The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
September 20, 2005

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

Members present: Regents Hopkinson, Johnson, Juline, and Ruiz, Advisory members Ledesma, Brunk, and Miller

In attendance: Regent Schilling, Faculty Representative Oakley, Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Vice President Hershman, Chancellors Carnesale and Fox, and Recording Secretary Bryan

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

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

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

Item 102, Update on Sustainable Transportation Initiative and Recommendation for Systemwide Sustainable Transportation Policy

A. Mr. Jonathan Gifford, a Santa Cruz campus member of the California Student Sustainability Coalition, delivered a letter thanking the Regents for supporting student initiatives related to sustainable transportation. He noted that students are interested in working with the administration on developing the sustainable transportation program.

B. Ms. Brooke Owyang, a Berkeley student, echoed Mr. Gifford's remarks and expressed the hope that the transportation program would focus on promoting pedestrian and bicycle paths.

C. Ms. Dorothy Le, a UCLA student, believed that the innovative and creative suggestions that come from students could help foster collaboration with the relevant campus departments in developing the program.

D. Mr. Soumi Mehta, a San Diego campus student, urged the University to work with its communities on developing the program and furthering the goals of the students' sustainability coalition.

E. Ms. Sarah Szamdelax, a UC Berkeley student, spoke in support of the efforts of both students and the University relative to implementing a sustainable transportation policy and program.

F. Ms. Betty Seto, a UC Santa Barbara graduate student, noted that the climatic changes of the past few decades are having adverse effects on the environment. She supported adoption of a sustainable transportation policy as a step in fostering a cut back in the use of nonrenewable energy.

Item 104, Amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program, Approval of External Financing, Certification of Environmental Impact Report, and Approval of Design for Life Sciences Replacement Building, Los Angeles Campus

G. Ms. Sandy Brown, representing the Holmby/Westwood Property Owners' Association, stated that although the group had enjoyed a generally good relationship with the campus concerning the development of building projects, its members were concerned that the process used with relation to the Life Sciences building had not provided sufficient opportunities for input from the public. She believed that its current aggressive development mode was setting a bad precedent for the campus.

H. Mr. Ed Moss, a Westwood homeowner, commented that the environmental impacts of the project had not been addressed adequately. The Environmental Impact Report was silent on what chemicals and biological processes would be involved in the work done in the building's laboratories and the possible risks involved.

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

Regent Juline commented that the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 2005 had not made it sufficiently clear that he had received generally affirmative answers to three questions which he had asked members of a panel of outside experts formed to direct a study to identify opportunities for cost reductions in the implementation of the University's capital program.

It was noted that the Committee lacked a quorum. In anticipation of the late arrival of a fifth member, voting on all recommendations was delayed until a quorum was assured.

3. **UPDATE ON SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVE AND RECOMMENDATION FOR SYSTEMWIDE SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION POLICY**

The President recommended that he be authorized to:

A. Adopt guidelines supporting sustainable transportation efforts throughout the University of California, as a further commitment to sustainability principles. The guidelines will complement the Policy on Green Buildings and Clean Energy and any other University academic or administrative programs that support the development and implementation of evolving sustainable best practices. Objectives of sustainable transportation activities will include guidelines governing campus fleets; inter- and intra-campus transportation efficiencies; expansion of pedestrian and bicycle access to and within campus; and other campus-specific transportation not specified above. The principles and goals of sustainable transportation should be applied to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. Implementation must be sensitive also to the individual needs and constraints at each campus.

B. Increase the use of low- and zero-emission vehicles in campus fleets and work with industry to provide campuses a greater range of vehicle and fuel choices, with the overarching goal of reducing harmful automobile emissions and reducing fossil fuel use.

C. Continue transportation demand management to increase alternative mode use and maintain and increase the provision of accessibility and mobility to the campus community, with the overarching goal of increasing campus transportation access and improving the quality of life by reducing the impacts of traffic and parking congestion.

D. Develop and implement Sustainable Transportation guidelines for all campuses and provide an annual report to The Regents on progress made regarding the Sustainable Transportation efforts.

Senior Vice President Mullinix recalled that at the July 2004 meeting, The Regents accepted the recommendation of then-Regent Murray to develop a systemwide sustainable transportation policy recommendation by September 2005. Regent Murray's request was prompted by the hope for a University sustainable transportation policy that would accommodate both systemwide needs and the unique conditions of individual campus environments. In accepting the recommendation, The Regents requested that the proposed policy be developed in consultation and coordination with students, faculty, and staff of the University.

The term "sustainability" as used in the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards refers to physical development and institutional operating

practices that meet the needs of the present users without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, particularly with regard to the use and waste of natural resources. Sustainable practices support ecological, human, and economic health and vitality. Sustainability presumes that resources are finite and should be used conservatively and wisely with a view to long-term priorities and consequences of the way in which resources are used. The Green Building and Clean Energy Policy item indicated that "these recommended policy actions are the first steps toward developing and implementing a larger and comprehensive sustainability policy for the University." With that premise in mind, the Sustainable Transportation Policy is part of a series of initiatives which will come to fruition over the next several years.

In October 2004, the Office of the President was pleased to engage Ms. Tara Goddard and Mr. Arthur Coulston, students from the Davis and Santa Cruz campuses, as the UCOP Sustainable Transportation Interns to spearhead the Sustainable Transportation Initiative. During an eight-month study, Ms. Goddard and Mr. Coulston collected data on the individual campus transportation systems, culminating in the creation of campus profiles. From January through March of 2005, the interns conducted site visits at which campus faculty, staff, students, and advocates provided input on best practices, challenges, and constraints and collaborated to identify and develop policy options in conjunction with all the stakeholders.

In June of this year, the Campus Sustainability Conference at UC Santa Cruz featured an entire conference track on Sustainable Transportation. Campuses shared best practices and policy recommendations, while researchers and transportation planners shared ideas on sustainable transportation practices. UC students sponsored a session on sustainable transportation efforts at individual campuses. The conference allowed the campuses to showcase their current sustainability efforts, to network with others responsible for transportation systems on their campuses, and to gather ideas for further sustainability implementation.

The proposed policy represents wide-ranging interaction with groups at the forefront of sustainable transportation ideas, including the California Student Sustainability Coalition, the California Climate Action Registry, campus administrators, and other stakeholders.

Regent Juline asked whether the University intended to disseminate to other users the knowledge it was gathering in its research on sustainable transportation. Senior Vice President Mullinix noted that the University has shared its findings with the higher education industry and was thought of as a best practice leader in this arena.

Regent Johnson asked whether campuses would be evaluated on how well they were adhering to the standards that will be set for this initiative. Mr. Mullinix responded that the Committee would receive an annual report that would include performance evaluations for the campuses.

Committee Chair Hopkinson observed that the recommendations were vague and lacked a list of principles and goals. Mr. Mullinix responded that a policy would be developed

in each area. There is a set of draft guidelines that outline the goals and implementation measures. The recommendation is to delegate to the President the development of guidelines supporting sustainable transportation efforts.

4. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR MANAGEMENT SCHOOL FACILITY PHASE 1, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the 2005-2006 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

Deletions shown by strikeout, additions by underscore

San Diego: Management School Facility Phase 1 - preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment - ~~$31,417,000~~ $43,557,000 to be funded from gifts ($31,057,000) and campus funds (~~$360,000~~ $12,500,000).

It was recalled that in October 2001, The Regents amended the Budget for Capital Improvements and Capital Improvement Program to include Preliminary Plans (P) for the Management School Facility Phase 1 (Facility) project. In May 2004, The Regents amended the Budget for Capital Improvements and Capital Improvement Program to include a total budget for the project of $31,417,000, to be funded through gifts ($31,057,000 with interim and standby financing of $14,950,000) and campus funds ($360,000). The Regents approved the project's design in November 2004.

In November 2004, the campus employed the Construction Manager at Risk delivery method to gain the Contractor's insights during the design and to take advantage of the flexibility afforded by re-bidding any sub-trade contracts of the project that exceeded the estimates. The campus has found this to be an effective delivery method for large, complex projects. The Construction Manager-General Contractor (CM-GC) assured the campus that there were commitments from a sufficient number of subcontractors to ensure a competitive bid.

In January 2005, prior to bidding the project, the CM-GC and an independent cost estimator calculated a potential budget overage of approximately $6,000,000 due to market conditions. At that time, the campus engaged in value engineering and identified potential bid alternates to lower the potential overage.

The CM-GC received subtrade bids in April 2005 equaling a total project cost of $46,914,000, or approximately $15,500,000 over the approved budget. Although the CM-GC prequalified four bidders for each subtrade, only one or two subcontractors per trade actually submitted bids. The low bids on ten of the subtrades came in at more than double the estimate. The campus rejected the bids and terminated the CM-GC contract. The campus then re-bid the entire project to five pre-qualified general contractors and using the design-bid-build process, increased the number and competition among

subcontractors per subtrade. The need to re-bid the project would delay occupancy from Fall Quarter 2006 to Winter Quarter 2007.

Prior to rebidding the project, the campus took a number of steps to allow bidders greater cost flexibility. Overall specification changes were implemented in all disciplines (architectural, mechanical, structural, and electrical). In addition, alternatives to the following specified items were identified to increase price competition:

- The Trespa exterior panel cladding specification was modified to permit another similar material (Prodema);
- The site concrete specification was modified to allow other concrete types;
- The composite stone specification was modified to allow for other stone materials;
- Standard surface plaster finish at ceiling locations was allowed in lieu of Sto finish.

The campus re-bid the project, and the low bid received on June 30, 2005 equaled a total project cost of $43,557,000, for a budget overage of $12,140,000. While the campus did reduce the budget overage by more than $3,000,000 based on the efforts to increase bid competitiveness and identifying materials options for cost savings, it was unable to overcome the significant unexpected increase in labor and materials costs given the surge of construction activity in the San Diego region. Of the five General Contractors who prequalified, only two submitted bids. Labor shortages and unavailability of subcontractors due to local market saturation affected the ability of the other prequalified contractors to submit bids.

Prior to rebidding the project, the campus considered a major redesign of the project; however, given the market conditions, a redesign effort would have taken significant time, and it is likely that little headway could be gained against the ever-increasing escalation of construction costs. The new design reflects careful consideration of the program requirements and has undergone continuous value engineering and peer review efforts. Any dilution of quality in the facility would have a negative impact on the status and standing of the Rady School of Management in the highly competitive market for MBA students.

Project Description

This project would comprise approximately 50,000 asf to house the Rady School of Management, and would include classrooms, seminar rooms, faculty and administrative offices, conference rooms, student work and study areas, a multipurpose room, and dining areas. The project would be located on the North Campus in La Jolla, situated to the north of the Eleanor Roosevelt College, to the west of Ridge Walk, and to the east of Scholars Drive.

The instructional space includes tiered and flat classrooms, smaller seminar rooms, open computer laboratories, and informal breakout rooms for student teams. In addition to conference rooms, a multipurpose room would be used for public lectures as well as large student instruction and gatherings. Offices would be provided for faculty, Ph.D. students, and administrative staff.

The Executive Education space, in addition to offices, would have a tiered classroom, informal breakout rooms, and assembly space that are dedicated to the executive program. A reference library would give students access to online resources and industry literature, and students could research employment opportunities and receive placement assistance in the career services center. Included in the multipurpose and interaction space would be a dining facility to provide food service for the school's daytime and evening students and employees.

Environmental Consideration

In November 2004, The Regents approved the project's design and certified the Environmental Impact Report for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The design has no substantial changes from the design approved in November and is substantially the same as analyzed in the certified EIR.

Financial Feasibility

The total project cost is $43,557,000, including interest during construction, to be funded with gifts ($31,057,000) and campus funds ($12,500,000). The campus has raised $27,265,000 to date, with $3,792,000 to be raised. As gift funds will be collected over time, the campus will use previously approved standby financing of $11,050,000 and interim financing of $3,900,000 in order to meet Regental policy to have funds on hand for award of bid. If the interim financing needs to be converted to long-term debt, the estimated annual debt service at 6.125 percent for 30 years is $287,000. Gift funds would continue to be collected during the construction phase and after completion.

The campus funds include a contribution of $360,000 to install expanded utility lines in conjunction with the project that will enlarge the infrastructure of the campus to meet the needs of future capital improvement projects.

Chancellor Fox, Vice Chancellor Woods, and Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann discussed details of the project.

In response to a question asked by Regent Johnson, Chancellor Fox affirmed that money had been built into the budget to cover contingencies such as an increased price in oil.

Regent Juline asked whether the wide difference between the project budget and systemwide benchmarks was due to a need to update the benchmarks or was an indication that this building is an exception. Mr. Hellmann responded that the benchmark is a hypothetical model that is constructed relative to general programmatic criteria. The

anomaly is explained by the fact that in the San Diego area it is difficult to attract bidders in the current marketplace.

In response to a question asked by Faculty Representative Oakley about the protracted bid process, Chancellor Fox reported that the situation was unprecedented. The project turned out to have an even higher cost following value engineering. Mr. Oakley observed that the project, which originally was funded mostly by gifts, now required $12 million of campus funds. Chancellor Fox responded that the campus committee that examines discretionary investments was aware that this overage would eliminate discretion on the campus, particularly for capital facilities and will slow down additional projects.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that for the extra $12.5 million the campus planned to use interim financing. Mr. Woods commented that the interim financing that was in place would have existed to cover pledges even if the project had come in on budget. The $12 million being requested is for the spread between gifts and pledge dates. Fundraising will continue over the construction period.

In response to Regent Schilling's question as to whether renegotiation would be possible if prices in the construction industry should drop, Mr. Woods responded that it would not be possible on this project, but he noted that other projects were being held up with the hope that the market will change.

Committee Chair Hopkinson anticipated that the schedule will be affected by the lack of available construction workers.

5. **CERTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN, EAST CAMPUS GRADUATE HOUSING, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Report and Findings.

C. Amend the Long Range Development Plan to reclassify four acres of UCSD Park land from Park-Restoration Land to Park-Ecological Reserve.

D. Approve the design of the East Campus Graduate Housing, San Diego campus.

[The Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring Report, Findings, and Long Range Development Plan 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 2004, the Regents approved the inclusion of the East Campus Graduate Housing, San Diego campus, into the 2004-2005 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvements Program for a total project cost of $78,000,000 at CCCI 4761. The project is funded from external financing ($77,300,000) and the San Diego campus' share of the University of California Housing System Net Revenue Fund ($700,000).

Project Site

The proposed East Campus Graduate Housing project site encompasses approximately 8.5 acres located within the southeast portion of the UCSD main campus. The project site is an undeveloped area approximately 100 feet northeast of I-5/La Jolla Village Drive interchange. The site is bounded by Miramar Street and the Mesa Student Housing Complex on the east and undeveloped land (UCSD Park) to the north, south, and west. Existing land uses farther from the site include the Health Sciences Neighborhood to the north and the Hyatt Aventine hotel/restaurant/office complex to the south (across La Jolla Village Drive). The project site is consistent with the campus' 2004 Long Range Development Plan.

2004 LRDP Amendment

The proposed use is consistent with the LRDP Housing land use designation. The project will, however, affect 7.51 acres of sensitive biological habitat. The 2004 LRDP EIR provided a method for mitigating for loss of sensitive biological habitat within the UCSD Park land use designation through reclassification of land.

The UCSD Park land use designation contains three subcategories: Restoration Lands, Ecological Reserve, and Grove Reserve. Restoration Lands are areas that have been disturbed by erosion, invasive vegetation, and past military use, but could be restored to enhance biological value. Ecological Reserve areas are biologically sensitive and no buildings, roads or driveways are permitted. Essential utilities may be considered if mitigated. Grove Reserve includes the eucalyptus stands that are distributed throughout the campus.

The replacement ratios for the 7.51 acres of impacted habitat require 6.86 acres of habitat land. Some of the mitigation will occur in areas already designated as Ecological Reserve (3.20 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and 2.72 acres of non-native grassland) in the North Canyon Ecological Reserve in the West Campus.

The LRDP Amendment is required for the redesignation of land to mitigate the native grassland habitat. The impact to native grassland requires one acre of mitigation land. There are 0.60 acres of native grassland on the East Campus. Because native grassland occurs on campus only in the East Campus, the campus is proposing to redesignate an additional 3.40 acres of land (four acres total) which encompasses all the remaining native grassland habitat on the campus. The remaining mitigation requirement of 0.40 acres of native grassland will be substituted by 0.40 acres of southern maritime chaparral

in the existing SIO Campus Ecological Reserve. The proposed LRDP amendment is to redesignate four acres surrounding the project site from Restoration Lands to Ecological Reserve. Much of the area proposed for redesignation is steep canyon edge near Interstate 5, unsuitable for facility development.

Project Design

The proposed project will be designed and constructed using the design-build delivery methodology. This project involves construction of four-story apartment housing facilities of approximately 292,000 asf (374,000 gsf), with 800 student beds and 6 non-revenue staff beds, for a total of 806 new beds. In addition, approximately 800 parking spaces will be provided in a 682-space parking structure and through 124 surface parking spaces dispersed off a perimeter access road that surrounds the site. The housing will be provided for single graduate and medical students in unfurnished, two-bedroom apartment units, along with associated community and support space.

Architecturally, the apartment units will be contemporary in style and constructed of Type V wood frame construction with a concrete masonry unit base, painted horizontal and vertical cementboard siding, sand-finished plaster, and deep-set aluminum windows. The concrete masonry will also be used for the patio walls at all first-floor residential units. The upper trim of the buildings will be enhanced with a metal fascia. Natural earth tone colors, ranging from olive to ochre, will be used for exterior paints. Each above-grade residential unit will contain a balcony. Awnings will be placed above windows to provide sun protection and energy efficiency, as well as architectural character.

The 176,000 gsf parking structure with 682 spaces will contain six levels, two of which will be below grade on one side and one of which will be an open-air deck. Vehicles will enter the structure from Miramar Street and the perimeter service road. Pedestrian access and circulation for the structure will be via two staircases and an elevator. The structure will be concrete. Security lighting will be installed throughout the structure, including the top roof deck. Security phones will be distributed throughout the structure, and unsafe areas will be fenced off.

Although the budget for this project was approved before the Regents' sustainability energy policy took effect, its design incorporates the following sustainability considerations: circulated and natural ventilation for cooling; recycling of construction waste; individual airflow, temperature, and lighting controls; Energy Star roof compliance; maximum day lighting; and use of best practice commissioning procedures. This project will comply with the University of California Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards and the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards and will achieve a Certified rating.

The University of California, San Diego Design Review Board has reviewed and approved the design of the East Campus Graduate Housing project in accordance with University policy. An independent seismic review has been completed. The Office of

Facilities Design and Construction will manage the project. Independent testing agencies will be used as necessary. The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect, Facilities Design and Construction, will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the University determined that the East Campus Graduate Student Housing project may have a significant impact on the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared. The proposed EIR, which is tiered from the program-level 2004 Long Range Development Plan EIR, was circulated to responsible agencies and the State Clearinghouse for a 45-day public review from June 23, 2005 to August 8, 2005. Written comments were received from three agencies relating to habitat regulations and mitigation, transportation and solid waste. In addition, a public hearing on the Draft EIR was held on July 19, 2005; no members of the public attended the hearing. Based on the Tiered EIR, the University concluded that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment; however, with project revisions and mitigating measures that have been agreed to by the University, potential significant effects will be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which documents responsibility for mitigation implementation, is included in the Final EIR.

One of the primary issues of concern evaluated in the EIR was the potential for finding munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), including unexploded ordnance (UXO), remaining onsite from past military use of the site as a small arms training facility. The EIR includes an environmental analysis of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (ACOE) MEC Construction Support Work Plan (Work Plan), evaluates the location of training ranges in relation to the site, and determines that the probability of encountering UXO/MEC on site is low, based on the type of arms used in training and upon field observations by the ACOE. The Work Plan and EIR analyze procedural details that will be implemented during construction of the proposed project. The ACOE will provide monitoring by a qualified ACOE representative during grading operations. Should MEC be encountered, ACOE representatives would initiate subsurface investigations and removal actions to prevent public or environmental hazards. ACOE would be responsible for all aspects of construction support and removal action procedures, including the implementation of engineering controls, detonation of any UXO, and/or disposal of any inert materials unearthed during project construction. No potentially significant impacts related to implementation of the Work Plan were identified in the EIR that could not be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Findings

The findings discuss the project's impacts and associated mitigation measures.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Hellmann recalled that the design-build team would commence construction in October. He showed slides of the project to illustrate the changes that had

been made in response to discussions about the project that took place at the previous meeting, when the Committee had expressed concern about the finish colors and the style of the balconies.

Regent Juline noted that a project for student housing at UC Merced was costing $181 per gross square foot compared to $146 for this project. Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio explained that because the project was design-build, the prices reflect an earlier market.

Committee Chair Hopkinson commented that the project was significantly improved visually. Mr. Hellmann confirmed that the landscape design was included in the budget.

Regent Ruiz expressed concern about exceeding the contingency. Mr. Hellmann responded that the campus was comfortable that the amount set aside would be adequate, as the design-build team is also carrying a contingency for its side of the project.

6. **AMENDMENT OF THE BUDGET FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL FINANCING, CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, ANDA APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOR LIFE SCIENCES REPLACEMENT BUILDING, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

A. The 2005-06 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include the following project:

Los Angeles: Life Sciences Replacement Building – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment – $135,822,000 to be funded from State funds ($90,322,000) and external financing ($45,500,000).

B. Financing be obtained not to exceed $45,500,000, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.

(2) Repayment of the debt shall be from the Los Angeles campus' share of the University Opportunity Funds.

(3) The general credit of The Regents shall not be pledged.

C. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to provide certification to the lender that interest paid by The Regents is excluded from gross income for purposes of federal income taxation under existing law.

D. The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

E. Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the Life Sciences Replacement Building Final Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

(1). Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report.

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Approve the design of the Life Sciences Replacement Building, Los Angeles campus.

[The Final Environmental Impact Report, 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.]

The Committee was informed that this action requests approval of a scope change adding19,219 asf (25,533 gsf), an amended project budget representing an increase of $44,192,000, and a revised total project cost of $135,822,000. At the November 2003 meeting, The Regents approved the budget for the Life Sciences Replacement Building project on the Los Angeles campus, a State-funded replacement laboratory facility that was to comprise approximately 150,000 gsf for academic departments occupying non-code-compliant space in the existing Life Sciences Building. Expanding the facility by 175,000 gsf would allow the campus to fulfill additional academic priorities for the Life Sciences.

In November 2003, The Regents approved the *2004-05 Regents Budget for Capital Improvements*, which included the Life Sciences Replacement Building project. The approved project budget was $87,029,000, to be supported with $66,733,000 of State funds, $18,996,000 of external financing, and $1,300,000 of campus funds. In accordance with standard University procedure, this approval by The Regents authorized only the project budget and specifically did not authorize the acquisition of financing. The State subsequently approved the project and appropriated funds for Preliminary Plans in the 2004-05 State Budget Act.

In November 2004, The Regents approved the *2005-06 Regents Budget for Capital Improvements*. This project was included in the budget and was allotted an additional $4,601,000 for inflationary adjustments to the working drawings, construction, and equipment phases of the work. The approved project budget is now $91,630,000, supported with State funding of $70,322,000, external financing of $19,997,000, and campus funds of $1,311,000. The State subsequently approved the project and appropriated funds for W and C in the 2005-06 State Budget Act.

Campus academic planning has determined the need for new Life Sciences faculty to support current and projected enrollment increases and the study of complex systems in the biological and biomedical sciences. Fulfillment of a new campus Biosciences Initiative would require additional faculty to support leading research in genomics, informatics, systems biology, imaging, integrative physiology, evolutionary and comparative physiology and biology, and stem cell biology; and a modern vivarium to support related research involving genetically-modified animals. Replacement of an obsolete vivarium that was not part of the previous proposal and provision of laboratories for new faculty were determined to be high campus priorities.

The budget amendment would support the expansion of academic programs and faculty, provide a modern vivarium and related laboratory support facilities, and address the volatility in the construction market and attendant rapid increase in construction cost of a project originally budgeted in 2002-03. The University has requested that the State increase the planned funding for construction in the 2006-07 State Budget by an additional $20,000,000, with the expectation that additional non-State resources would be committed to fulfill the facility objectives of the academic program. The proposed amended budget of $135,822,000 would be supported with State funding of $90,322,000 and external financing of $45,500,000.

A related Life Sciences Replacement Building Site Preparation project was approved by the President in August 2005. The $5,817,000 Site Preparation project is funded entirely by external financing.

In December 2004, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Bohlin Cywinski Jackson of Philadelphia, PA., as executive architect for this project.

Project Description and Design

The project would replace the Life Sciences Building on the Los Angeles campus with a modern laboratory science building. The existing building was constructed in phases between 1954 and 1964 and has never undergone a major renovation, renewal, or upgrade. The building lacks code-compliant fire-rated construction, life-safety, mechanical and utility systems, and is obsolete for contemporary biological research and teaching. Laboratories are compartmentalized into small, inefficient spaces that lack the power, cooling, temperature controls, air filtration, air changes, ventilation capacity, and special rooms necessary to support sophisticated scientific research instrumentation and computing equipment. The kind of research that can be undertaken within the facility is limited, since it does not meet standards required by federal agencies. Studies demonstrated that it would not be feasible to renovate the building for life sciences wet laboratory uses and that the most cost-effective strategy would be to construct a modern laboratory building on a nearby site.

The site for the proposed facility is located near the existing Life Sciences Building and other laboratory buildings and occupies the site of the west wing of Mira Hershey Hall. The L-shaped site wraps around the original historic Mira Hershey Hall to the south and

east of the site. Manning Drive to the north is an entrance to the campus and Charles Young Drive is to the west. Much of the site was originally an arroyo running through campus that was filled in the 1950s. To the south the site borders on the Mildred Mathias Botanical Garden. The project is situated in accordance with the 2002 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

The proposed project would comprise 106,457 asf (175,911 gsf) of new construction. The building is type 1 construction, H-8 occupancy, composed of a concrete structure with flat slab floors and concrete shear walls. The exterior is consistent with UCLA architectural guidelines and vision plan, using UCLA brick, buff-colored masonry elements and buff-tone window mullions and sunshades. The building is organized into two rectangular blocks arranged on the L-shaped site with an open-air passageway to provide an important pedestrian link to the historic Mira Hershey Hall. The building would accommodate portions of the Division of Life Sciences of the College of Letters and Science, including the Departments of Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology, Physiological Science, and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. The space would comprise of five stories of research laboratories and laboratory support, academic and research offices, scholarly activity, special collections, a vivarium, building support space, and conference rooms. The conference and meeting rooms will overlook the new outdoor garden courtyard formed between the new building and Hershey Hall.

Laboratories would be planned to accommodate changes in use over time. They would be fitted in ways that can be supplemented in the future with additional benches and casework for the particular needs of individual investigators and new technologies. Special rooms would be provided for toxic, heat-producing, and noisy equipment. Procedure rooms, dark rooms, optical laboratories, environmental rooms, autoclave rooms, equipment rooms, and imaging-microscopy and freezer facilities would also be provided. The vivarium would include a barrier mouse facility and a non-barrier facility for rats, birds, and several aquatic species. The building would be designed to support an H-8 occupancy classification, due to the quantities of hazardous chemicals to be used in its laboratories, and to support the use of vibration sensitive equipment.

Private offices would be provided for faculty, with shared offices for post-doctoral scholars. Graduate students would be accommodated in shared research offices, workrooms, and write-up stations in the laboratories. Scholarly activity, conference, and break rooms would be distributed to promote interaction among building users. Building support space would include a loading dock with related holding and storage facilities; building and dock manager's offices; and central mail and copy rooms.

Group 2 and 3 equipment would include movable laboratory benches, casework, and cabinets. Construction is scheduled to begin in September 2006, with completion by May 2009.

Need for Budget Amendment

An increased project budget of $44,192,000 is needed due to the following:

Construction Cost Increases (+$33,946,000)
A construction cost increase of $15,400,000 is due to additional scope to construct replacement vivarium facilities, additional research laboratories, and related support space representing approximately 25,000 gsf of new construction and 15,000 gsf of program upgrades to previously budgeted space.

Other construction cost increases of $18,546,000 are due to the construction cost impact of recent market conditions in the Los Angeles area (+$9,650,000); construction escalation costs revised to reflect projected market conditions and to support the increased scope (+$8,000,000); and higher than projected costs for foundation and related structural work due to the availability of more detailed information about site conditions than when the project was originally budgeted (+$896,000).

Soft Cost Increases (+$5,999,000)
Increases for external and internal fees (+$3,429,000), survey and testing (+$875,000), and contingency (+$1,695,000) have been budgeted to support the additional project scope and other construction cost increases described above.

Special Items (+$4,247,000)
Loan interest increased to support the proposed project financing costs (+$2,093,000). Group 2 and 3 equipment costs for movable laboratory benches, casework, and cabinets increased to support the expanded academic program (+$2,189,000). These increases have been offset by a net reduction in other miscellaneous special items (-$35,000).

Green Building Policy and Clean Energy Standard

This project will comply with the *Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards* and will seek to attain a LEED and Labs 21 equivalency certified rating of approximately 38 points. The following features will be included: energy savings obtained through working with Savings by Design to incorporate accurate sizing of mechanical loads; use of low energy use lab equipment; use of high performance glass and sun shading devices; use of daylight in occupied lab and office spaces; use of recycled content and low emitting materials; waterless urinals and drip irrigation; indoor environmental safety features to provide chemical resource management; management of indoor air quality during construction; and participation in campus-wide transportation initiatives.

The campus has conducted a peer design review, a peer structural review, and an independent cost study review of the building design. UCLA Capital Programs will manage the project and the Administrative Vice Chancellor will perform project oversight. Outside consultants and inspection and testing agencies will be used as necessary.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the potential environmental effects of the proposed Life Sciences Replacement Building (LSRB) were analyzed in a Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2005031118) dated September 2005. The Final EIR is tiered from the 2002 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR (2002 LRDP EIR), certified by The Regents in February 2003.

On March 4, 2005, UCLA conducted a community leader information meeting to present the proposed LSRB project and solicit input on the scope of environmental analysis. On March 18, 2005, UCLA transmitted a Notice of Preparation and an Initial Study to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research as well as local and regional agencies and other interested groups and individuals to begin the environmental review process. The Initial Study evaluated which environmental issues could rely on the analysis provided in the 2002 LRDP EIR, and which issues would require further analysis in a focused Draft EIR for the project. Based on the evaluation in the Initial Study, further analysis was indicated for the environmental issues areas of aesthetics, cultural resources, and construction-related air quality, noise, and traffic. All impacts associated with the remaining environmental issue areas were found to have been adequately addressed in the 2002 LRDP EIR following incorporation of relevant mitigation measures and continuing adherence to adopted campus practices and procedures. For these issue areas [air quality (long-term), biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise and vibration (long-term), population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic (long-term), and utilities and service systems], no further analysis was required in the Draft EIR for the project. The Initial Study is included as Appendix A to the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR and Notice of Completion were released for public review establishing a 45-day review period from May 27 to July 11, 2005. Public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR was provided in the Los Angeles Times and the UCLA Daily Bruin. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available at two on-campus and two off-campus libraries and were distributed to interested agencies, groups and individuals, and the Draft EIR was made available on the UCLA Capital Programs website. A public hearing was held on June 30, 2005, during which comments on the Draft EIR were received. Written comments from Caltrans and one individual were received during the review period. Written comments from California Department of Toxic Substances Control and another individual were received following the close of the public review period. UCLA evaluated the testimony received at the public hearing as well as the written comments received and prepared written responses, which are contained in the Final EIR.

The Final EIR evaluates the potential environmental effects of the project on aesthetics, cultural resources, and construction-related (short-term) air quality, noise and vibration, and traffic. The Final EIR indicates that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on construction-related noise and vibration, and traffic following incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures and adopted campus practices and procedures. All remaining impact areas are determined to be less than significant

following incorporation of all relevant LRDP EIR mitigation measures and continuing implementation of adopted campus practices and procedures.

Three alternatives to the project were analyzed in the EIR: (1) No Project; (2) Botany Building/Lath House Site Alternative; and (3) Reduced Project.

The Final EIR includes, as an appendix, a Mitigation Monitoring Program, to ensure implementation of applicable LRDP EIR mitigation measures and campus practices and procedures to reduce significant impacts. Monitoring of the implementation of mitigation measures would be conducted annually in conjunction with the ongoing 2002/1990 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Relationship to the 2002 Long Range Development Plan

The proposed project is consistent with the 2002 Long Range Development Plan land use planning principles and square footage allocation for the Core campus zone.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures and applicable campus practices and procedures to reduce those impacts, project alternatives, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. The Findings also set forth Overriding Considerations for approval of the project in view of its unavoidable significant environmental effects for short-term construction-related noise and traffic impacts.

Financial Feasibility

The total project cost of $135,822,000 at CCCI 4328 will be funded from State funds ($90,322,000) and external financing ($45,500,000). Assuming campus debt of $45,500,000 amortized over 30 years at 6.125 percent interest, the average annual debt service is estimated at $3,350,000 and would be repaid from the Los Angeles campus' share of the University Opportunity Fund. The campus is within the prescribed Opportunity pledge and payment limits. In FY 2010-11, the first full year of principal and interest payments, 48 percent of Opportunity Funds are pledged for debt service.

Chancellor Carnesale, Vice Chancellor Blackman, and Campus Architect Averill discussed the project and showed a video of it.

Faculty Representative Brunk reported strong faculty support for the project.

Regent Juline noted that some material concerning the EIR had been received by Committee members only recently. General Counsel Holst reported that he and the attorney in the Office of the General Counsel who deals with California Environmental Quality Act compliance issues had reviewed the material and were satisfied that any legal implications are such that the University's position is sound.

Committee Chair Hopkinson commented that the massing from Hilgard Avenue was very well done. The view and the prominence of Hershey Hall were attractive and appropriate. She noted that the landscape was a key issue. Some landscaping between Hershey Hall and the new building might be an asset. The large brick walls bothered her; she viewed them as inconsistent with the recent direction of UCLA campus design. Mr. Blackman responded that more articulation was planned for the expansive brick surfaces.

In response to Regent Hopkinson's question about the sunny orientation of the building's laboratories, Mr. Blackman explained that the sun screens are deep, horizontal elements that should be sufficient for shading. Senior Vice President Mullinix observed that consideration would be given to placing the laboratories on the coolest sides of future buildings.

Regent Ruiz commented on the number of negative communications that had been received from the neighborhood. Chancellor Carnesale responded that the campus used its standard process of identifying upcoming projects, starting with a community meeting with homeowners associations, for the purpose of bringing forth commentary. Committee Chair Hopkinson believed it may not have been with respect to the EIR but rather with respect to the design that the neighbors felt they had not been given sufficient opportunity for input.

Faculty Representative Oakley observed that even with perfect notice, there would be homeowners concerned about the impact of the expansion of the campus. He believed that the University must remain committed to maintaining its urban campuses and not exporting new projects to satellite locations.

7. **CERTIFICATION OF ADDENDUM TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SIERRA TERRACES HOUSING PROJECT, MERCED CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as evaluated in the Addendum to the Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

A. Certify the Addendum No. 6 to the Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

C. Approve the design of the Sierra Terraces Housing Project, Merced campus.

[The Addendum No. 6, Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report, and Findings were mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that at the July 2005 meeting, The Regents approved an amendment to the 2005-06 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program to include the Sierra Terraces Housing Project at a total project cost of $21,942,000 at CCCI 4642, funded from external financing. In November 2004, the Regents authorized completion of Preliminary Plans ($990,000).

In July 2005, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Fisher Friedman Associates of Emeryville, CA as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Site

The 3.78-acre site for the proposed facility is located in the campus core, bounded generally by Ranchers Road to the north, the future Recreation and Wellness Center to the west, Scholars Lane to the south, and Valley Dining Commons to the east. The site is also near Valley Terraces, the initial housing project constructed on the campus. The project is consistent with the campus 2002 Long Range Development Plan.

Project Design

The Sierra Terraces Housing Project is designed to contain 68,000 asf within a total area of 85,000 gsf for 412 new beds (400 student beds and 12 non-revenue staff beds). The project will include two general space types: residences, including living and study space plus bathrooms, and support space for uses such as offices, maintenance and storage. The project plan places the residences and support space in three structures.

The buildings are type V, one-hour protected, sprinklered wood frame structures. The exterior is clad in cement plaster, with factory finished vinyl windows and energy efficient, low-e glazing. The Sierra Terraces exterior wall colors are earth tones which will be compatible with the Valley Terraces project and the future Recreation and Wellness Center located nearby. The Sierra Terraces' concrete tile roof material and color will be similar to Valley Terraces' and will be compatible with the campus academic buildings.

The project will comply with the University of California Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards approved by The Regents, as well as with the Presidential Policy on for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards. In addition to meeting these LEED equivalent policy standards, the project will seek a LEED silver rating of at least 33 points.

The campus has conducted a peer design review and independent cost and structural engineering reviews of the Sierra Terraces Housing Project. The Physical Planning-Design and Construction Office, with the oversight of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, will manage this project. Construction of the project is scheduled to begin in April 2006, with completion targeted for August 2007.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and the University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the campus prepared Addendum #6 to the Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR) to evaluate the project in relation to the original analysis done in the LRDP EIR. The potential environmental effects of the Sierra Terraces Housing Project were analyzed in the EIR for the UC Merced Long Range Development Plan, which was certified by The Regents in January 2002 (State Clearinghouse # 2001021065). Volume 1 of the Draft EIR assessed the potential environmental effects of implementation of the LRDP, identified means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the LRDP. Volume 2 of the Draft EIR analyzed the project-level environmental impacts associated with the first phase of development on the Merced campus (2004-05 through 2007-08 academic year), referred to as the Phase 1 Campus, which included the proposed project as the second of three phases of student housing.

The Draft LRDP EIR public review period was August 13, 2001 to October 4, 2001. In response to public requests, the campus extended the public review period an additional seven days, providing a total of 52 days for public review and comment. Copies of the Draft EIR were made available at several libraries, information repositories, and the UC Merced project office in the Merced area; a copy was posted on the web site jointly hosted by UC Merced and Merced County; and hard copies as well as CDs of the document were mailed to all people who requested them. A public hearing on the Draft EIR was held on September 13, 2001, during which comments on the Draft EIR were received. Written comments from interested public agencies and individuals were received throughout the public review period. The responses are contained in the Final EIR.

The LRDP EIR evaluated the potential effects of the proposed project as part of the Phase 1 Campus impact analysis, which evaluated project-level impacts resulting from development of the first phase of the UC Merced campus. Potential impacts for the Phase 1 Campus were evaluated in ten environmental issue areas: aesthetics; air quality; biology resources; cultural resources; geology, seismicity and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; noise; recreation; and traffic circulation and parking.

The LRDP EIR indicated that the Phase 1 Campus, which includes the three phases of student housing, would result in significant or potentially significant impacts, prior to mitigation, in the following areas: aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology, soils and seismicity; noise; and traffic circulation and parking.

With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the effects of Phase 1 Campus lighting on nearby Lake Yosemite Regional Park and other sensitive areas, increased levels of carbon monoxide, ozone precursor, and PM10 emissions, and increased ambient noise levels attributable to traffic increases would remain significant and unavoidable; however, these impacts are considered acceptable for the reasons specified in the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its

approval of the 2002 LRDP EIR. All other impacts would be mitigated below a level of significance.

As a component of the Phase 1 Campus, the LRDP EIR analyzed the potential environmental effects of constructing a Student Housing Complex in three phases, completed for occupancy in 2004-05, 2006-07, and 2008-09, respectively. The Student Housing Complex is described to have a multipurpose community building, a dining commons, and three phases of housing.

The first phase of housing, Garden Suites, which was completed in summer 2005, includes 586 beds within 150,526 total gsf for the entire project and 101,480 asf for the housing portion only. On September 18, 2002, The Regents adopted and made Findings regarding Addendum #2 to the Final EIR, which evaluated minor technical changes and additions to the Final EIR to reflect The Regents' approval of the final design of Garden Suites and Lakeview Dining Complex, which is now referred to as Valley Terraces. The proposed project, Sierra Terraces, would be the second phase of campus housing.

The LRDP EIR description of the second phase of student housing included 815 beds within 184,800 asf. A childcare facility of 4,000 to 7,000 asf was also included in the scope of the second phase of housing. The Sierra Terraces Housing Project would include 412 beds within 68,000 asf and does not include a childcare facility. The scope of the proposed project was reduced from the scope described in the LRDP EIR due primarily to budget constraints, and therefore represents a portion of the second phase of housing as originally conceived. The proposed project would be developed on a site previously analyzed in the LRDP Final EIR designated for housing.

As discussed in Addendum #6, there were three changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken since the LRDP Final EIR was certified as complete:

- Progress in the UC Merced Phase 1 environmental permitting process, consistent with the anticipated process for UC Merced campus development. This change in circumstances does not require revisions in the LRDP Final EIR.

- The LRDP EIR described the second phase of student housing to contain 184,800 asf of housing while the proposed Project would contain 68,000 asf of housing. This reduction of scope does not require revisions in the LRDP Final EIR as it constructs a portion of the scope of work that was originally conceptualized with no new or unanalyzed environmental impacts.

- The LRDP EIR described the second phase of student housing to include a 4,000 to 7,000 ASF childcare facility. The Sierra Terraces Housing Project will not include a childcare facility in its scope. This minor reduction of scope does not require revisions in the LRDP Final EIR.

No additional environmental analysis or review is required to address the environmental impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project, as revised, other than as provided in EIR Addendum #6, as all have been analyzed in the LRDP EIR.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure implementation of project-specific mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts is included as an Appendix in the Final LRDP EIR. Monitoring of the implementation of mitigation measures will be conducted annually in conjunction with the annual status report for the 2002 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's mitigation measures and conclusions regarding approval of the project and certification of the Addendum in conformance with CEQA. The Findings also determine that all unavoidable significant effects on the environment that would result from the Sierra Terraces Housing project are acceptable for the reasons set forth in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the LRDP and the Phase I Campus.

Vice Chancellor Desrochers and Campus Architect Smith illustrated their comments about the project through the use of slides.

In response to a question asked by Regent Juline, Mr. Smith indicated that the western panoramic view over the housing areas would be maintained.

Regent Johnson was complimentary about the design. She noted the importance of the project for students and their parents. Vice Chancellor Desrochers reported that the question most commonly asked was about the availability of housing. Families want to have their children housed on the campus.

Committee Chair Hopkinson noted that the buildings looked longer than those in the first phase and the roof line seemed overpowering. Mr. Smith reported that the roof had been varied to the extent possible, given the budgetary constraints. He agreed to reexamine the design so as to diminish the likelihood of ending up with an oppressive-looking building.

8. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, DIGITAL ARTS FACILITY, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

B. Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program in their entirety.

C. Approve the design of the Digital Arts Facility, Santa Cruz campus.

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

It was recalled that in November 2003, The Regents approved the Digital Arts Facility, Santa Cruz campus, for inclusion in the 2004-05 Budget for Capital Improvements and the 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Program for a total project cost of $20,671,000 at CCCI 4100. This budget was amended in November 2004, due to an increase in the CCCI, for a total project cost of $21,699,000 at CCCI 4328. The total project cost will be funded from State funds.

Estimates indicate a total project cost of $22,641,000, due to increased inflation in the construction market. The campus has worked steadily at reducing the estimated budget overage during the schematic design phase. Cost reduction strategies have been identified and significant redesign has occurred to achieve lower costs and bring the project closer to the original budget. While efforts will continue to align the costs with the original budget during the design development and construction documents phases, it appears unlikely that delivering the approved scope will be possible with the funds available. In order to reconcile scope and budget, the campus intends to work with the Office of the President to request that the State approve a project scope reduction by deferring construction of the Theater Arts Addition, which was intended to be a small expansion of the existing Experimental Theater to provide a back-of-theater suite with a dressing room, shower, and green room. Its proposed site was at the existing Experimental Theater loading dock, at the northeast corner of the Theater Arts Complex, northwest of the Elena Baskin Visual Arts Studios. This would reduce estimated project costs by $942,000 to $21,699,000.

In August 2005, the Office of the President approved the appointment of Bohlin Cywinski Jackson of Berkeley, California, as Executive Architect for this project.

Project Site

The Digital Arts Facility site is south of the Elena Baskin Visual Arts Complex, east of the Theater Arts Complex, and north of the Music Facility. Immediately to the north is a dense grove of mature oak trees, part of the forest edge that defines the northern limit of the campus' Great Meadow. The project site slopes from north to south. It is bordered on the south and east by Meyer Drive, with the Academic Resource Center to the east. The site is consistent with the campus 1988 Long Range Development Plan, in an area designated Campus Core.

Project Design

The new Digital Arts Facility project was originally programmed to provide 25,613 asf within a total area of 44,193 gsf containing instructional, research, and administrative

office space for the Digital Arts and New Media program and the Visual Art, Theater Arts, and Music departments. The Digital Arts and New Media M.F.A. program serves as a center for innovation and exploration of digital technologies in the arts. Faculty and students are drawn from a variety of established disciplines such as the arts, computer engineering, and social sciences. Digital arts practice is the focus, but history, theory, and criticism are integrated throughout the program's research and teaching, investigating the boundaries and possibilities of digital art and new media.

With the deferral of the Theater Arts Addition, the project would provide 24,128 asf within a total area of 42,826 gsf. The Digital Arts Facility building would house media laboratories of different size, volume, and technical characteristics for both digital and traditional media, including light- and sound-controlled studios for photography, videography, drawing, sculpture, multi-disciplinary visual arts, electronic music and algorithmic composition, and occasional public performances; technical support spaces and faculty studios and offices; and administrative offices. The centerpiece of the building is the two-story tall Media Lab, an experimental open studio for the creation, modeling, and presentation of research projects. It is designed to be light-tight and sound-isolated, with theatrical lighting and sound systems and equipped for digital access and video and digital projection, and will have a capacity for 60 to 90 spectators when used as a presentation or performance space.

The three-level building, a Type V-N (non-rated) three-story concrete and braced steel frame structure, would be oriented on an east-west axis parallel to the contours of the slope. Concrete retaining walls would be necessary at the first level of the building at its north, east, and west elevations. Responding to the local karst (fractured marble) geology, the foundation system would consist of a structural slab over reinforced concrete grade beams and pier caps over drilled concrete piers. Major utility lines are available to the south and east along Meyer Drive and have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. An existing stormwater detention facility south of the Music Facility would be expanded to accommodate runoff from the new building, if warranted. The existing grove of mature oak trees bordering the site on the north will be preserved.

The building assembles the complex variety of room sizes and heights into a simple rectangular volume. North-facing clerestory windows at drawing and art research studios provide controlled natural light at studio spaces, resulting in a varied roofline. The exterior would be clad in stained or painted vertical wood boards, in keeping with both the building's wooded setting and the nearby Baskin Visual Arts Complex and Academic Resource Center. Large aluminum-framed windows and doors at the building's first level entry mark the location of the media lab and the building's public entrance. Office spaces will have smaller aluminum windows, with metal sun-shading systems on the south and west sides of the building.

The Digital Arts Facility project has been designed to outperform California Energy Code Title 24 by 20 percent and will participate in the Savings by Design program. Although the budget for this project was approved before the Regents' sustainability energy policy took effect, its design incorporates the following sustainability features: extensive use

of natural light and ventilation, exterior solar screening at south and west facing glazing, limited use of air conditioning, low-flow toilets and waterless urinals, and native, drought-tolerant landscaping.

The design of the Digital Arts Facility Project has been reviewed in accordance with University policy by UC Santa Cruz's Design Advisory Board. The campus has also conducted independent cost and structural reviews of the project. The Physical Planning and Construction Office, with the oversight of the Vice Chancellor–Business and Administrative Services, will manage this project. Construction is scheduled to begin in September 2006, with completion anticipated for fall 2008.

Environmental Impact Summary

Pursuant to State law and the University procedures for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) entitled "Digital Arts Facility EIR" was prepared to analyze the environmental effects of the Digital Arts Facility including the Theater Arts Addition. The EIR identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives for the Digital Arts Facility Project.

On January 19, 2005, the University issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) announcing the preparation of the EIR for the Digital Arts Facility Project. The NOP was circulated to responsible agencies, interested groups, and individuals for a 30-day review period. It was accompanied by a Draft Initial Study Checklist, which determined that the preparation of an EIR focused on the topics of Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic would be required for the project. A publicly advertised EIR Scoping Meeting was held at the UCSC Physical Planning and Construction Office on February 7, 2005, to solicit input from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations regarding the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in the EIR; no agency representatives or members of the public attended.

The Draft Focused Tiered EIR for the Digital Arts Facility project was published on June 8, 2005, and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day period ending on July 22, 2005. The Draft EIR was widely circulated. Copies were made available at the main branch of the City of Santa Cruz Public Library and two on-campus libraries. In addition, copies of the document were mailed to 17 agencies. The availability of the document and notice of public hearing were published in the Santa Cruz Sentinel and campus publications, and through mailings to individuals who have requested notification of UCSC projects.

A public hearing was held on July 11, 2005, at the UCSC Physical Planning and Construction Office to receive oral comments on the Draft EIR. No individuals provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. During the review period written comments were received from The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), the City of Santa

Cruz Planning and Community Development Department, the City of Santa Cruz Water Department, the State Clearinghouse, and one individual. Written comment letters were received from the County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works and from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) following the close of the public review period.

The letters commented on the following area and potential impacts: the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to odors and toxic air contaminants related to project construction, hydrology and storm water runoff, water quality, water supply, traffic impacts, fair-share mitigation measures, and cumulative impacts.

The Final EIR, dated September 2005, includes the Draft EIR, refinements to the project description, changes made in response to comments, corrections of typographical errors, comment letters received on the Draft EIR, transcripts from the public hearing, and detailed responses to the comments received.

Project Impacts

The EIR identifies noise associated with construction of the Theater Arts Addition as a temporary but significant and unavoidable impact due to the proximity of construction to existing facilities. The Initial Study Checklist and the EIR identify potentially significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics, biological resources, and cultural resources that would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation.

The EIR concludes that the project, together with other on-and off-campus projects would result in significant cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, traffic, and water supply. The proposed project's contributions to the cumulative aesthetics impacts were not found to be considerable. The contribution of overall campus growth by 2009, the year the project buildings would be occupied, to cumulative traffic and water supply impacts would be considerable.

Alternatives

In addition to the proposed Digital Arts Facility Project, the EIR analyzes three alternatives to the proposed Digital Arts Facility Project including: No Project Alternative; Project Reduced in Size Alternative; and Arts Area Alternative Sites.

Mitigation Monitoring Program

The UCSC campus would be responsible for implementing all Digital Arts Facility Project EIR mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of The Regents. To assure that all measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared and is included in the Final EIR. The MMRP provides a reporting mechanism for the mitigation measures. To the extent that the Digital Arts Facility Project incorporates relevant 1988 LRDP EIR mitigation measures previously adopted by The Regents, implementation of these mitigation

measures will be monitored pursuant to the existing 1988 LRDP EIR MMRP previously adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 1988 LRDP.

Findings

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

Campus Architect Zwart showed slides of the project.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the building was very attractive and was in keeping with the style and feeling of the campus. She noted, however, that wood buildings can be challenging to maintain. Mr. Zwart explained that, based on costs, the final choices were unpainted corrugated metal siding or wood. Given that there is nothing in the vicinity made of metal and that the building elevation is south facing, wood was deemed to be the most appropriate. Other wood buildings on campus have needed re-staining about every ten years, which is acceptable.

[At this point, President Dynes joined the meeting.]

9. **UPDATE OF DESIGN, UNDERHILL PARKING FACILITY AND FIELD REPLACEMENT, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

It was recalled that the Underhill project included construction of a four-level, 1,000-vehicle parking facility with a recreational sports field on the roof level. The construction was to replace a parking facility and field demolished in 1993 after the discovery of water intrusion and structural deterioration, which posed a hazard of structural failure. The total project cost is $42,667,000 funded by external financing ($30,709,000) and a combination of Berkeley campus Parking System Net Revenue Funds and Parking Replacement Reserve Funds ($11,958,000). The construction method is design-build.

Vice Chancellor Denton discussed the changes to the design that had been made following comments made by Committee members upon approving the project at the previous meeting. They had been concerned about the area between the parking structure and an office building. The second issue had to do with two small buildings at the east end of the athletic field.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Gayle showed slides of the revised design, which had been improved by changes in color choices, landscaping, and a walkway.

Committee Chair Hopkinson commended the design.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 2005, approved the recommendations contained in paragraphs 3, 4, and 6 and voted to present them to the Board, and approved items 5, 7, and 8.

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

This item was withdrawn.

11. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, ENGINEERING UNIT 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The Committee was informed that the Engineering Unit 3, Irvine campus would be constructed at a cost of $65,730,000 to be funded from a combination of State funds ($53,963,000), external financing ($8,591,000), and campus funds ($3,176,000). The new 86,895 asf (149,938 gsf) Engineering Unit 3 building would provide 68,795 asf for the Henry Samueli School of Engineering for instructional and research laboratories and faculty and administrative offices, 5,400 asf for a 350-seat lecture hall, and 12,700 asf for surge space. Design approval will be sought at the Committee's November 2005 meeting.

Vice Chancellor Brase and Campus Architect Gladson discussed the project. Mr. Brase noted that design renderings would not be presented until after the Committee had commented on the project. He recalled that the Irvine campus is building projects in redevelopment sites. Low-cost, low-density buildings are being replaced with buildings that are more in scale and permanent. He reported that, as there is some controversy about the demolition of the ICS/Engineering Research Facility and Computer Science and Engineering building, he intended to provide pertinent information about the site selection.

Ms. Gladson recalled that the project was made up of laboratories, office support space, surge space, and the lecture hall. She showed slides of the project to provide context and illustrate how the project reinforces the campus' identifying style, noting that the area poses contextual challenges because it encompasses a variety of architectural styles. A 90-foot-high, concrete and brick building is planned.

Committee Chair Hopkinson suggested that, in working with the design, care go into preserving the intimate feeling created by the scale of the pedestrian level.

10. **PRELIMINARY DESIGN DISCUSSION, MISSION BAY NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH BUILDING (19A, PHASE 1), SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Barclay reported that design approval for the Mission Bay Neuroscience Research Building (19A, Phase 1) would be sought in early 2006. He provided a brief update on the Mission Bay campus, noting that between March and October the campus will have opened five facilities, including two parking structures, a community center, the first student housing project, and the QB3 building. About half of the capacity permitted under the 1997 Long Range Development Plan's Environmental Impact Report has been filled. Fundraising remains strong.

Mr. Barclay noted that 19A, Phase 1 is the first element of the second neuroscience building at Mission Bay. The academic leadership in 1999, when the programming was planned for Phase 1 Mission Bay, committed to advance the next increment of the campus' neuroscience program as early as possible. In addition to the programmatic reasons, which included the need for program expansion and Parnassus decompression, the separation of sites places stress on the neurology graduate program. The campus is concerned about building costs and development risks, but the academic imperative of the building requires that this project be made a priority.

Campus Architect Wiesenthal discussed the design of the building, with the aid of slides. He reiterated that the program will combine neuroscientists already at Mission Bay with others from the Parnassus campus. One of the programmatic concepts that is key to the design is bringing together three different types of researchers in one building. There are systems biologists, who are looking at the function of the brain in a systematic way; molecular researchers, who are conducting basic science; and clinical scientists. Fostering interaction will be a theme for the architecture of the new building.

Mr. Wiesenthal recalled that total project cost is estimated to be $64 million, excluding Group 2 and Group 3 equipment. Phase 1 would provide approximately 48,000 asf (91,250 gsf) of new space. With the future completion of Phase 2, the estimated combined building size would be 142,800 asf (243,500 gsf). Budget approval and approval of external financing will be requested after completion of the preliminary phase.

Noting that it is prohibitively expensive to go below grade at Mission Bay due to the soil conditions, the ground floor is occupied by the entry, mechanical space, a loading dock, and a vivarium. On completion of Phase 2, more publicly oriented spaces, including an auditorium, will be added. The large wet bench laboratory, which has been placed in the center of the laboratory neighborhood, is the access point for the smaller procedure rooms. Computational research space and faculty offices are easily accessible on each floor, effectuating an integration of the three types of scientific activity.

Mr. Wiesenthal discussed the building's context and how it fits into the Master Plan. He recalled that the principles of the plan include creating connections through building siting and landscape design. The neurosciences building will frame a courtyard, which is central to the design of the building. There will be a clear physical and visual connection between the function and form of both sides of the quadrangle. Another Master Plan principle is that of the cohesiveness of the architecture. An attempt has been made to strike the right balance between individual innovation and creativity and identity within a united framework for each of the buildings on the campus. This is accomplished through massing, materials, and composition. The building will feature large windows and accessible balconies to foster interaction on the upper levels. Like other laboratories at Mission Bay, the building will be LEED certifiable.

Regent Ruiz asked whether energy generation had been contemplated for the site. Senior Vice President Mullinix responded that photovoltaic systems in general were considered

when the University's green building policy was developed. It was decided to prepare buildings, where possible, to be retrofitted with new and developing technologies as they become more economical. Mr. Wiesenthal noted that the campus has put out a Request for Proposal for a solar power developer to install energy-saving technologies on the roof and south facade of parking building 23B. Also, a long-term strategy is being developed for a cogeneration plant that would power all of the Mission Bay campus.

Regent Hopkinson noted the narrow space between the laboratory and its adjacent building. Mr. Wiesenthal reported that the laboratory building would have windows on that side for natural light. The building is zoned so that the dry wing has operable windows. The air conditioning system will be designed to respond appropriately when windows are opened.

11. **COST REDUCTION UPDATE**

Senior Vice President Mullinix commented on the status of the University's Cost Reduction Opportunities Study. He reported that the study had been distributed to the chancellors, campus architects, vice chancellors for administration, budget and planning officers, and physical plant directors. Each campus was asked to discuss the recommendations made to the Committee and to submit a response to the Office of the President regarding implementation of the report. All the campuses responded informally, but the responses were not fully coordinated. At subsequent meetings with the chancellors and Office of the President staff, opportunities for implementing the recommendations were considered. Comments from the campuses suggested that details concerning the establishment of campus coordinators who would be accountable for capital projects would need to be developed further. Preliminary discussions took place concerning the possibility of effecting legislative changes that would enhance cost savings for the University. The University failed in its efforts to get legislation passed that would implement pieces of the report, however. Alternative strategies for effecting passage of pending legislation are being considered.

Senior Vice President Mullinix commented that the campuses will continue to analyze ways of establishing a single focal point for capital projects. He reported that outside experts will be consulted as to how some areas may be brought into sharper focus with regard to business case analyses. More focus is being placed already on the process of examining contracts. It is expected that consultation with the campuses and outside contractors will produce suggestions for eliminating requirements and smoothing the contracting process.

Mr. Mullinix observed that in order to move forward with the study's recommendations it will be necessary to have the full support of the campuses. He expected to return to the Committee at its November meeting with a fuller report on implementation of the recommendations.

Regent Juline believed it would be helpful to have Mr. Mullinix's November report in written form. He noted that help from the Legislature will be important if the University

is to achieve the desired changes for improving the construction process. All possible means to achieve the passage of helpful legislation should be identified.

Regent Ruiz suggested developing a schedule for implementing the recommendations. He expressed concern that the construction environment will continue to deteriorate, given the effects of Hurricane Katrina, and that a sustained crisis in the industry will accelerate the escalation of costs. Mr. Mullinix agreed that strategy and timing must be considered. Recent projects have failed to attract reasonable bids. It will be necessary for the University to modify programs in response to the market and to develop long-term financing strategies. Vice President Hershman reported that every capital project involving State funds is having to be revisited. The State has committed only $345 million per year for capital projects, while projects are coming in at up to 30 percent over budget.

Faculty Representative Oakley asked whether there were any way to hedge construction costs. Mr. Mullinix responded that the only way was to try to shift the full burden onto the contractor; depending on the market conditions, however, that could cost a large premium.

12. **REVIEW OF THE UC CAMPUS AND MEDICAL CENTER SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM**

Senior Vice President Mullinix reported on the University's progress since 1990 regarding the UC Campus and Medical Center Seismic Safety Program. This program began in the late 1970s, and many building were seismically corrected between the program's inception and 1990. The last report to the Regents was on January 14, 1999. Since 1990, an additional 197 buildings graded "poor" and "very poor" have been corrected or demolished. The seismic safety program work is expected to extend to 2020. Completed and active projects have been supported with a combination of State, federal, private, and bond monies. The University has about $2 billion of deferred maintenance and an ongoing need of $200 million to replace building systems. The progress is reflected in the following chart:

Summary: Seismic Safety Program 1990 to present (Poor and Very Poor)			
	Seismic Capital Facilities	**Completed/ Active**	**Remaining**
Berkeley	124	41	83
Davis	36	30	6
Irvine	52	39	13
Los Angeles	45	36	9
Riverside	22	20	2
San Diego	24	24	0
San Francisco	14	10	4
Santa Barbara	25	19	6
Santa Cruz	16	13	3
TOTAL	**358**	**232**	**126**

Committee Chair Hopkinson commented that the University lacked an appropriate methodology for identifying future building needs. She believed that the building program should be closely related to the academic plan. It was unclear to her how the campuses were setting their priorities. Vice President Hershman responded that a five-year target for State funds is established for each campus, related to enrollment growth, the amount of space they have, and their existing facility. The campuses must set their priorities within the $345 million scope provided. Regent Hopkinson commented that the Committee should have an opportunity to consent to those priorities, and before that can be done, the academic priorities needed to be accepted. Mr. Hershman commented that each campus has a process for determining academic priorities, which are then built into the capital budget. Regent Hopkinson was skeptical that they do that consistently. Mr. Hershman continued that a five-year plan is presented to The Regents, but only a one-year capital budget requires approval. Regent Hopkinson believed the process should be reversed; that an academic plan approved

by the appropriate committee should be the basis for the priorities that are set for the building program. Mr. Hershman stated that each campus would need to be examined separately, which would be an enormous task. He noted that the University uses a CPEC methodology that establishes space standards, against which each campus is measured. The goal is to keep campuses within the 90 percent to 100 percent of those standards. With the non-State capital program. Targets are set as to the appropriate level of debt for each campus. The campuses determine where the academic decision-making should reside.

Regent Hopkinson maintained that the ten-year campus academic priorities for buildings that result from the academic plan should be examined. Faculty Representative Brunk reported that the Academic Senate has a budget and planning committee on each campus, and there is a systemwide committee that works with the administration. He indicated his willingness to have the faculty opine on the academic aspects of the building program, as the academic program is the province of the Academic Senate. Regent Hopkinson maintained that the academic plan must precede the building plan. The administration, working with the Academic Senate, should take the lead for each campus. She believed that the Committee needed to understand the magnitude of the problem and the decision-making process that results in buildings coming forward. Regent Ruiz stressed the importance of developing and updating a five-year plan. Regent Hopkinson noted that, for the University, five years is insufficient from the standpoint of obtaining additional resources and looking ahead. Mr. Hershman pointed out that the University has been very successful with its five-year plans; nearly every building has been funded for the past twenty years.

Regent Hopkinson requested that a process be initiated which will result ultimately in a longer range, comprehensive ten-year plan to address UC's needs for new and renovated facilities. These are needs resulting from all causes, including earthquake, major maintenance issues, and academic priorities; however, the process would start from the academic side, with each campus developing plans and priorities for facilities based on academic needs. This area could be the focus of the Committee on Educational Policy, with final approval by The Regents. Based on the academic process and overlaid by earthquake issues, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings would then review and recommend to The Regents a ten-year prioritized plan. Broad "costs" and potential revenue sources would need to be identified during this process.

In response to a question asked by Regent Hopkinson about seismic safety, Vice President Hershman reported that the greatest problems are UCLA hospital space and medical school space, which will need at least $400 million to correct. Only the first increment is in the five-year capital budget. The other problem is UC Berkeley, which has completed or has under way 6.6 million gross square feet of seismic work and plans to complete another 500,000 gsf in the next five years, leaving 1.7 million gsf undone. It has been the campus' priority to tackle the worst buildings first. The projects that remain tend to be smaller. Regent Hopkinson asked for a report on a plan to address the remaining seismic safety projects.

In response to a request by Regent Hopkinson, Senior Vice President Mullinix agreed to provide an update on the status of each campus' Long Range Development Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary