The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
March 15, 2005

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at Covel Commons, Los Angeles campus.

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

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

The meeting convened at 1:00 p.m. with Committee Chair Hopkinson presiding.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Regent Hopkinson conducted a public comment period for the purpose of hearing from those who wished to comment on University-related matters and matters on the Committee's agenda. The following person addressed the Board:

Ms. Dorothy Lee, a UCLA student in biochemistry speaking on behalf of the California Students Sustainability Coalition, thanked the Committee for sending UC Office of the President interns to campuses to discuss sustainable transportation with students and administrators. She requested that the University reduce the total fossil fuel emissions of its fleets by half in the next ten years, with an overall goal of having a climate-neutral fleet by 2030, and reduce the amount of single-occupancy vehicle ridership by 25 percent in the next ten years, with an overall goal of reducing it by 50 percent by 2025.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 18, 2005**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 18, 2005 were approved.

3. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, ADOPTION OF FINDINGS, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, C.V. STARR EAST ASIAN LIBRARY, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The Committee recommend to The Regents that, subject to the concurrence of the Committee on Finance, the 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Berkeley: C. V. Starr East Asian Library – study, preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $39,675,000, to be funded from gift funds.

To: Berkeley: C. V. Starr East Asian Library – study, preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $46,400,000, to be funded from gift funds ($37,400,000) and external financing ($9,000,000).

B. Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as described in the 2020 Long Range Development Plan and Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend that The Regents:

(1) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

(2) Approve the design of Phase 1 of the Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies, the C.V. Starr East Asian Library, Berkeley campus.

[The 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 January 2005, The Regents approved the 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for UC Berkeley, which provides a framework for land use and capital investment to meet the academic goals and objectives of the campus through the year 2020. The LRDP describes both the scope and distribution of capital investment anticipated within this time frame, as well as policies to guide the location, scale, and design of individual projects. The Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies is proposed as the first project implemented under the 2020 LRDP's policies and guidelines. Phase 1 of the Tien Center will house the C.V. Starr East Asian Library.

The East Asian Library at Berkeley contains one of the most comprehensive collections of materials in East Asian languages in the United States, including rare and valuable items that make it a unique resource for scholars from around the world. The library has grown from 75,000 volumes at its founding in 1947 to more than ten times that number today. Its combined holdings in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and other East Asian languages form one of the top two collections in the United States outside of the Library of Congress. The EAL currently occupies 22,429 asf in three campus buildings (Durant Hall, California Hall, and 2223 Fulton), and approximately 55 percent of its collections are in remote storage at the Northern Regional Library Facility. The library's dispersed holdings pose problems that are detrimental to scholarly use. Its rare books, many of which are national treasures, are inadequately housed in overcrowded conditions with no temperature or humidity control, posing a serious risk to such valuable University assets. The lack of space also affects other functions of the library, such as use of reference materials, access to computer technology, and the introduction of new digital library

technologies. A new, expanded library facility is needed to house the existing collections adequately and to provide for their future growth and use.

At the September 2003 meeting, The Regents approved the C. V. Starr East Asian Library project budget in the amount of $39,675,000, to be supported entirely with gift funds. Approval is requested to augment the existing budget by $6,725,000, for a revised total project cost of $46,400,000, and to obtain $9,000,000 of external financing for the project. The augmentation to the budget is needed to accommodate recent increases in construction costs and market conditions that were unanticipated at the time the project was originally budgeted.

In September 2003, the Office of the President appointed Tod Williams Billie Tsien and Associates of New York, NY as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Description and Design

The project site is located within the classical core of the campus park. The C.V. Starr East Asian Library will replace an existing 36-space surface parking lot at the south base of Observatory Hill, directly across Memorial Glade from Doe Library. The primary north-south pedestrian route through the campus park frames the eastern edge of the site. Observatory Hill, an area of natural oak woodland, abuts the site to the north. Haviland Hall (ca. 1924), a National Register building, lies adjacent to the west.

The location of the C.V. Starr East Asian Library follows the 2020 LRDP campus park guidelines with respect to both the preservation of the central glade and the formal, orthogonal relationships of Doe Library, Haviland Hall, and other buildings within the classical core ensemble. The project preserves the dramatic view of Doe Library from the North Gate entrance to the campus park.

The site improvements proposed to the east of the Starr Library are an interim solution. Planned for the site, but not part of the current design approval, is a new campus open space comprised of a plaza and grand stair descending to Memorial Glade. A Phase 2 building housing the Institute of East Asian Studies and the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures will be located at the western base of Observatory Hill, directly east of Haviland Hall. The timing of the plaza, grand stair, and the Phase 2 building of the Tien Center depends on future funding.

This project will construct a new library of 46,054 asf (67,000 gsf) divided evenly between four floors. In addition to the book stacks, the project will house a rare book collection, a media and digital materials center, reference and periodical reading rooms, study rooms, offices, and a book processing center. The lower two floors will house the majority of stacks, and the top two floors will house the public elements of the library.

The architectural treatment of the C.V. Starr Library building will follow the 2020 LRDP campus park Guidelines with respect to orientation, form, and materials. In keeping with these Guidelines, the building shape is rectangular (188' x 86'), with the long edge of the building running parallel to the central glade. Situated against the south base of

Observatory Hill, it will have two floors above and two below grade. The building will have its primary entrance on the east side, facing the major cross-campus pedestrian path.

The building structure will be poured-in-place concrete frame with sheer panels and a steel roof. The exterior will be clad in granite and architecturally finished concrete. A clay tile roof will match those of existing buildings in this part of the campus. The central portions of the west, south, and east elevations feature bronze grilles set in front of a grid of factory-finished aluminum-frame glass windows and spandrel panels. Access ramps and stairs required by the sloping site are included in the project scope.

Regental budget approval of the C. V. Starr Library predated the adoption of the UC Presidential Green Building and Clean Energy Policy; nevertheless, the project has been designed to include several sustainable features in accordance with both University policy and the policies of the 2020 LRDP. The project will achieve equivalency with LEED certification. The LEED checklist has been used to identify areas for the project to incorporate sustainable design measures, ranging from careful selection of materials to indoor air quality and systems monitoring during and after construction. Careful attention to energy conservation, site development, and resource management will continue throughout working drawings and construction delivery.

The UC Berkeley Design Review Committee has reviewed the design of C.V. Starr East Asian Library and has affirmed that it is in accordance with University policy. The project has also been reviewed by the UC Berkeley Structural Review Committee, with independent structural review conducted at each stage of the project development.

Construction is anticipated to begin in September 2005 and to be complete in November 2007.

Need for Augmentation

Dramatic increases in the construction bidding market over the past year have affected projects throughout the University system and the state. Projects in the San Francisco Bay Area are additionally affected by the high demand for building materials and skilled labor in this region.

In response to this upsurge in the market, the campus undertook extensive value engineering efforts to limit the budget increase to the greatest extent possible, resulting in a cost savings of over $1,750,000, or about 25 percent of the projected cost increase. Cost-cutting changes to be incorporated in the final design include:

- Reduction in materials used
- Simplification of details
- Selection of more economical materials
- Building Exterior
    - Deletion of major retaining walls and ramps
    - Revisions to the roofing system and grillwork
    - Reduction of the first floor topping slab to four inches

    - Switch to aluminum windows rather than a bronze window system
- Building Interior
    - Reduction of display features
    - Simplification of HVAC and related elements
    - Elimination of custom components of the library stack shelving system
    - Purchase of most furniture and equipment by campus directly, eliminating general contractor markup and installation charges

As further protection against the volatile bidding environment, the campus will create deductive bid alternates. The campus also continues its ongoing efforts to achieve cost savings by encouraging bidder participation and expanding product and material sources.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act to analyze the environmental effects of the 2020 LRDP, including the Chang-Lin Tien Center for East Asian Studies (Tien Center). In January 2005, The Regents certified the EIR before approving the 2020 LRDP. The City of Berkeley has filed a CEQA lawsuit challenging the EIR.

The Draft EIR consists of Volume 1 and Volume 2. Volume 1 includes a program-level analysis of implementation of the 2020 LRDP and a project-level analysis of the Tien Center, including the C.V. Starr East Asian Library as the first of its two phases. Volume 2 includes technical appendices. The EIR identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives for the 2020 LRDP and the Tien Center. The Final EIR includes the DEIR and Volumes 3a and 3b, which contain the responses to public comments received on the Draft EIR, a summary of changes to the Draft EIR made in response to those comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Environmental Review Process

At the early stage of formulation of the 2020 LRDP, UC Berkeley held two informal "open house" workshops in March 2003 to which the public was invited. Staff presented a general overview of concepts under consideration for the 2020 LRDP and invited questions and comments. A Notice of Preparation and Initial Study which was published on August 29, 2003 (Appendix A in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR) notified the public of the preparation of a Draft EIR and described its proposed scope. The Initial Study indicated that no additional analysis would be required of potential project-specific impacts of the Tien Center on air quality, hazardous materials, public services, or most aspects of transportation and traffic. The project-specific study of the Tien Center in the EIR examines possible impacts upon aesthetics, biological resources, geology, seismicity and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, utilities, and service systems.

UC Berkeley held a meeting on September 22, 2003 at which the public was invited to comment on the scope of the EIR. The Draft EIR was published on April 15, 2004 and

was circulated for a 61-day comment period ending June 14, 2004. The Draft EIR incorporated the 2020 LRDP in its entirety as the project description at chapter 3.1; chapter 3.2 is the Tien Center project description. At the request of the City of Berkeley, the comment period was extended to June 18, 2004. UC Berkeley staff presented a preview of the of the Draft EIR to City of Berkeley staff on April 12, 2004 in advance of formal publication.

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

Eleven of the more than 300 comment letters received on the draft EIR expressed concern or objection to the Tien Center project. Comments on the Tien Center related to its site and design in relation to the classical core of the campus, and especially its effect on Haviland Hall.

The campus acknowledged in the EIR that the project does not meet one of the architectural guidelines for the classical core – the guideline calling for individual, punched, vertically oriented windows. The guidelines state that solutions of extraordinary quality may depart from the guidelines. The campus Design Review Board in reviewing the project in relation to the guidelines found that the design, which features single major window elements on the south façade, represents a synthesis of western and eastern architecture and that the window and decorative screen are a major design element which it is crucial to retain.

The campus acknowledges that Phase 2 of the project, not designed and not the subject of this approval, will be close to Haviland Hall, but contends that the architecture of Haviland Hall and its location, not the existing open space around it, are what create its historic significance. The site and alignment of the Tien Center do follow the concepts of John Galen Howard's Beaux Arts Plan, which showed a major building of roughly the same scale as Doe Library on the site of Observatory Hill.

The Tien Center is not anticipated to result in significant environmental impacts. The 2020 LRDP EIR includes the results of an archaeological study completed at the site of the C.V. Starr East Asian Library (see Volume 2, Appendix chapter D.2, of the EIR). Some subsurface materials from the former campus conservatory would be recovered, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, during the construction phase of the C.V. Starr East Asian Library, in accordance with campus continuing best practices.

Findings

The Findings discuss the Tien Center's impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives in conformance with CEQA.

Vice Chancellor Edward Denton recalled that during a previous informal presentation, Committee members had offered constructive comments. He reported that these had been incorporated into the design. Two building models were displayed, and Assistant Vice Chancellor Robert Gayle presented slides of the project.

Regent Johnson admired the design. She appreciated that it fit into the classical tone of the campus but maintained originality. She asked for further details about the building's sustainability. Mr. Gayle responded that the project conforms to all campus green policies. Steps have been taken in life cycle costing to take advantage of the use of the campus steam system and other centralized features in order to maintain energy conservation.

Committee Chair Hopkinson commented on the design. She recalled reading that, as part of the cost reduction, some facets on the exterior marble were being eliminated. She noted that aluminum has replaced bronze on the façade. Mr. Gayle stated that meeting budget goals for the project had been challenging. All window systems were changed from bronze to bronze anodized aluminum. Alternative ways are being reviewed of fabricating the grill system. Regent Hopkinson commented that the scale of the stone bench on a corner of the building remained overbearing. Mr. Gayle agreed to reexamine its design.

Regent Hopkinson had questions related to the cost items, referring to the architectural fees as an example. While she acknowledged that esteemed architects are expensive, she believed the fee was too high. She suggested that items for all future projects present a clear and consistent picture of project costs and the elements that contribute to those costs. She expressed a general concern about the high fees the University pays architects. Senior Vice President Mullinix recalled that, in order to ensure that practices are compatible, Internal Audit had been asked to examine how campuses charge soft costs.

Regent Hopkinson noted that one cost-saving item mentioned was the separation in the bidding process of furniture, fixtures, and equipment from the construction budget. Mr. Mullinix reported that the University often uses this strategy.

In response to a question asked by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Gayle stated that he was confident that the necessary value engineering would not affect the integrity of the design.

Regent-designate Rosenthal asked about the status of gift financing. Vice Chancellor Denton reported that it was likely some Opportunity Funds would be needed to augment the budget.

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, PHYSICAL SCIENCES EXPANSION, DAVIS CAMPUS**

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

A. Adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program and Findings.

C. Approve the design of the Physical Sciences Expansion, Davis campus.

[The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, 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 in November 2003, The Regents approved the inclusion of the Physical Sciences Expansion, Davis Campus in the 2004-2005 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2004-2007 Capital Improvement Program, at a total project cost of $47,273,000. The new total project cost is $49,721,000, based on updated construction cost index for State-funded projects included in the 2005 State budget. The project will be funded from a combination of State ($48,515,000) and campus ($1,206,000) funds.

In January 2005, the Office of the President approved the appointment of MBT Architecture of San Francisco as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Site

The proposed site for the Physical Sciences Expansion (PSE) project is on the southwest portion of the Facilities Services site, in the central core of the UC Davis campus. The PSE project is the initial phase in development of a new academic quadrangle that will provide a link to the Arboretum. The PSE building forms the west edge of this future quad and is bordered by California Avenue, the Academic Surge Building, the new Mathematical Sciences Building, and the Arboretum, and Putah Creek. The project will require the removal of a portion of the Facilities Services Operation and Maintenance structures and other buildings. The Facilities Services replacement facilities are addressed by a separate campus-funded project. The proposed use of the site is consistent with the Academic and Administrative land use designation in the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

Project Design

The Physical Sciences Expansion will contain 51,250 asf within a total area of 88,362 gsf. The project will provide teaching and research facilities for the Departments of Geology, Chemistry, and Physics and will be comprised of instructional laboratories and service, research laboratories and service, faculty offices, departmental offices, and support space. Laboratories and offices are organized in three distinct units, with teaching labs on the north side for ease of student access, research labs in the center to limit traffic through sensitive areas, and administrative offices on the south to create a distinct Geology Department identity.

The three-story structure has a cast-in-place concrete system composed of flat slabs and concrete shear walls. The exterior finishes consist of precast panels, with a combination of individual window openings and curtain walls, painted metal trim, sun shades, and painted metal roof screen to shield the rooftop mechanical equipment.

In accordance with University Policy, the design of the Physical Sciences Expansion has been reviewed by an independent design consultant and value engineering teams, and the design has incorporated sustainability and energy efficiency principles which include storm water management, water-efficient landscaping, optimizing energy performance of equipment, and management of construction waste.

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

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study was prepared to determine whether any potential environmental effects are associated with the project. The Initial Study also evaluated the potential environmental impacts related to the Services Unit Park project, as Operation and Maintenance units must vacate the core campus site in order to construct the PSE facility. The Initial Study was tiered from the 2003 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Initial Study considers project and site-specific impacts as well the adequacy of the cumulative impacts and mitigation measures that are addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The draft Initial Study was circulated for public review from January 11, 2005 to February 14, 2005.

Comments on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration were received from the Department of Health Services (DHS) and the Department of Transportation (CalTrans). The DHS letter regarded a possible future water well on campus and the need for an amended DHS water supply permit for such a well. The LRDP EIR evaluated the possible need for this well to support campus growth. The well is not required for this project. The CalTrans letter addressed payment of fair share contributions for highway improvements. The campus committed to negotiate these payments in the LRDP EIR.

Based on the impact assessment in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, it has been determined that the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts beyond the identified impacts and associated mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The project specific mitigation measure in the IS/MND relates to an intersection affected by the Service Unit Park.

Where possible, the cumulative impacts of the campus growth identified in the LRDP will be mitigated by the LRDP EIR mitigations being implemented. In accordance with CEQA's mitigation monitoring requirements, measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are monitored under the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

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

Campus Architect Robert Strand presented slides of the project.

Regent Kozberg asked about the values being defined by the new quadrangle that was being established for programs in the physical sciences. Mr. Strand responded that the goal is to move operations and maintenance facilities away from the campus core with a view toward replacing them with green space and academic buildings.

Regent-designate Rosenthal advocated developing a strong relationship between the law school and the new quad area. He asked about the possibility that toxic run off from the chemistry building could affect the Arboretum area. Mr. Strand responded that all elements are either treated or handled by dedicated systems.

Regent Anderson asked that information about sustainability be included in design documents that are mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that the equipment screening on the roof appeared to be too close to the edge. Mr. Strand indicated that it had already been moved back once and the campus intended to consider moving it back further, if possible. He reported that the color of the aluminum mullions matched the window trim. Regent Hopkinson noted that the massing of the screening material made it look like part of the building. She advised not matching its color to that of the window trim. Mr. Strand agreed to substitute a soft earth tone that would relate to the pre-case exterior finish.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted the spread between usable and gross square footage. Mr. Strand responded that a 58 percent ratio was typical for the University's laboratories.

Regent Rominger noted that, although Davis has hot summers, most windows in the building will face the sun. Mr. Strand reported that the façades and the windows themselves will be fitted with shading devices.

Faculty Representative Brunk asked how the visual impact of the old campus water tower will be mitigated. Mr. Strand anticipated that possibly a steel trellis would be added to the tower in order to incorporate it into a landscaped entry.

Regent Kozberg pointed out the significance of starting a new campus quadrangle. She believed that a stronger sense of place should be created by the new building. Regent Hopkinson agreed that, as a key element, the building's design did not provide sufficient interest. Both she and Regent Kozberg expressed the hope that the design was not meant to set the general tone for the quadrangle's buildings. Mr. Strand responded that because of the complexity of the mechanical elements, the building's budget was austere. It was decided, therefore, to keep the design relatively subdued so as to put more money into the quality of the materials. Regent Hopkinson was not persuaded that this was the best approach.

In response to a request by Regent-designate Juline, Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio indicated that benchmarks for the various building elements as well as the cost of replacing versus renovating buildings would be added to the design items.

Senior Vice President Mullinix suggested approving the design with the condition that it be enhanced in some way.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, with the understanding that the design would be modified acceptably.

5. **ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SERVICE UNIT PARK, DAVIS CAMPUS**

This item was withdrawn.

6. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ON THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT #2 FOR THE HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT PROGRAM, AND AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Amendment #2 to the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

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

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

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

E. Adopt the initial phase (LRDP Phase) of the campus' recommendations to meet requirements of SB 1953 and to overcome functional obsolescence as follows: (1) develop three integrated specialty hospitals with a total of about 210 beds at Mission Bay by 2012, (2) maintain tertiary and quaternary care with about 600 beds at Parnassus Heights for a total of about 810 beds during the LRDP phase, (3) provide ambulatory care facilities at both Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay, and (4) populate both sites with basic and translational disease-oriented research programs. Ultimately, in future approvals beyond the LRDP time horizon (Future Phase) the concept is to have two major integrated campus sites with clinical care and basic and translational research.

F. Amend the Long Range Development Plan to:

(1) Update Chapter 3, Clinical Programs, of the LRDP to describe the hospital replacement planning process and the campus' recommendations for future clinical uses at Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, and Mount Zion.

(2) Update Chapter 5, Plans for Existing Sites, to:

a. Expand the campus boundary of the Mount Zion site to include property at 1545 Divisadero Street, and add 30,900 gsf of "vacant/alteration" space to the space profile for Mount Zion to reflect the existing vacant building at that location.

b. Acknowledge ongoing discussions with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) regarding the potential co-location of UCSF's and DPH's inpatient facilities at Mission Bay.

c. Incorporate updated physical facilities information for the Veterans Administration Medical Center and the UCSF Fresno Medical Education Program into the LRDP.

(3) Update Chapter 6, Major New Site at Mission Bay, to describe the potential acquisition of additional land there and possible change of use to include clinical uses.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Impact Report for the Amendment #2, Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Final 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.]

Chief Executive Officer of UCSF Medical Center Mark Laret, Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding, and Chairman of the Pediatrics Department Dr. Sam Hawgood discussed the details of the plan for the future of UCSF Medical Center.

It was recalled that all inpatient facilities in California, including those of the San Francisco campus Medical Center at Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion, are subject to the Alfred E. Alquist Hospital Facilities Seismic Safety Act (Senate Bill 1953), which imposes deadlines for new State-mandated seismic and life-safety standards. At the time of the San Francisco campus LRDP approval by The Regents in January 1997, no major improvements to or replacements of hospital facilities were considered. The Medical Center's activities, including those at Moffitt/Long Hospital, were assumed to remain generally in their then-current locations, configurations, and sizes. In addition, from November 1997 to April 2000, The Regents leased Moffitt/Long Hospital, Mount Zion Hospital, and other facilities of the Medical Center to the joint public corporation formed with Stanford University. The Board of Regents was not involved in physical planning or compliance with seismic requirements for these facilities under SB 1953 during this time. Since the return of Medical Center operations to The Regents in 2000, comprehensive future facility planning has been under way, leading to this proposed LRDP Amendment.

The San Francisco campus conducted an extensive, four-year planning process to determine how best to replace the Medical Center's aging and seismically deficient inpatient facilities at Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion in a manner that would be consistent with the long-term vision for the academic and clinical enterprise of the campus. This planning process was guided by a broad cross-section of faculty and staff in two sequential campus committees, and involved campus-wide participation including the Academic Senate, as well as external community participation through the campus' Community Advisory Group. The resulting LRDP Amendment explores options for the replacement of Mount Zion Hospital by December 31, 2012 and identifies a range of possible replacement scenarios for inpatient services currently in the Moffitt portion of Moffitt/Long Hospital at Parnassus Heights, which must be decommissioned by December 31, 2029. The campus determined that 650 beds are needed to meet core hospital program needs and fiscal feasibility criteria. The long-range scenario assumes that the campus will proceed with construction of a new hospital of 210 beds on property to be acquired, or on property already owned but designated for research at Mission Bay, while continuing to operate Moffitt/Long Hospital with up to approximately 600 beds until 2030 (for a total of 810 beds). Moffitt would be decommissioned by 2030. After 2030, about 400 beds would be assumed to operate at Parnassus Heights.

Need for Replacement of Hospital Facilities

The majority of the UCSF Medical Center's inpatient facilities are located at Parnassus Heights in the 526-bed Moffitt/Long Hospital, which is composed of two adjoining 15-story buildings which function as one structure; Moffitt, built in 1955, and Long, built in 1982. Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute has approximately 20 beds. Through internal modifications, 54 beds are planned to be added to Moffitt/Long, for a total of 600 beds. Moffitt/Long Hospital, like the rest of UCSF's Parnassus Heights site, lacks adequate space and will not continue to meet the growing demand for highly specialized patient care. In addition, the buildings' space configuration and layouts are functionally obsolete, inefficient, and too inflexible to adapt to changing patient care needs. The buildings are costly to operate and maintain, and the utility systems are aging, making it difficult to meet growing demands for new technology.

The UCSF Medical Center also maintains a small inpatient presence in the "A" and "B" buildings built in 1948 at Mount Zion in San Francisco's Western Addition neighborhood consisting of 61 active cancer surgery beds, which also need to be replaced for the reasons articulated above. Because inpatient functions in the A and B buildings are physically and functionally integrated and cannot operate independently from one another, achieving SB 1953 compliance at Mount Zion would involve retrofitting the A building and replacing the functions in the B building in a new structure by 2013, followed by replacement of the functions in the A building in another new structure by 2030. Because of the expense associated with implementing such a plan relative to the small number of beds there, inpatient use at Mount Zion is not planned to continue beyond 2013. The decision to cease inpatient use at Mount Zion by 2013 is also due to the fact that the site lacks sufficient space to meet the growing demand for highly specialized patient care and would not adequately provide for the expansion and integration of research and educational components there. After 2013, the Mount Zion site would continue to serve ambulatory care, outpatient surgery, and related clinical research and education uses.

SB 1953 Compliance Status

SB 1953 requires hospitals to retrofit facilities to meet new seismic standards by 2008, and to retrofit or rebuild to meet even stricter standards by 2030. An extension of the 2008 deadline to 2013 is possible if a hospital elects to replace, rather than retrofit, a non-compliant facility. Two types of standards are reported; Nonstructural Performance Categories (NPC) and Structural Performance Categories (SPC). The current compliance status of hospital facilities at Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion is described below.

Moffitt/Long Hospital SB 1953 Compliance

Year 2008 Compliance. Both Moffitt and Long are rated NPC 2 and require retrofitting to meet NPC 3 standards by 2008. In addition, the Central Utility Plant at Parnassus Heights, which serves the hospital, is rated NPC 2 and requires retrofitting to meet NPC 3 standards by 2008. The campus has also identified specific structural items in Moffitt that need upgrading by 2008 to meet an SPC 2 rating (Long is rated SPC 4 and meets all

SPC requirements). In November 2000, The Regents approved an allocation of $25 million of State Lease Revenue Bonds for the UCSF Medical Center to perform necessary nonstructural and structural seismic work through SB 1953 Year 2008 compliance.

Year 2030 Compliance. While Long is able to meet the more stringent Year 2030 seismic requirements with some nonstructural work, due to its age and its condition Moffitt would require extensive seismic upgrades and retrofitting in order to allow use as an inpatient facility beyond 2030. As noted above, Moffitt and Long are physically and functionally integrated and cannot function independently from each other. Because of this, the continued use of Long for inpatient activities beyond 2030 would require that inpatient functions currently housed in Moffitt be replaced in a seismically compliant structure by 2030.

Mount Zion Hospital SB 1953 Compliance

The A and B buildings at Mount Zion described above, as well as the D and R buildings which contain support functions, were retrofitted in 2002 to meet NPC 2 standards. Because inpatient functions at Mount Zion will cease in 2013 and be replaced elsewhere, an extension of the 2008 nonstructural and structural requirements to 2013 has been granted, and no further seismic upgrades to these buildings under SB 1953 are planned.

Academic and Clinical Planning

The evaluation of these seismic compliance scenarios for the replacement hospital also involved a parallel academic and physical planning process. To maintain the successful integration of clinical and academic programs, planning was guided by several clinical and academic imperatives. The following are among the academic drivers:

- Foster the integration of research and clinical care;
- Provide opportunities to develop a major translational research initiative at campus sites;
- Develop vibrant education, research and clinical care at all major campus sites;
- Maximize the use of existing campus locations.

Central to the hospital replacement planning process is the recognition that planning for clinical facilities must occur together with planning for related research facilities in order to maintain the successful integration of clinical and academic programs. Due to physical capacity constraints, including the limitation on space that can be developed at Parnassus Heights negotiated between The Regents and the State Legislature in 1976, it was determined that the entire 650-bed planning target could not be accommodated solely at Parnassus Heights without seriously disrupting and displacing academic programs there and could not be achieved in time to replace beds at Mount Zion which must be taken out of service by the December 31, 2012, the legislative deadline in SB 1953. Furthermore, it was determined that the research campus at Mission Bay would benefit greatly from a clinical presence there, particularly through the co-location of clinical facilities with basic and translational disease-oriented research programs. As a result, several split-site

scenarios, whereby inpatient facilities would be split between two sites, were identified for consideration. The split-site approach also supports the need to implement the hospital replacement program over time, and in phases, due to financial and operational constraints.

In order to support the development of programmatic recommendations for replacement clinical facilities, extensive strategic planning has been conducted which addressed the sizing of inpatient and outpatient facilities, their programmatic composition, and their relationship to major related research programs. A variety of programmatic options were vetted within the planning goal of 650 total beds, and various aspects of each option were assessed, including clinical and research benefits, clinical coverage issues, phasing, capital affordability, and operational cost performance.

Important clinical drivers include:

- Ensure that inpatient facilities meet stringent State-mandated earthquake safety standards;
- Address the functional obsolescence of existing inpatient facilities to ensure the continued delivery of high-quality, state-of-the-art care;
- Increase inpatient and outpatient capacity to meet objectives of the Medical Center Strategic Plan.

The Medical Center Strategic Plan was developed to determine how the Medical Center could best achieve the financial position necessary to support needed infrastructure investments in the short term and the replacement of Moffitt Hospital and Mount Zion Hospital over the long term. The Plan calls for an incremental increase in bed capacity in existing facilities in the short term, along with the growth of targeted services and a variety of operating performance and customer service initiatives. Based on the Medical Center Strategic Plan that considered multiple factors, including Bay Area demographics, current and projected demand, and market share of specific services, a hospital replacement bed planning target of 650 beds was used in the planning process.

The resulting proposals contained in this LRDP Amendment call for two major integrated campus sites with clinical care co-located with basic and translational research programs. One site would house specialty hospitals, and the other site would house a tertiary-quaternary hospital with an emergency department. Both sites would contain ambulatory care facilities, and both would be populated with basic and translational disease-oriented research programs.

Project Sites

The LRDP Amendment EIR evaluated alternative development to equal 650 beds in operation in the milestone year of 2012 and beyond the LRDP timeframe to 2029. As described below, five development locations were evaluated against detailed screening criteria to identify a range of possible replacement scenarios at Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, and Mount Zion. Each scenario was evaluated for site characteristics, costs,

programmatic, market and logistical considerations, parking and traffic issues, environmental impacts, and community and governmental relations.

(1) Parnassus East – the area adjoining and incorporating the current location of the Medical Center. Under the current LRDP, an additional 54 beds would be added to the existing 526-bed Moffitt/Long Hospital through internal modifications. Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute has approximately 20 beds. In the future, about 400 beds would be operated at the Parnassus East site in a combination of new and renovated space. Associated outpatient and clinical research space would be accommodated in existing facilities on campus.

(2) Parnassus West – the western edge of the main campus, at the opposite end of Parnassus Avenue from the current Medical Center. Under the current LRDP, demolition of the obsolete Laboratory of Radiobiology and the seismically poor UC Hall would be completed. In the future, up to 400 beds could be constructed at the site as an alternative to the Parnassus East site. Associated clinical space would be accommodated in existing facilities on campus.

(3) Mission Bay South – an assemblage of blocks comprising approximately 14.5 acres adjacent to the southern edge of the current Mission Bay campus, on the south side of 16th Street. This location has a capacity for up to 650 beds and associated clinical space. As noted above, about 210 beds would be constructed by 2011-2012, but the site could accommodate a program of up to 650 beds in the future.

(4) Mission Bay North – the northern most portion of the 43-acre Mission Bay campus site, bounded by Gene Friend Way on the south, Owens Street on the west, Mission Bay Boulevard on the north, and Third Street on the east. As an alternative to the Mission Bay South site, up to 400 beds and associated clinical space could be constructed on the northern undeveloped blocks of the campus site.

(5) Mount Zion – demolition and new construction on the existing "main block" at Mount Zion, bounded by Sutter, Divisadero, Post, and Scott Streets. This alternative has been set aside and, under the preferred plan, Mount Zion would provide for expanded ambulatory care, outpatient surgery, and related clinical research and education uses.

Recommendations and Phasing

LRDP Phase

The first phase of the preferred plan, which would be implemented during the time frame of the current LRDP (through 2011-2012), would develop three integrated specialty hospitals containing a total of approximately 210 beds for a children's hospital, women's hospital, and the first phase of cancer hospital services, along with adjacent ambulatory care combined with translational research facilities and parking. This first phase hospital

would: 1) provide replacement space for inpatient services currently at Mount Zion hospital which must be decommissioned by the December 31, 2012 seismic deadline; 2) provide state-of-the art facilities and growth capacity for the children's hospital and women's and cancer surgery services; and 3) allow for the growth of targeted inpatient services in space released at Moffitt/Long Hospital by the children's hospital and women's programs there. As part of this first phase, major renovations to Moffitt/Long Hospital to provide up to 54 additional beds are planned. Parnassus Heights also includes approximately 20 beds at Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute, so Parnassus Heights would provide up to 600 beds to ensure the continued delivery of high-quality care there until the second phase.

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee has identified the Mission Bay South site as the preferred location for the first phase hospital; however, because The Regents does not yet own this property, the Mission Bay North and Mount Zion sites were identified as backup locations for a first phase hospital.

Future Phase

Planning for hospital replacement considered not only the first seismic deadline, which occurs during the LRDP time horizon of 2012, but also the second seismic deadline of 2030. Thus, the EIR analyzes scenarios for potential future phase activities beyond the LRDP's 2012 time horizon to ensure that current activities are considered in the context of the overall long-term requirements of the seismic legislation. The campus is not recommending Regental action on this future phase at this point, and analysis in the EIR does not commit the University to any specific scenario or project funding.

Academic and Clinical Rationale

A children's hospital was selected for the first phase of the preferred plan for the following reasons:

- Children's services are most separable from other services at Parnassus;
- Children's is the largest single program that can be relocated from Parnassus, freeing two floors of space for expansion of high-end adult specialty services in Moffitt/Long Hospital, consistent with the campus' strategic clinical and academic goals;
- A separate children's facility would provide visibility and identity for the existing children's hospital that has been lacking as a "hospital within a hospital" at Moffitt/Long, thereby improving its competitive position;
- Children's hospitals have demonstrated strong fundraising potential;
- An analysis of operating costs for a free-standing children's hospital compares favorably relative to other options.

The national reputation of the campus in maternal-fetal and neonatal medicine is founded upon the close collaborative care between obstetrics-gynecology, neonatology, and pediatric surgery. The integration of a women's hospital with the children's hospital will ensure continued excellence in the clinical care of complex maternal conditions, the

diagnosis and treatment of birth defects, and clinical investigation in maternal-fetal surgery.

A cancer hospital was selected as a specialty hospital to be built together with the children's hospital and a women's hospital because patients receiving care at both such facilities would greatly benefit from the presence of cancer specialists. Co-locating a women's hospital with a cancer hospital will ensure that women with cancer diagnoses, including breast and gynecologic cancer, have immediate access to the appropriate specialists. In addition, a large majority of all children's hospitalizations at the children's hospital are attributable to cancer and cancer-related issues. Much of the leading research of the campus seeks to understand the cancer mechanism – beginning at birth – so that cancer can be detected and treated early in life, and the location of the Cancer Hospital adjacent to a planned new cancer research building at Mission Bay will provide a synergistic opportunity for the discovery and development of new treatments. Cancer hospitals are also one of the two best options, along with children's hospitals, for fund raising.

Finally, integrating multiple specialty hospitals will allow for collaboration between translational research and the delivery of patient care. "Bench to bedside" collaboration among basic scientists, clinical researchers and physicians (the translational care spectrum), and the collaboration of multidisciplinary medical specialists (e.g. perinatologists, fetal surgeons, cardiologists, cancer specialists, neurologists), will create a rich environment for new discoveries in the care of fetal, pediatric, maternal, women and cancer patients.

Potential Land Acquisition at Mission Bay

The terms of a ground lease for an approximately 9.7-acre portion of the Mission Bay South site are being negotiated with the owner, Catellus Development Corporation. Real estate due diligence is being completed for the Mission Bay South site. Planning studies have indicated that the 9.7-acre portion of the Mission Bay South site could accommodate the LRDP phase of the replacement hospital facilities as described above. A request to enter into an option to ground lease with an option to purchase the 9.7 acres was approved by The Regents at the January 2005 meeting. Additional land contiguous to the 9.7-acre portion of the Mission Bay South site could provide up to an additional 4.6 acres but is not required to meet the current proposed hospital sizing. Any future acquisitions are subject to Regents approval.

Financial Planning

The San Francisco campus is in the process of preparing a detailed financial plan for the preferred hospital replacement option that has been identified. Anticipated sources of capital to fund the hospital replacement include hospital revenue bonds to be paid out of operating revenue, philanthropy, and parking and auxiliary financing. Project budgets, financing plans, and building designs would come to The Regents for approval at a later date, after certification by The Regents of the Hospital Replacement Environmental Impact Report and approval of the LRDP Amendment #2.

Other LRDP Amendment Actions

Mount Zion. In 2001, the property at 1545 Divisadero Street, adjacent to the Mount Zion site, was donated to The Regents. The site includes a 30,900 gsf, two-story building which is vacant. LRDP Amendment #2 updates the campus boundaries of the Mount Zion site to include 1545 Divisadero Street.

San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH). The San Francisco campus has engaged in discussions with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) regarding the potential co-location of the campus' and DPH's inpatient facilities at Mission Bay. In addition, the planning process includes replacement options for about 100,000 asf of campus research programs in seismically poor buildings at SFGH. The location of such research space would depend on DPH's preferred location of SFGH inpatient facilities. LRDP Amendment #2 acknowledges these ongoing discussions.

Veterans Affairs Medical Center. LRDP Amendment #2 incorporates updated facilities information for the Veterans Affairs Medical Center into the LRDP. New projects since the 1996 LRDP include a research building on the site of Building 12, a Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility on the Building 13 site, a research building funded by the Northern California Institute for Research and Education, and an animal research facility.

Fresno Medical Education Program. Construction of the Fresno Medical Education and Research Center has recently been completed, and building occupation in 2005 will allow for the consolidation and co-location of University education and research space in one new building. LRDP Amendment #2 incorporates this updated information into the LRDP.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, an Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the proposed LRDP Amendment #2 for Hospital Replacement (State Clearinghouse Number 2004072067). The Notice of Preparation and Initial Study was circulated from July 13 through August 11, 2004. A public scoping meeting was held on July 28, 2004.

The Draft EIR was prepared and circulated to the public, responsible agencies, and the State Clearinghouse for a 45-day review period between November 30, 2004 and January 14, 2005. Seven written letters and email comments were received. Four speakers testified at a public hearing was held on January 10, 2005. A copy of the written and oral comments received during the public review period, and responses, are included in the Final EIR. The comments mainly concern the potential site selection of the Mission Bay South parcel, representing an expansion of property under control by The Regents for the San Francisco campus.

The EIR evaluated the hospital replacement program of 650 beds at a program level. There were four site scenarios for meeting the 650-bed program alone or in combination which were evaluated at an equal level of detail. While the EIR was in preparation, the

campus developed its recommendations for three integrated specialty hospitals of about 210 beds during the LRDP timeframe, while continuing to operate Moffitt/Long Hospital with about 600 beds. Project level approvals and additional CEQA analysis, if necessary, will be brought to The Regents at a future date.

Included in the project description is a feasibility analysis for providing a helipad for helicopter access to the Medical Center. Due to the location and topography at Mission Bay, it was concluded that a helipad is feasible were the Mission Bay South or Mission Bay North sites to be developed.

With regard to the Parnassus Heights options, the project description summarizes the space planning assumptions that were made in order to address the space ceiling – a commitment by The Regents to cap the gross square footage and boundaries of the Parnassus Heights site. Implementation of the 1996 LRDP projects would bring the campus site to the 3.615 million gsf space ceiling goal of the LRDP.

The EIR identifies impacts that remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation in the following areas:

(1) Construction, mobile and stationary source emissions, as well as cumulative source emissions, would remain significant and unavoidable after extending transportation demand management programs to new development.

(2) Demolition of UC Hall, an historic resource, would remain significant and unavoidable, after measures to document, interpret, and conserve historic elements of the structure.

(3) Conflicts with City of San Francisco height and bulk limits would remain significant and unavoidable.

(4) Operation of a helipad at Mission Bay would exceed nighttime noise standards over residential areas and would remain significant and unavoidable after implementing flight path recommendations.

(5) Cumulative construction noise would be a temporary but significant and unavoidable.

(6) Traffic impacts could be mitigated through street improvements; however, those mitigations would be under the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco and would be significant and unavoidable if not implemented by that agency.

The EIR identifies potential significant environmental impacts that can be mitigated to less than significant in the following areas:

(1) Increased nighttime light and glare, mitigated by design standards.

(2) Nighttime construction lighting, mitigated by construction contract requirements.

(3) Visual impacts of new hospital construction, mitigated by design standards.

(4) Hazardous wind speeds at pedestrian level, mitigated by wind modeling and design modifications, as needed.

(5) Construction air quality degradation (e.g. dust), mitigated by construction contract specifications.

(6) Disturbance of archaeological resources during excavation, mitigated by steps described in mitigation measures.

(7) Ground failure or liquefaction due to major earthquake, mitigated by site-specific engineering and design.

(8) Increased load on hazardous waste management facilities, mitigated by comprehensive environmental health and safety program.

(9) Water quality impacts on combined sewer system, mitigated by implementation of the City and County of San Francisco Water Pollution Prevention Program.

(10) Conflict with The Regents' space ceiling policy at Parnassus Heights, mitigated by commitment to a demolition and relocation plan that achieves space ceiling goals.

(11) Construction and operational noise impacts, mitigated by construction contract requirements and stationary equipment controls.

(12) Construction traffic impacts, mitigated by commitment to a construction traffic and parking management plan.

The Final EIR is accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and findings of overriding consideration regarding significant effects on the environment.

Regent Johnson asked what was being done to ease patients' transportation between Mission Bay and Mount Zion. Vice Chancellor Spaulding responded that the City has a good Muni system and the University runs a free shuttle service among its major sites. Also, as a city within a city, Mission Bay will have its own transportation system. Dr. Hawgood noted that roughly 70 percent of the children at UCSF's Children's Hospital come from outside the City of San Francisco. Mission Bay is a more accessible site for patients coming from other areas.

Regent Johnson asked what the model would be for the women's hospital and what role the Women's Health Center at UCSF would play. Mr. Laret reported that, in order to be meaningful and affordable, the women's hospital at Mission Bay initially will be limited to obstetrics and cancer. The leaders of the Women's Health Center have been involved in the design of the new program. Dr. Hawgood noted it is critical that programs that work together be in close proximity.

Regent Anderson asked about the space cap established by the City. Vice Chancellor Spaulding explained that the space cap was established by The Regents. It followed major neighborhood opposition to further development of the main campus. The Mount Sutro Defense Committee appealed to the State Legislature, which put language in the Budget Act encouraging the Board to incorporate the space ceiling as a permanent limitation on the capacity of the Parnassus site. Every effort to modify it since 1976 has failed.

Regent Kozberg mentioned that SB1953 may be amended. Vice Chancellor Spaulding believed that was a possibility, but he reported that even if more time to meet the requirements were granted, UCSFMC would want to adhere to its original timetable.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the campus had evaluated alternatives, but she wondered why some of those alternatives had been discarded. She asked a series of questions: how much it would cost to move the entire enterprise to Mission Bay; what were the costs related to operating two facilities plus a Mount Zion outpatient program; what the impact on care and efficiency would be of providing specialty activities at Mission Bay to patients from Mount Zion; whether the feasibility of a helicopter link between Mission Bay and Mount Zion had been explored; why the campus' projection for a need for 650 beds in 2013 to meet core hospital needs has increased to 790 beds; what the reasons were for maintaining an outpatient program at Mount Zion; and how housing needs were being dealt with.

Senior Vice President Mullinix responded that it would cost billions of dollars for the University to build a single hospital with its attendant educational facilities. Mr. Laret listed some of the issues involved. He recalled that the land that was available at the time from Catellus was insufficient to accommodate a replacement for the Parnassus campus.

Other parcels would have had to be acquired, which it was determined would not be feasible economically. Also, it would not make sense to abandon the Parnassus facilities, as the University and the State have invested large amounts of money in the site to integrate research with patient care. Considering these and other factors, the idea of moving all facilities to Mission Bay was discarded. Concerning operating figures, Mr. Laret estimated that to run hospitals at two sites would have an added cost of $10 million to $15 million per year. Mr. Spaulding noted that when Mount Zion was being run as a larger facility, the premium was about $11 million per year to run both it and the Parnassus hospital. Regent Hopkinson asked how changes in Medi-Cal might affect the situation. Mr. Laret noted that Medi-Cal volume, which has increased at most of the campuses, has remained flat at UCSFMC at 22 percent. There are a relatively small and stable number of Medi-Cal patients in the San Francisco.

Concerning cross-coverage, Mr. Laret reported that experience at Mount Zion had proved that few patients can be managed exclusively by an individual service. Necessary cross-coverages were developed among all the clinical programs. Part of the inefficiency of being on two sites is that the University pays to provide cardiology coverage, infectious diseases consults, and all the other subspecialties to make sure that the care provided is appropriate. Whether for financial reasons, efficiency, or convenience, the campus will never compromise the quality of care; in some ways, services have been over-covered at Mount Zion. This is part of the philosophy of what would be required at the Mission Bay campus as well. Finally, the campus at Mission Bay is within two miles of San Francisco General Hospital, the faculty of which are from UCSF. Many of them cross-cover between Parnassus and San Francisco General. It may be an option to have some of them cross-cover at Mission Bay. Dr. Hawgood agreed that this was the most difficult of the faculty clinical care issues that were part of the discussion. The Mount Zion experience has provided a model for experimenting with different systems. The patient population at Mission Bay will be largely a referral population; there will no adult emergency room there. It is not the perfect solution but is workable and will not compromise clinical care.

Concerning the projected need for beds, Mr. Laret explained that the anticipated increase is based on the experience of the past two years. If an additional 210 beds are added at Mission Bay, operating beds are shut down at Mount Zion, and Parnassus continues to have 580 beds, it is likely that 790, and possibly as many as 1111, beds will be needed in 2030. Only the number for which there is demand will be made operational. As the children's hospital is moved out of three floors of Moffitt and Long, only two floors will be backfilled, leaving the third for support services, so the number of beds will be reduced to meet actual demand.

Concerning the necessity of operating an outpatient program at Mount Zion, Mr. Laret reported that the hospital does substantial outpatient business, close to 300,000 visits per year, because it is accessible. The trend is to bring outpatient care closer to where patients and primary care physicians are, which would be more acceptable than requiring everyone to travel to the large Mission Bay facility.

Mr. Spaulding responded to the question about helicopter flights. He recalled that San Francisco is extremely hostile to the use of helicopters. Even San Francisco General

Hospital, which houses the area's major trauma center, has never been allowed to use them. Although Mr. Spaulding noted that flights approaching over water might make a heliport acceptable at Mission Bay, he recalled that following the Loma Prieta earthquake, when power was lost at the Parnassus site, the City denied PG&E the right to air lift a generator to the hospital. He believed there would be no possibility of running flights between Mission Bay and the other sites. Regent Hopkinson advocated continuing to try to obtain that permission.

Concerning housing, Mr. Spaulding recalled that the original contribution agreement for 30 acres from Catellus and 13 acres from the City enjoined the University from using the site for housing. A subsequent amendment to the LRDP allowed the construction of a major housing project on Block 20. Although the details of the Redevelopment Agency negotiations remain closed, it is hoped that as a byproduct of the discussion the University may be permitted to provide additional housing for its employees. With the addition of the hospital, with its thousands of jobs, plus an expected population of 8,000 on the built-out campus, there will be a need for all categories of housing.

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

7. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR MISSION BAY NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH BUILDING (19A, PHASE 1), SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend to The Regents that the following project be approved:

> San Francisco: Mission Bay Neuroscience Research Building (19A, Phase 1) – preliminary plans – $4 million, to be funded from gift funds.

It was recalled that the San Francisco campus wishes to proceed with the preliminary phase of the Mission Bay Neuroscience Research Building (19A, Phase 1), supported with $4 million of gift funds. Layout of the complete building must be determined in order to provide details of the separation of Phase 1 from Phase 2. Accordingly, Preliminary Plans for Phase 1 will include certain design work for Phase 2, as ultimately the two buildings will be connected as one. Regental approval of the full budget for both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects will be requested separately in the future.

Phase 1 will be planned to provide 48,000 asf (91,250 gsf) of new space, for a total project cost of approximately $64 million, to be supported with gift funds and external financing. This will result in a total project cost of $700 per gsf and construction cost of less than $515 per gsf. The total project cost estimate excludes Group 2 and 3 equipment. Schematic Design for Phase 2 is included in the Phase 1 total project cost. Phase 2 will comprise about 94,800 asf (152,250 gsf) and will be supported with gift funds. Anticipated costs for Phase 2 will be in line with Phase 1 costs escalated to the date of construction of Phase 2. With the future completion of Phase 2, the estimated combined building size will be 142,800 asf (243,500 gsf).

UCSF School of Medicine neuroscience researchers are in urgent need of additional space. The Keck Center comprises 17,600 asf at Parnassus Heights in several locations and is currently occupied by twice the population it was designed to accommodate. Subdivision of the existing Keck Center space into multiple small rooms and individual labs is inefficient and discourages interaction and collaboration among researchers. This lack of unified and adequate space threatens the growth of UCSF's neuroscience research programs as well as the recruitment and retention of UCSF faculty.

The proposed Phase 1 Mission Bay 19A project will provide urgently needed decompression and expansion neuroscience research space. The new wet and dry laboratory research building of approximately 48,000 asf (91,250 gsf) will be designed with an open configuration to foster interaction among researchers. Phase 1 will accommodate approximately 16 principal investigators, 12 systems neuroscientists, and 4 molecular neuroscientists, all currently housed at Parnassus Heights.

The Phase 1 project would allow for the "blending" of systems biological scientists, who study the function of the brain, with molecular researchers and clinical scientists. This would foster new discoveries about psychiatric disorders, diseases of neurodegeneration, developmental disorders, pain, deafness, and blindness and would create opportunities for new program partnerships with other Mission Bay research programs.

Project Description

Phase 1 will provide approximately 48,000 asf (91,250 gsf) in a five-story wet and computational-testing research laboratory building. The overall building height will be 85 feet to the parapet, consistent with the campus Mission Bay Master Plan. Bench laboratory and laboratory support areas will be stacked by floor for efficient layout and distribution of services. Offices on the periphery of the floor plate will allow direct access to individual research groups and facilitate interactions among offices.

The proposed Phase 1 project will include the following:

- *Bench Space*: The upper four floors of the project will include bench laboratory area with an approximately one-to-one ratio of typical wet bench lab area to lab support space.

- *Experiment-Testing Rooms and Lab Support*: The project will include Experiment-Testing Rooms and Lab Support space. Shared support spaces and open lab zones will foster interaction and collaboration. Lab support will include equipment areas, fume hoods, cold rooms, tissue culture, and perfusion rooms. Both the bench and the experiment-testing lab types will be designed as generically as possible to maximize flexibility.

- *Office-Computational Space*: Separate from the research zone, all of the office suites will be co-located in a single zone of the floor to facilitate interaction. Office space will include academic offices and computational work stations for post-doctoral students and other researchers, providing a collegial and quiet work

area outside the lab. Four faculty offices are planned for each of the four research floors, with computational work stations allocated for each research lab. The office suites will also incorporate shared functions, including conference rooms, administrative support space, and an open interaction-break space.

- *Vivarium*: The project will include vivarium space on the ground floor. The vivarium will contain a mix of holding, rearing, and surgical procedure rooms, as well as a support area for sterilizers, storage, offices, showers, and lockers. The vivarium will include small animals, non-human primates, rodents, and birds.

- *Building Support*: Building support functions provided by the Phase 1 project will include materials handling, break-coffee areas, lobby-reception, Environmental Health and Safety handling areas, machine shops, and data server rooms.

Approximately 17,600 asf will be released in Keck Center as a result of the Phase 1 project. This space will be used to provide clinical departments with space for faculty required for hospital expansion, decompression, and to address critical recruitments. Construction of Phase 1 is planned to begin June 2006 and to be completed approximately in September 2008.

This project will comply with the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards adopting 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 Compliance

The 1996 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and 2001 SEIR provided the environmental analysis for the Mission Bay site, which included environmental review for the 2.65-million-gsf capital program. This project is consistent with the LRDP. Further building-specific environmental analysis will be prepared in an Addendum to the 1996 LRDP and will be reviewed in conjunction with project design approval.

Funding Plan

Development of preliminary plans for Phase 1 and Schematic Design for Phase 2 will not exceed $4 million and will be supported with gift funds. Sufficient gifts have been raised to cover the cost of preliminary plans.

The total project cost of Phase 1 is estimated to be $64 million, to be supported with two-thirds gift funds and one-third external financing. Group 2 and 3 equipment is not included in this estimate but will be added at the time of the final budget approval. Phase 2 will be supported with gift funds and will comprise approximately 94,800 asf (152,250 gsf). With the future completion of Phase 2, the estimated combined building size will be 142,800 asf (243,500 gsf). The estimated total project cost for Phase 1 is

$700 per gsf. Anticipated costs for Phase 2 will be in line with Phase 1 costs escalated to the date of construction of Phase 2.

Future Regental Action

At a future meeting, the campus will request Regental approval of the total project cost of the Phase 1 building as well as approval of the financing plan. Regental approval of the budget for Phase 2 will be requested after Regental approval of Phase 1.

Vice Chancellor Spaulding emphasized that the planning for both phases would be supported entirely with gift funds.

Regent Hopkinson asked what percent of construction was represented by the $4 million cost of preliminary plans. Senior Vice President Mullinix indicated that it was about 3 percent. Austerity had caused the project to be broken into two phases.

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

8. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR CAMPUS PARKING STRUCTURE 3, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the Committee recommend to The Regents that, subject to the concurrence of the Committee on Finance, the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program for the subject project be amended as follows:

From: Santa Barbara: Campus Parking Structure 3 – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $20,250,00, to be funded from external financing ($16,750,000) and Parking Reserves ($3,500,000).

To: Santa Barbara: Campus Parking Structure 3 – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – $22,289,000, to be funded from external financing ($18,789,000) and Parking Reserves ($3,500,000).

It was noted that the $2,039,000 budget augmentation for the Campus Parking Structure 3 project at the Santa Barbara campus will be supported entirely with increased external financing and represents a 10 percent increase over the presently approved budget. Additionally, approval of a scope change is requested. As a cost-saving measure, total spaces will be reduced from 1,156 to 1,124, a reduction of 32 spaces.

The Campus Parking Structure 3 project is a critical component of an overall campus plan to address the loss of 1,400 parking spaces due to the construction of new facilities. Campus Parking Structure 3 will compensate for the loss of 882 spaces necessitated by construction of the Student Resources, Education, and Social Science projects. At the July 2003 meeting, The Regents approved an amendment to the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program for the Campus Parking Structure 3,

for a total project cost of $20,250,000. Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, amendment of the Long Range Development Plan, and the project design were approved at the October 2003 meeting of the Committee. Subsequently, the project has received Coastal Commission approval.

Project Description and Need for Augmentation

The proposed 355,000 gsf Campus Parking Structure 3 will provide 1,053 structured parking spaces, reduced from 1,086 at the time of Regental approval in July 2003. An additional 71 surface lot parking spaces, increased from 70 at the time of Regental approval in July 2003, will be supplied in an adjacent lot on the west side of campus.

Three bids were received, the lowest of which was $2,039,000 over the approved budget. Analysis of the low bid determined that the increase in cost was due primarily to the rise in the cost of concrete, steel, and labor. As material and labor costs are not expected to decrease in the near future, and as the project critically affects a number of other sequential projects and campus parking availability, an augmentation is requested.

CEQA Classification

A Mitigated Negative Declaration was approved by The Regents at the October 2003 meeting. The revised project budget and scope do not change the conclusion of the environmental analysis.

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

9. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, MUSIC BUILDING, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

It was recalled that the Music Building project is scheduled to be submitted for design approval at the Committee's May 2005 meeting. The cost is estimated to be $42,056,000, from State funds. The Music Building will provide 86,000 gross square feet and 46,975 assignable square feet, to include office space, a 400-seat recital hall, three rehearsal halls, practice rooms, and a recording studio. In accordance with the 1989 UCSD Master Plan, the project is located in the University Center area, in proximity to the Price Center and the Geisel Library. The University Center Neighborhood Planning Study, which envisions developing an avenue of the arts, supports its proposed placement.

Vice Chancellor Woods and Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann showed slides of the preliminary design. Mr. Woods commented that the budget for the project was extremely limited and that the project had been redesigned because originally it had been substantially over budget.

Mr. Hellmann discussed the context and architectural character of the building. He believed that its design was reflective of Center Hall, which has strong structural components with arcades and colonnades, as envisioned by the planning study; the

Student Academic Services Building and the Science and Engineering Research Facility, which have similar elements; the Visual Arts facility; and the Gilman Parking Structure. Fretted glass, which is used in Pepper Hall, will be used in the Music Building. The architect is LMN of Seattle.

Mr. Hellmann mentioned the complex acoustical requirements of music buildings. The structure must be isolated. Consideration must be given to the walls and joints so that the sound from the outside does not compromise sound inside and so that sound inside is contained in individual spaces. This makes the building very expensive and somewhat inefficient. Outside the recital hall an outdoor room has been created, screened by planting. On the east side there is an arcade. The entrance is covered by space above it that creates a courtyard.

Mr. Hellmann reported that the recital hall on the first floor, rehearsal halls, and an experimental performance laboratory will have glass with sound block. The administrative offices are on the street level. The second floor contains instructional space. The recording studio for the Interdisciplinary (with Visual Arts) Computing in the Arts program uses digital recording and sound. Faculty offices and studios fill the remainder. The third floor has practice studios, instructional space, and faculty offices and studios.

To resolve acoustical issues, the structure is concrete frame, with poured-in-place concrete and concrete block. Because is has many blank walls, bamboo landscaping will be used to soften its edges. An assemblage of channel glass is used for small windows in the studios. On the north side a glass area opens to the experimental performance facility. The concrete masonry units will have a sandblasted finish.

In response to an inquiry by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Hellmann reported that the acousticians for the project are Cyril Harris and Taylor and Associates.

Regent-designate Rosenthal asked where public performances could be held on campus, as this building is not planned to accommodate them. Mr. Hellmann responded that, as the La Jolla Playhouse is not well geared for musical performances, it is hoped that in the future a true concert hall may be built.

Regent Hopkinson noted that the portion of the building where students would be performing seemed difficult to get to. She suggested that flexibility should be provided so that in the future the space could be used for other than internal performances. Mr. Hellmann responded that in the University Center plan there is an area called Market Square. As the Center develops, the area will become more of a focal point for activity. The recital hall is located on the building's northern edge to give the Market Square additional activity.

Regent Hopkinson noted the use of concrete block, which she was concerned would look dated. Mr. Hellmann believed that the size chosen for the concrete block and its sandblasted finish would approve its appearance.

10. **UPDATE ON SAN DIEGO SUPER COMPUTER EXPANSION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The San Diego campus presented an update on requested changes to the design of the Super Computer Expansion project that had occurred subsequent to the Committee's approval of the project at its January 18, 2005 meeting.

Vice Chancellor Woods and Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann presented slides of the redesign. Mr. Hellmann recalled that concern had been expressed about the imagery of the building. One comment had to do with loading dock screening. He indicated that there were two docks and that both had been screened with additional landscaping. The building has been ridded of its vertical metal louvers on the east end. On the north and south elevations, the horizontal nature of the windows had been deemed to be unattractive. The redesign combines horizontal and vertical screening and drops the sills in certain locations to break up the horizontal line and give the building more depth and texture.

Regent Hopkinson commented that, while the windows on the north and south seemed improved, the east end showed significant improvement.

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

Senior Vice President Mullinix and Vice President Hershman provided an update on the University's deferred maintenance and long-term facilities renewal needs. Mr. Mullinix recalled that, following a presentation in 1998 on the severity of the University's deferred maintenance problem, The Regents had approved a five-year bond program to fund highest-priority deferred maintenance projects. The State's growing budget crisis forced the University to reduce the bond program in FY 2001-2002 and suspend it entirely in FY 2002-2003. Not only was the bond program suspended, but $7.1 million of permanent, State-funded deferred maintenance was eliminated from the University's budget as part of a one-time, $29 million cut; nevertheless, in the four years of the program, over $289 million of bond, permanent, and one-time State funds were distributed to the campuses, allowing completion of over 1,200 highest-priority deferred maintenance and facilities renewal projects. This unprecedented level of funding provided the campuses with an opportunity to address many of their most critical deferred maintenance problems, including long-neglected infrastructure projects.

Mr. Mullinix commented that, though exacerbated by recent budget cuts, the University's deferred maintenance is a long-term problem that will not disappear with occasional, even if substantial, infusions of funding. Deferred maintenance is the result of a lack of funding for facilities renewal and the systematic replacement of components of buildings and utility systems to extend the useful lives of facilities. Renewal costs are driven largely by the age of facilities and the life cycles of building and infrastructure systems. Approximately half of the University's State-eligible space was constructed in the 1950s and 1960s; an additional 15 percent was built before 1950. Most of the systems in these buildings are near or at the end of their useful lives.

Four years of the bond program demonstrated that a predictable funding stream for facilities renewal, even at modest levels, gives campuses significant leverage over limited resources by allowing planning of multi-year projects, coordination with capital programs, benefitting from economies of scale and full-system renewals, and avoiding the extraordinary premiums paid when work is done as emergency repair.

Mr. Mullinix reported that the University operates over 100 million square feet of space, about half of which is State-supported core instructional and research space. The half which is non-State-supported includes auxiliaries and other self-supporting activities, hospitals, housing, dining facilities, and student activities. Nearly 50 percent of the State-supported space is in buildings with complex utility and mechanical systems needed to support research and teaching laboratories. Complex space is much more expensive to maintain and renew and has a shorter life span. With roughly two-thirds of the University's space older than 35 years, most mechanical and other systems with life cycles between 25 and 40 years are reaching or have reached the end of their useful lives. The result is a large annual facilities renewal need that will grow steadily in the next decade. Facilities renewal not done in a timely manner becomes part of the University's deferred maintenance backlog.

Mr. Mullinix emphasized that, in addition to the suspension of the bond program in 2002-03, the State cut and has not restored permanent deferred maintenance funding. The State has also not funded operation and maintenance for new buildings since 2003-04. This exacerbates what is a 20 percent to 30 percent underfunding of basic operation and maintenance expenditures over the last two decades.

In the 1990s, the University developed a model that calculates UC's deferred maintenance backlog and projects the system's future facilities renewal needs. The model focuses on life cycles of buildings, subsystems, and campus infrastructure. It is estimated that there is at least a $600 million backlog of the highest-priority deferred maintenance projects. This backlog is the result of a failure to address systematic facilities renewal. Renewal needs are driven by the age of building and infrastructure and the length of useful life of building subsystems and infrastructure components. Over the next 50 years, the model projects UC's average annual facilities renewal needs for State-maintained space at $200 million per year and an additional $40 million to renew campus infrastructure including roads, central plants, and underground utility distribution systems.

Mr. Hershman observed that economies of scale offer efficiencies and benefits of extending the useful lives of entire systems. Predictable funding also provides for systematic building renewal. In most cases, the University has in place mechanisms for addressing the long-term needs of its auxiliaries and other non-State assets. The University is rebuilding its hospitals, modernizing its housing and athletic facilities, and creating a mechanism for establishing reserves to address the future needs of some of the newer non-State-supported research buildings. As for State-maintained space, the Compact with the Governor calls for increasing State support for basic operations and maintenance in 2008-09. UC's deferred maintenance program backlog is a big problem, but it could be managed with an ongoing facilities renewal funding system. In looking

at capital needs and programs, an attempt will be made to give a higher priority to stabilizing and maintaining existing facilities.

Vice President Hershman acknowledged that periodic progress had been made with regard to deferred maintenance, but he reiterated that the progress was halted by faltering economies. An agreement with Governor Davis had promised to improve basic funding for maintenance and make progress with respect to deferred maintenance using one-time money, and additional capital outlay was funded. These improvements that were begun were not continued. He believed that The Regents needed to develop a plan once again to address the problem.

Several strategies could be considered to deal with the situation over the next decade. Mr. Hershman commented that one strategy was the funding for basic operating and maintenance workload as buildings are constructed. The money was once provided as part of workload funding; as buildings came on line, some maintenance money was included. One option for attempting to resume regular funding is to try to reach an understanding with the Governor about including maintenance money in a special allocation. Another is related to the University's marginal cost-funding formula. The University has agreed to revisit its formula that provides dollars per student as students are added, with a view toward building in some money for maintenance. The amount would be significant, considering the expected continued growth.

Mr. Hershman noted a second strategy. The Compact with the Governor provides for additional University funding of 1 percent to go toward meeting core needs of the University beginning in 2008. That money could be used for a variety of purposes. One could be basic funding for maintenance.

Mr. Hershman recalled that significant amounts of the capital budget for the last five years have been used for new buildings to accommodate enrollment growth. The five-year capital budget will provide for major new facilities which will absorb about two-thirds of the budget. The other third involves building renewal. He suggested that once the major growth is concluded, around 2010-11, an agreement be sought with the Governor to continue funding for capital at the same level, but devoting a much larger share to basic building renewal. He reiterated that studies demonstrate that the University needs about $200 million per year for this. If the State would continue to provide $350 million per year, half or more could be devoted to building renewal.

Finally, Mr. Hershman reported that the University had obtained significant debt financing for deferred maintenance using nonresident tuition, the only source available at the time. He suggested that once the fiscal situation improves in a few years, consideration be given to using the University's debt for deferred maintenance or once again building into the Compact with the Governor the provision that if one-time funds become available to the State, it would consider using them for the University's deferred maintenance. He believed that all strategies will need to be considered when setting priorities for long-term planning.

Regent Hopkinson was concerned that the University may need to wait until after the building boom in California has subsided before the issue of the increasing student population can be addressed in any material way. Mr. Hershman was confident that some progress could be made by changing the marginal cost formula.

Regent-designate Rosenthal asked how other State agencies deal with the problem. Mr. Mullinix believed others were no less challenged. Mr. Hershman noted that public schools have begun using more of their bond money for deferred maintenance while their growth has subsided.

Regent Kozberg asked whether an anticipated request for another school bond for construction was going forward. Mr. Hershman responded that the Governor has committed in the Compact to seek either General Obligation or lease-revenue bonds. Options are being discussed about doing a GO bond issue that would include K-12 or postponing a GO bond issue until 2008 and using lease-revenue bonds meanwhile. Mr. Mullinix added that because of the uncertainty in this area and the fact that the lease-revenue bonds are charged partially against the University's credit, the campuses have been informed that approvals are being frozen on the non-State capital plan that was approved earlier, and the Office of the President has requested the submission of a greatly diminished list of borrowings.

Regent Kozberg asked whether, if either lease-revenue or GO bonds go forward, the University could follow the lead of the schools, using some money for modernization and some for new construction. Mr. Hershman responded that the strategy is practiced mostly for new construction. Once this growth spurt has subsided, the balance must be changed. He believed the public would support a GO bond issue, particularly if it included all of education.

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

This item was withdrawn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary