Final Initial Study was prepared for the proposed Arroyo Student Housing Project to determine any potential environmental effects associated with the project. The Final Initial Study was tiered from the1990 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (July 1990) due to timing. The 2005 LRDP and EIR are proposed for approval at this meeting. The Mitigated Negative Declaration describes the project's relationship to both the 1990 LRDP and the 2005 LRDP. The land use designation for this site is proposed to be changed from Administration and Parking (1990 LRDP) to Housing and Athletics and Recreation (2005 LRDP) to reflect the campus goal of housing 50 percent of students in campus controlled housing. The project complies with the 2005 LRDP EIR Planning Strategies, Programs, and Practices and relevant Mitigation Measures. The Mitigated Negative Declaration considers only project and site-specific impacts. Cumulative impacts and mitigation measures for all campus development proposed in the 1990 LRDP are addressed in the 1990 LRDP EIR. A draft Initial Study was prepared and circulated to the public, responsible and trustee agencies, and to the State clearinghouse for a 30-day review period from September 21, 2005 to October 21, 2005.

Based on the impact assessment in the Final Initial Study, it has been determined that: (1) the proposed project, as mitigated, would not, by itself, result in significant impacts, and (2) that the cumulative impacts of the campus growth identified in the 1990 LRDP would be mitigated by the 1990 LRDP EIR mitigations.

In accordance with CEQA's mitigation monitoring requirements, measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts identified in the 1990 LRDP EIR are monitored under the 1990 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program. New project-specific impacts and mitigation measures were identified in the following areas: Biological Resources (short-term construction-related impacts and consistency with the Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan), Noise (temporary construction-related impacts), and Transportation/Traffic (short-term increases in construction-related traffic and short-term disruptions to traffic operations and pedestrian and cyclist safety during construction). These mitigation measures would be monitored in accordance with the Arroyo Student Housing Project Mitigation Monitoring Program included in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's environmental review process, the relation of the project to the 1990 LRDP EIR, project impacts and mitigation measures addressed in the context of the Arroyo Student Housing Project Final Initial Study, and conclusions

regarding approval of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project in conformance with CEQA.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson presented slides of the project.

Regent Johnson asked why a flat roof was chosen. Mr. Johnson responded that the main reason was cost. He noted that the Riverside campus has many flat roofs, which are in fact slightly pitched to allow for run off. This roof will have a light-colored polyurethane coating.

Regent Juline noted community criticism regarding parking. Mr. Johnson reported that 65 parking spaces are accommodated on the site. The campus is working with residents adjacent to the site to mitigate any adverse effects caused by the expansion of parking.

Regent Schilling asked about the use of solar energy. Mr. Johnson explained that solar and photovoltaic systems are not cost-effective for this project.

In response to a question asked by Committee Chair Hopkinson, Mr. Johnson indicated that the color of the plaster will match the warm hue used on the adjacent Pentland Hills project.

Committee Chair Hopkinson calculated that the 511 beds will cost $94,000 per bed. A four-bedroom, four-bed unit will cost $389,000, which seemed excessively high. She believed that the University could do a better job of lowering its cost for housing construction. She also raised an issue about lighting for the athletic facility, which in similar situations has necessitated post-construction changes because of community complaints. Mr. Johnson responded that residences are about 100 feet away from the playing fields in this project. The campus has built a 20-foot berm topped by trees and will use technologically advanced lighting that prevents spillover to adjacent areas. Hours of use will be limited, also. Faculty Representative Oakley remained unconvinced that the adverse effects of the lighting could be mitigated adequately, and he was concerned also about the potential noise levels and the way in which the impacts and mitigations had been addressed in the environmental document. University Counsel Smeltzer explained that the project had undergone sufficient review and that the environmental documents addressed the mitigation measures adequately.

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

7. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING BUILDING, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

It was recalled that the Materials Science and Engineering Building, Riverside campus, will accommodate the critical space needs for joint interdisciplinary programs in nanotechnology, materials science, and bioengineering of Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS).

Programmatic objectives of the MS&E Building will result in additional instructional and research space for BCOE and CNAS to accommodate a significant increase in the number of undergraduates, graduates, and faculty in nanotechnology, materials science, and bioengineering.

A special class laboratory, core facilities, scholarly activity, six general assignment classrooms, academic offices, and administrative space are included in the building project total of 73,602 asf/128,000 gsf. Total project cost is $58,668,000. The architect is Bohlin Cywinski Jackson.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson presented slides of the design.

Committee Chair Hopkinson was not favorably impressed with the design. She found it reminiscent of campus buildings from an earlier era that is not admired for its architecture. Mr. Johnson responded that the campus had struggled with the balance between cost and design. He believed that her opinion would have been more favorable if the renderings had shown the architectural detail more clearly.

8. **TRANSFORMING CAPITAL ASSET UTILIZATION AND DELIVERY UPDATE**

It was recalled that the President had proposed that the University implement the recommendations contained within the report commissioned by The Regents entitled, *Transforming Capital Asset Utilization and Delivery: Opportunities for Reducing Project Costs and Achieving More Program for the University's Capital Dollar,* and provide semi-annual updates to The Regents on implementation progress.

At the September 2004 meeting, The Regents proposed a study to develop recommendations for building cost reduction opportunities. A committee of outside experts (Committee), comprised of acknowledged leaders in their respective fields, including architects, a construction-program manager, a developer, a contractor, and an institutional owner, was formed to direct the study. The Committee identified fifteen specific areas of inquiry with promise for yielding significant cost reduction opportunities. Over the course of six months, information was presented to the Committee concerning University organizational structure and processes, as was specific data gathered and interviews conducted with campus officials specific to the fifteen areas of inquiry for twenty-four UC and non-UC projects.

The Committee drafted a reported entitled, *Transforming Capital Asset Utilization and Delivery: Opportunities for Reducing Project Costs and Achieving More Program for the University's Capital Dollar*, and presented its findings and recommendations to The Regents at the July 2005 meeting.

Senior Vice President Mullinix and Vice President Hershman elaborated on the report's findings and recommendations.

The report contained the following six major recommendations:

(1) Creating, in the position of a single campus individual, the ownership and accountability for all capital asset utilization, delivery, and performance.

(2) Engaging in, at the very earliest conceptual stages of capital planning, a rigorous "business case analysis" to determine the best economic options for achieving program goals.

(3) Greatly simplifying and shortening the process for project concept development, design, and funding approval.

(4) Removing impediments within the University's construction contract requirements and delivery process in order to encourage more highly qualified firms to bid on University projects and facilitate early consultation with subcontractors on project planning and design.

(5) Developing universal design-construction standards to describe desired outcomes, performance metrics to evaluate outcomes achieved relative to dollars spent, and a Universitywide consolidated information system for sharing and reporting on project data.

(6) Charging an individual "change-agent" with the authority and responsibility for implementing the above recommendations.

The report was distributed to the chancellors, executive vice chancellors, vice chancellors for administration, members of the President's Cabinet, and senior campus officials involved in the capital planning and delivery process; these included capital planning and budget officers, campus architects, and physical plant directors. Ideas and strategies for implementing the recommendations were solicited.

Preliminary responses from the campuses and others were reported to The Regents at the September 2005 meeting. At that time, it was agreed that the President should report back to The Regents in November with a specific implementation plan.

Focused consultations with chancellors, executive vice chancellors, and vice chancellors for administration, among others, have generated excellent discussions and ideas for instituting the changes suggested within the report. There is general agreement with and support for each of the six recommendations. Detailed concerns and issues were raised that will need to be worked through in the implementation process. Informed by these discussions, the President has adopted the following strategy for implementing the six report recommendations outlined below.

(1) **Ownership and Accountability**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- Capital asset planning, budgeting, design, construction, operation, and acquisition represent a significant functional area that requires a unified, cohesive, and focused sustained effort.

- Given the breadth and scope of the chancellor's responsibilities, it is reasonable for there to be a single individual (capital asset chief) upon whom the chancellor may rely to be accountable for the critical decisions on capital projects from earliest concept to final occupancy and operation. This chief is to be responsible and accountable for all project milestones, including planning, development, business case modeling, approvals, and delivery. In the broadest sense, the individual carries the imprimatur of the chancellor.

- Similarly, it is reasonable for there to be a single individual at the Office of the President upon whom the President and chancellors may rely to be accountable for the critical decisions and processes under the purview of the Office of the President that affect given capital projects.

- These individuals' roles are aligned with the University's consultative process and work with senior academic and business leadership, building or advisory committees, and other stakeholders in guiding discourse and facilitating informed decisions and successful outcomes.

- Recognizing that each campus has a distinctive organizational structure and process, the model for implementing a "chief" may vary among the campuses. The primary implementation criteria are that there be clarity of authority, responsibility, and process.

Implementation Milestones

- Draft description of scope, authority, and responsibility for "chief." (winter 2005 - spring 2006)

- Campuses and Office of the President develop model of organizational structure which defines authorities, relationships, key decision points, and process for capital asset decisions, and the role of the chief in that context. (winter 2005 - spring 2006)

- Chiefs implemented at campuses and Office of the President. (summer - fall 2006)

(2) **Business Case Analysis**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- Campuses currently engage in analyses that approximate business case analysis. The best practices among these should be spread to all campuses.

- The expectation is for rigorous analyses to be initiated at inception that evaluate priorities, expectations about specific outcomes, business and design alternatives, building site considerations, delivery and schedule expectations, conceptual budget targets, and funding-financing feasibility issues.

- There should be a clarity and transparency to this planning process, which is facilitated by disciplined and documented analyses.

- Creative approaches and flexibility are to be encouraged, with the goal of precluding projects from being locked into a given solution without benefit of comprehensive examination and complete and continually updated information.

- Upon final implementation of the solution (e.g., new construction, real estate acquisition, long-term lease, rehabilitation-renovation), campuses will conduct a post-occupancy review, with the goal of determining the extent to which the solution satisfied the expected outcomes cited in the business case analysis.

Implementation Milestones

- Assemble and evaluate analytical best practices from the campuses. (winter 2005 - spring 2006)

- Investigate and evaluate business case analyses conducted by institutional entities similar to UC. (winter 2005 - spring 2006)

- Develop UC-specific business case templates. (summer - fall 2006)

- Disseminate and provide training in business case analysis in the UC context. (fall - winter 2006)

- Business case analyses to support all capital projects and real estate transactions. (spring 2007)

(3) **Shorter, Simpler Process**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- Delays translate directly into increased costs for capital projects. The process should be streamlined to provide for early involvement and

improve communication among all parties. University processes that cause delays without adding value should be identified and eliminated.

- The approval process for both State- and non-State-funded projects should be examined for opportunities to create a more nimble and efficient process.

- Review should encompass those processes at the campuses, at the Office of the President, and between campuses and the Office of the President.

Implementation Milestones

- Conclude discussions with the State to attain additional flexibility for projects committing to the streamlined process so as to broaden feasibility for a wider range of projects: Discussions with the State have been initiated.

- Simplify the submittal requirements for the Detailed Planning Program to avoid costly and lengthy detailed design that does not add value to the final outcome - Discussions with the campuses have been initiated.

- Re-examine and draft recommendations to increase efficiencies in campus, Office of the President, and Regents' review and approval processes. Initiate discussions with the Committee on Grounds and Buildings with regard to Regents' review and approval processes, as required - winter 2005 - summer 2006.

(4) **Robust Flexible Contracting Environment**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- In an increasingly challenging construction market, the University must seek ways to emerge as a more attractive owner-partner for contractors to work with.

- The University's contracts should be examined for appropriate risk sharing. University processes and methods should be re-evaluated for opportunities to remove impediments to contractors.

- A critical component of improving the University's ability to encourage high-quality contractors to work on University projects is modifying competitive bidding requirements imposed by statute.

Implementation Milestones

- As informed by the previous legislative session, renew strategy for and seek to obtain passage of "Best Value" and other amendments to the Stull Act. (Legislation has been initiated (SB 667) and has passed out of its house of origin, with efforts on course for enactment within this two-year session.)

- Identify contract risk sharing and process impediment modifications that can be addressed immediately, focusing on issues identified in the Committee report, as well as others that are obvious candidates for change. (Candidates for the initial set of changes have been identified, and revised provisions are being developed and implemented.)

- Undertake a comparison of University construction documents versus those from entities such as institutional owners, American Institute of Architects, and Associated General Contractors. (fall 2005 - spring 2006)

- Enlisting assistance of University executives, contract administrators, project management staff and others, complete the process of identifying other potential areas of unfair risk shifting and provisions that discourage bidders or unnecessarily increase project costs. (Initial discussions with contract administrators have been conducted; remaining investigations and discussions are to be completed by early 2006.)

- Initiate discussions with external parties (general and subcontractors, risk managers, architects) to evaluate and suggest changes to the University contract provisions and processes. (Certain campuses conduct such discussions annually; a comprehensive coordinated effort scheduled for winter 2005 - spring 2006.)

- Following consultation with Office of General Counsel, implement remaining changes to contract provisions. (spring - summer 2006)

- Use scheduled Project Management Institute (UC PMI) sessions, and/or develop other training opportunities to educate and train capital project staff on best processes and methods for improving working relationships with contractors - spring 2006 and ongoing.

(5) **Systemwide Building and Project Metrics, Standards and Data**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- There is strong need expressed by the campuses for a common Universitywide information system to share project data in order to provide for appropriate benchmarking and comparison and to facilitate a predictive capacity for future project planning and management.

- In tandem with such a system, there is support for developing performance "mission-relevant" metrics that can be shared and used for business case analysis and post-occupancy reviews.

- Campuses currently maintain their own design and construction standards. There is support for a consolidated set of systemwide standards, emphasizing those standards that would shorten planning and design time lines, and, when combined with strategic sourcing, would generate direct savings to the projects. Examples of these standards include a typical faculty office, a residence hall bedroom, and plumbing fixtures.

Implementation Milestones

- Sharing project data for benchmarking, comparison, and to facilitate a predictive capacity for future project planning and management:

    - Identify categories and types of project data that would be useful to be collected and shared. (winter 2005 - spring 2006)

    - Draft and implement a plan to enable shared campus access to data. (summer - fall 2006)

- Developing mission-relevant performance metrics:

    - Develop metrics that define desired project outcomes and performance criteria. (winter 2005 - summer 2006)

- Include mission-relevant metrics in business case analysis and projects submitted for design and funding approval, and for use in post-occupancy review. (fall - winter 2006)

- Consolidating design and construction standards for Universitywide use:

  - Initiate survey and review of existing campus design and construction standards. (Design standards already exist at most campuses; a consolidation and review of those standards is scheduled for winter 2005 - spring 2006.)

- Develop design and construction standards that are appropriate for Universitywide reference. (summer - winter 2006)

  - Develop and implement strategic sourcing agreements based upon Universitywide standards. (The University has implemented strategic sourcing agreements specific to construction products; additional agreements arising from the design-constructions standards effort are to be initiated fall - winter 2006.)

(6) **Process-Change Agent**

Implementation Guidelines and Considerations

- Given the breadth and scope of the recommendations, it is reasonable to expect that a sustained focused effort will be required to initiate, manage, and successfully implement the proposed initiatives. Such an effort can most effectively be vested in an individual or individuals appointed by, and reporting directly to, the President on the implementation effort (Change Agent(s)).

- The Change Agent(s) will be the individual(s) to whom the President and The Regents look for accountability and responsibility for implementing the initiatives, and the individual (s) must be empowered by them and provided with the necessary resources to implement the initiatives.

- The Change Agent(s) will work closely with the individual campuses and with units within the Office of the President to accomplish the initiatives. A close partnership with the chief(s) at each location is desirable, given the critical role that those individuals are expected to play in the successful implementation of the initiatives at their given location.

Implementation Milestones

- Draft performance scope and requirements for Change Agent(s) position. (fall 2005)

- President to designate Change Agent(s). (winter 2005)

- Draft and obtain approval for budget and staffing plan. (fall - winter 2005)

- President to provide progress report to The Regents on status of implementation of all recommendations. (end of FY 2005-06 and semi-annually thereafter)

In response to a question asked by Regent Juline, Senior Vice President Mullinix confirmed that all of the recommendations had been found to be relevant and beneficial in their implementation in making improvements. He noted that it would be advantageous to have standard systems for collecting construction costs and monitoring construction projects, which was suggested in the report, but that the University is not in a position to make that type of investment at present.

In response to a further question asked by Regent Juline, Senior Vice President Mullinix reported that there are two people in the Office of the President are who are engaged in analyzing design projects. There are a number of people who examine the projects from the perspective of the budget. Regent Juline asked whether it is planned to involve redesigning the definition, scope, authority, and responsibility for a chief at the Office of the President. Mr. Mullinix responded that the Office of the President would have a person equivalent to the campus position, although parameters for creating that position have not been determined. For each project, the campuses could come to one person who would be accountable. Regent Juline advocated conferring with leaders of the California State University to determine the effectiveness of its construction program organization. He reinforced the notion that discussions with external parties should include those who choose not to do business with the University. He asked whether the University maintains lists of pre-qualified contractors. Mr. Mullinix responded that, for most jobs contractors are pre-qualified. A list is not kept because the nature of the work varies.

Committee Chair Hopkinson thanked Senior Vice President Mullinix for his extensive work on this initiative.

9. **STATUS OF CAMPUS LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

In response to a request at the September 2005 meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, the table shown below, which illustrates the status of campus Long Range Development Plans (LRDP) and the horizon year for the recently approved and proposed plans, was provided for information. Five plans have been approved since 2002 and four more plans will be presented to The Regents over the next two years.

UC LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANS, STATUS: SCHEDULE & TIME HORIZON

Last updated: October 28, 2005

Campus	Current (or previous) LRDP Approved	Estimated Start for LRDP EIR NOP[1]	Estimate for Regents Approval LRDP&EIR[2]	Horizon Year
Merced	n/a	NOP issued Winter 2001	**Approved** Jan 2002	2015/2025
Los Angeles	Nov 1990	NOP issued June 2001; reissued March 2002	**Approved** Mar 2003	2010
Davis	Sep 1994	Summer 2002	**Approved** Nov 2003	2015
San Diego	Nov 1989	Dec. 5, 2003	**Approved** Sept 2004	2020
Berkeley	May 1990	Spring 2002	**Approved** Jan 2005	2020
Riverside	Jul 1990	NOP issued Dec 2001	November 2005	2015
Irvine	Sep 1989	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	2020
Santa Cruz	May 1989	Summer 2004	Summer 2006	2020
Santa Barbara	Sep 1990	Summer 2006	Winter 2007	2020
San Francisco	Jan 1997	Hospital Amendment - July 2004	None proposed; Major amendment #2 - Approved March 2005	2020

[1] Estimated date of Notice of Preparation (NOP) filed with State OPR based on academic quarter
[2] Estimated date for Regents' approval based on academic quarter

Senior Vice President Mullinix reported that the Santa Barbara campus would provide the Committee with a presentation on the housing portion of its Long Range Development Plan in advance of the request for LRDP approval. In response to a question asked by Committee Chair Hopkinson concerning the San Francisco campus, he reported that the decision process with regard to the reconfiguration of the medical center's hospitals would be two-phased, beginning with a discussion at the January 2006 meeting of The Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary