The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
December 5, 2006

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met by teleconference on the above date at: Robertson Auditorium 2, UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, 1675 Owens Street, San Francisco; 2535 25th Ave. So., Minneapolis, MN; 5123 Cheadle Hall, Santa Barbara Campus; 401 B Street, Suite 1200, San Diego; 2220 Lodgepole Circle, Modesto; and 1875 Century Park East, Suite 1025, Los Angeles.

Members present: Regents Coombs, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Ledesma, Schilling, and Schreiner; Advisory members Bugay and Brown

In attendance: Acting Secretary Shaw, Acting General Counsel Blair, Vice President Hershman, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened in Open Session at 5:00 p.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

For the record, it was confirmed that notice had been given in compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing the President's recommendation with respect to the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects, Berkeley campus.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Committee Chair Kozberg explained that members of the public are given this opportunity to comment on University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Committee concerning Item 102, Committee on Grounds and Buildings: *Certification of Environmental Impact Report for the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects and Approval of Design, Student Athlete High Performance Center (SCIP), Berkeley Campus*:

Speaking in support of the recommendation:

A. Ms. Leigh Whelpton, a UC Berkeley student-athlete, believed that the High Performance Center plan made optimal use of the available site and was planned appropriately for a location that was near the practice, medical, and support staff facilities on which student-athletes depend.

B. Mr. Bill Ausfahl, a volunteer on the SCIP project, reported that Cal's sports facilities are the worst in the Pac-10. He noted the effort of engineers, architects, and volunteers working on the project for the past six years to

develop an approach to the projects that protects the environment and is sensitive to the design of Memorial Stadium..

C. Mr. Richard Beahrs, a UC alumnus, believed that the University had taken seriously and responded appropriately to all suggestions concerning the athletic facilities renovation program and that the projects should be allowed to proceed as planned.

Speaking in opposition of the recommendation:

D. Mr. Zachary Runningwolf was against the proposed destruction of trees on the site of the Student Athlete High Performance Center.

E. Mr. Scott Wachenheim, speaking also on behalf of Ms. Frederica Drotos and Ms. Carole Bennett-Simmons, believed that the recommendation should be denied in favor of an alternative site at 223 Fulton Street or another site, not adjacent to an earthquake fault, where students and staff would be safer. He believed that the FEIR also should be rejected because it fails to name the oak grove in its list of significant impacts that cannot be mitigated due to the size and historic significance of the trees. He believed the EIR should be reopened to public study and comment. He reported that an alternative site on Fulton is the site preferred by the City of Berkeley.

F. Mr. Jim Sharpe, a long-term Berkeley resident, noted that the scope of the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects EIR did not include Bowles Hall, a historic building. He advised withdrawing, revising, and recirculating the EIR for SCIP.

G. Mr. Dan Sicular asked for positive action to save Tightwad Hill, the hillside behind Memorial Stadium. He recalled previously presenting a partition of 1,000 signatures asking that the stadium renovation plans be altered to preserve views of the stadium from the hill. He suggested considering a reduced project.

H. Ms. Ellen Gunther, representing the Alameda County Sierra Club, stated that a key issue was cutting down 38 mature coast oaks as part of the expansion. They represent one of the last stands of coast live oaks in the city and are valuable as a gene bank. She urged that solutions be found that do not involve removing these trees.

I. Ms. Joan Barnett read a letter in which the President of the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association voiced the concern that the student athlete facility would cause serious, irrevocable environmental degradation to an area of national and cultural significance.

J. Mr. Dan Marks, Director of Planning and Development for the City of Berkeley, expressed appreciation for the Committee's action to delay approval of the FEIR for the athletic center. He reported that, as the first respondents in any emergency, the City's major concern is public safety. He believed that the FEIR does not take into account the impact on the city of a major problem at the stadium. He suggested addressing the stadium renovation before embarking on other parts of the SCIP and that an alternative site be chosen.

K. Mr. La Wood believed it would have been appropriate to hold the special meeting in Berkeley. He believed that no money should be put into any project to renovate or construct facilities located on active earthquake faults.

L. Mr. Doug Buckwald offered an oak sprig from a tree near Memorial Stadium, a broken piece of mirror for the campus administration to reflect on their relationship with the campus and community, and an acorn to represent hope that a healthy environment will be preserved in the future.

M. Mr. Mike Kelly, representing the Panoramic Hill Association, reported that the group intended to sue the University on the basis that CEQA requirements had not been fulfilled by the campus. He commented that, although private funds and ticket sales would support the stadium renovation, because it is self-insured the taxpayers would pay for any subsequent earthquake damage.

N. Mr. Bob Randolf, a Berkeley poet, provided a copy of his "Tree Poetry" and read a short poem about oak trees.

O. Mr. Robert Breuer supported improving Cal's athletic facilities but did not believe they should remain on an earthquake fault. He believed no alternative site was seriously studied for the stadium or athletic facility. He supported Edwards Stadium as that alternative.

3. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTHEAST CAMPUS INTEGRATED PROJECTS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, STUDENT ATHLETE HIGH PERFORMANCE CENTER, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

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

A. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report, as modified by The Regents Item Supplement.

B. Adopt the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

C. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

D. Approve the design of the Student Athlete High Performance Center, Berkeley campus.

Vice Chancellor Denton recalled that at the November 2006 meeting, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings approved an amendment to the budget to include the Student Athlete High Performance Center (SAHPC) project at a total project cost of $111,948,000, at CCCI 4948, to be funded entirely from gifts. The SAHPC, to be located adjacent to Memorial Stadium, would create a first-class athletic facility for approximately 450 student athletes in 13 sports programs and integrate the site and landscape into the surrounding campus to improve connection and circulation. At the November 2006 meeting, design approval and certification of the EIR were deferred at the request of the Regents until today's special meeting.

In September 2006, the appointment of Howard Needles Tammen and Bergdorff of Los Angeles, California as Executive Architect for this project was approved within the Office of the President.

California Memorial Stadium (the Stadium), originally constructed in 1923, is one of the most significant buildings on the Berkeley campus and has been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. The design of the structure, its integration into the topography, and its location on campus create a place that is a significant resource for athletics, the Berkeley campus, and the surrounding community; however, the Stadium is situated directly on the Hayward fault, and a 1997 seismic evaluation of buildings on the UC Berkeley campus rated it as "Poor" under UC seismic evaluation guidelines. At present the structure presents seismic risk for its users, its facilities are not adequate for day-to-day or game-day programmatic functions, and the connection and integration with the adjacent campus and community are poor and in need of improvement. In order to protect the occupants that may be in the Stadium during a large earthquake, a retrofit of the building is required.

Primary goals of the SAHPC project are to:

- Relocate Stadium daily occupants to enable seismic improvements of the Stadium;
- Address current deficiencies in the quality and quantity of athlete training and development facilities by providing facilities that are comparable with other top tier NCAA Division l programs;
- Integrate the Stadium with its site and the campus in order to improve access to the Stadium and enhance game-day experience for visitors;
- Improve the surrounding Stadium environs, which are currently characterized by high cyclone fencing and surface parking lots; and
- Provide open space for daily public use, while preserving some of the wooded landscape west of the Stadium.

The fundamental concept guiding the design of the SAHPC is to respect the architecture and character of the existing Stadium by retaining the historic west facade

and bowl shape. In order to reduce the apparent mass of the SAHPC, it will be set substantially below grade to the west of and adjacent to the Stadium. The design will enhance the exterior character and function of the Stadium through the addition of new plazas, landscape, entry and egress routes, and ADA accessible routes to the Stadium.

Project Description and Design

The site for the proposed SAHPC is immediately west of the existing historic California Memorial Stadium. The use of this site is in accordance with the Berkeley 2020 Long Range Development Plan.

The proposed SAHPC project, a new 108,950 asf (142,000 gsf) building is a two-level athlete training and development facility located at the west side of the Stadium. It will contain three distinct functional components: (1) the athlete training and sports medicine center (32,300 asf), (2) football facilities (50,850 asf), and (3) other team sports facilities (25,800 asf).

The new facility will be mostly below the grade of the west-sloping site to allow full exposure of the Stadium's historic west wall from Piedmont Avenue, while providing a visual transition from the rough stone wall at the base of the hillside (along Piedmont Avenue) and up to the Stadium itself. Stairs and ramps will provide access up to the SAHPC and the Stadium from Piedmont Avenue and from other parts of the main campus.

The roof of the new building will form a large (nearly two acres) exterior plaza at the current promenade grade that will connect the North Stadium entrance to the current stairway entrance to the west and south seating sections of the Stadium. The plaza will be used for gatherings as well as for circulation for the large crowds at the Stadium on game days and access for emergency vehicles. At the south end of the structure, two additional levels are under a stair and a plaza that connect the main plaza with the primary south entrance of the Stadium and Prospect Courtyard.

The exposed exterior vertical surfaces of the SAHPC structure will be finished in natural stone. The plaza will be finished using precast concrete pavers set over insulation and a waterproofing membrane. Approximately seventeen trees will be incorporated into the plaza, along with site furnishings for user convenience. Extensive glass in the skylights and interior partitions will allow natural lighting inside. Interior walls will consist of painted concrete, masonry block, or drywall. Appropriate waterproofing of exterior walls and soundproofing materials in interior walls will be applied.

Due to its location near the Hayward Fault, the concrete structure of the SAHPC will be designed to resist near-fault ground motion forces and displacements. Prior to constructing the SAHPC, it will be necessary to provide underpinning and soil cement walls to support the west wall of the Stadium. The project includes shoring the west sides of the building excavation until the new cast-in-place concrete foundation mat,

perimeter and interior shear walls, and the floor and roof slabs of the structure are constructed.

The SAHPC project will provide spaces that fully comply with current codes for life safety, including fire detection and alarm, fire sprinklers, and fire rated construction. Entrances and exiting will provide for safety and ease of access of all users, including the disabled.

The UC Berkeley Design Review Committee has reviewed the design of the Student Athlete High Performance Center and has affirmed that it is in accordance with University policy. The project has also been reviewed by the UC Berkeley Seismic Review Committee, with independent structural review conducted at each stage of project development. Independent construction cost review indicates that the project is within the stated budget.

The proposed delivery method for the SAHPC project is Construction Manager at Risk. A private project management consultant, URS of San Francisco, will manage the project, with assistance from the Berkeley Campus Capital Projects unit and the executive architect's project team. Other consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The campus architect will perform project oversight. The project as planned allows the Stadium to remain fully accessible for home football games during construction. Construction of the SAHPC will be accomplished through two principal bid packages.

The project is due to start construction in January 2007 and be completed September 2009.

Green Building Policy and Clean Energy Standard

The project will comply with the Presidential Policy for Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards and Sustainable Transportation Practices. As required by this policy, the project will adopt the principals of energy efficiency and sustainability. The mechanical system will be designed to provide ventilation, heating, and cooling commensurate with the various tenant uses and with the campus' requirements to exceed energy conservation performance requirements under Title 24 by a minimum of 20 percent. Efficient design will also make use of systems allowing the project to comply with the University's efficiency and sustainability standards. The project is being designed to achieve a LEED equivalent rating of silver, at approximately 34 points. The thick exterior concrete walls and slab will provide thermal mass that will help stabilize interior temperatures.

Future Phases and Background of SCIP

The Regents considered and approved the 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which is implemented in part by the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects (SCIP), at the January 2005 meeting. Combined, the SCIP projects, which include the SAHPC, will provide approximately 20 percent of the new gross square footage anticipated in the 2020 LRDP and 24 percent of the LRDP projected parking.

In its entirety, the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects consists of the following components:

(1) The California Memorial Stadium Seismic Corrections and Program Improvements project is a multiphase project to improve the seismically poor, historically significant Stadium, provide improved program space, and update game-day amenities and services. In Phase 1 (presented for consideration and approval in this item), the project will include constructing a new building adjacent to the Stadium, the Student Athlete High Performance Center, to address life safety issues at the Stadium by providing a new permanent home for programs that currently use the Stadium daily. The SAHPC project will result in the movement of day-to-day uses to the new Student Athlete High Performance Center. Future phases will include the renovation and seismic upgrade of Stadium spaces to support events at the Stadium.

Once the SAHPC is completed and occupied, Stadium renovations can commence as funds become available. Planning and construction of Phase 2 (Seismic Retrofit and West Side improvements) will not begin prior to 2009 and will not be completed before 2010, at the earliest. As funds become available and on completion of the Phase 2 project, Phase 3 (East Side improvements) will commence with planning no earlier than 2010 and will not be completed before 2011 at the earliest. These projects will provide for seismic retrofitting of the Stadium and construct in the Stadium other improvements to the venue that include new toilet rooms and concessions, circulation corridors for events, improved fan seating, a new press box and club spaces, and other upgrades that will bring the facility into code compliance for safety and accessibility. Phase 2 and Phase 3 projects will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

(2) The Parking Structure and Sports Field project will consolidate parking in the southeast campus. The Southeast Campus Integrated Projects will result in the displacement of approximately 545 surface parking spaces (399 spaces at the Stadium and Law and Business Connection Building sites and 146 spaces at the existing Kleeberger surface parking area) to accommodate landscape and program improvements. A new parking facility accommodating up to 911 vehicles at the current site of Maxwell Family Field (formerly Kleeberger Field) will add 300 spaces to the campus parking inventory, and consolidate

and replace lost spaces; the sports field will be replaced on the roof level. This future project will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

(3) The Law and Business Connection Building, a new building of approximately 180,000 gross square feet, will link collaborative programs of the Haas School of Business and the School of Law at a site in the southeast quadrant of UC Berkeley's Campus Park. The project will include abatement and demolition of Calvin Laboratory and will be located at the site of Calvin and the existing 2241 and 2243 College Avenue buildings (the project is examining alternatives, including demolition, and sale for relocation of 2241 and 2243 College Avenue). The Law and Business Connection Building responds to a principal finding of the UC Berkeley Strategic Academic Plan: the need to concentrate future academic growth on the core campus and its adjacent blocks to encourage the synergy among disciplines that leads to new insight and discovery. This future project will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

(4) The Southeast Campus and Piedmont Avenue Landscape Improvements will address the movement of people, bicycles, and vehicles in the southeast campus; renovate the landscape to enhance views of the California Memorial Stadium and the experience of Piedmont Avenue within the project area; enhance opportunities for interaction in the landscape at and between activity nodes; and improve the coherence of the landscape in this area. Piedmont Avenue is owned by the City of Berkeley. This future project will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

(5) School of Law and Haas School of Business Program Improvements includes interior building changes to improve the use of space for current programs in the Law Building and Simon Hall for the School of Law and in Haas for the Business School and to respond to the proposed Law and Business Connection Building by improving access and transparency between the new building and the existing buildings. This future project will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

(6) Renovation and Restoration of the Piedmont Avenue Houses will entail renovation of the buildings for existing program occupants and restoration to recognize the historic character of some or all of the buildings at 2222 to 2240 Piedmont Avenue (five structures and site environs). Seismic, life safety, and

disabled access improvements will be part of renovation and restoration of these houses. This future project will be presented to The Regents for budget and design approval at a later date, at which time it will be determined whether additional CEQA environmental review is necessary to evaluate the project proposed.

Environmental Impact Summary

In conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act and University procedure for implementing it, the campus determined that the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects could have significant effects on the environment, and an EIR has been prepared. Based on the Initial Study, the Berkeley campus determined that potential SCIP effects in many environmental issue areas were adequately analyzed in the 2020 LRDP EIR; however, the following nine environmental issue areas warranted additional analysis in an EIR: aesthetics; cultural resources; geology, seismicity and soils; hydrology and water quality; land use; noise; public services; emergency access; transportation and traffic; utilities; and wastewater, storm water and steam/chilled water construction.

In January 2005, The Regents approved the 2020 Long Range Development Plan for the Berkeley campus and certified the LRDP Program Environmental Impact Report. The SAHPC project, a component of the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects, is proposed, in part, to implement objectives of the campus 2020 LRDP. The EIR for the SCIP expands upon the analysis contained in the 2020 LRDP EIR to address environmental impacts of the SCIP projects in greater detail, including the SAHPC project.

Environmental review of the proposed SAHPC project is part of the SCIP-focused EIR. The SCIP EIR provides project-level analysis of the SAHPC project and is tiered from the UC Berkeley 2020 LRDP EIR, certified by The Regents in January 2005.

The EIR analyzed SCIP-related impacts in the environmental issue areas identified above. The EIR proposes a variety of mitigation measures to address significant SCIP impacts, including the SAHPC. In addition to the SCIP as initially proposed, the EIR analyzes alternatives to each of the projects: a no projects alternative; an alternative without construction of a new parking structure; an alternative that disperses the projects to different sites in Berkeley in the vicinity of campus; an alternative that moves the Stadium use and the Student Athlete High Performance Center to a site in Albany; and an alternative where the size of the Law and Business Connection Building, the Parking Structure, the Student Athlete High Performance Center, and the programmatic improvements to the CMS is reduced.

The alternative that reduced the size of project components was found to be the environmentally superior alternative, in addition to the no project alternative. Although were this alternative implemented, in whole or on a component by component basis, impacts upon aesthetics, cultural resources, noise, public

services/emergency access, and utilities and service systems will be reduced, key project objectives would remain unsatisfied.

The SCIP components as described above are preferred projects which will move through The Regents', campus', and Office of the President's approval processes as appropriate in the coming years.

The public review period for the Draft EIR on the SCIP was May 8 through July 7, 2006. During that time the Draft EIR was reviewed by various State and local agencies as well as by interested individuals. A total of 63 comment letters were received: eight from public agencies (three were from the City of Berkeley) and 55 from other organizations or individuals. Two petitions, one with 66 signatures and one with approximately 1036 signatures, were received. A public hearing was held on June 5, 2006, at which 23 people commented. The letters, comment cards, petitions, and public hearing transcript are included in the Final EIR. The Final EIR contains the comments on the Draft EIR, responses to these comments, and revisions to the SCIP and EIR based on comments received.

Implementation of the SCIP has the potential to create significant impacts on the environment in a number of areas. The EIR concludes that impacts in the following areas will be reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementing all identified mitigation measures listed in the Summary and text of the EIR:

- Moving the College Avenue houses at the site of the proposed Law Business Connection Building to another appropriate site; alternative disabled access or alternative programming could mitigate potentially significant adverse changes to the historic Piedmont Avenue houses.

- Performing storm drain capacity studies and potentially increasing pervious surfaces or incorporating alternative detention/retention strategies could mitigate potential exceedance of storm water drainage systems; monitoring and adjusting flows throughout the construction of Maxwell Family Field parking structure could mitigate potential construction period hydrological impacts to Strawberry Creek.

- Conducting engineering analysis and implementation of recommendations and maintenance measures could mitigate potential impacts upon existing drainage patterns.

- Implementation of intersection improvements, at the discretion of the City of Berkeley, could reduce potential significant intersection delays at Durant and Piedmont, and Bancroft and Piedmont.

- Implementation of design recommendations for the Maxwell Family Field parking structure could mitigate potential inefficient and unsafe operations.

- Installation of pedestrian crossing protections on Gayley Road could reduce pedestrian crossing conflicts.

- The total number of net new parked vehicles at Maxwell Family Field parking structure could be capped at 300 to reduce potential for new impacts on vehicle circulation or parking.

- The University will estimate the amount of construction prior to each phase of construction to assure parking demand does not exceed baselines established in the 2020 LRDP EIR.

- The University and the contractor will consult with the Berkeley Fire Department to ensure construction phasing and staging will not interfere with fire protection and emergency access to and from surrounding areas, including the Panoramic Hill neighborhood.

- The University will continue to cooperate with agencies to reduce the impact of additional events at the Stadium upon the transportation network.

Significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, either because mitigations are not available or are currently considered infeasible, include the following:

- Changes to the visual character of Gayley Road with the introduction of the parking structure; changes to limited scenic vistas from neighboring Panoramic Hill with program improvements to the Stadium.

- Significant adverse changes to the historic significance of the Stadium as a result of seismic and program improvements.

- Significant adverse changes to a potential historic resource (a small grid form building) at Maxwell Family Field.

- Potentially significant adverse changes to historic resources (the College Avenue houses and Calvin Laboratory) at the site of the Law Business Connection.

- Adverse changes to the historic character of Piedmont Avenue with pedestrian improvements and vicinity landscape changes.

- Potential loss, injury, or death resulting from rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic ground shaking.

- Substantial periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- Noise in excess of local standards due to demolition and construction for the Integrated Projects.

- Significant intersection delays at Durant and Piedmont and Bancroft and Piedmont.

- Potential construction period impacts upon traffic, noise, storm water, cultural resources, and air if new or altered wastewater collection facilities are required to accommodate the proposed projects.

Community concerns about the SCIP component projects have included the following topics: the proximity of the projects to an earthquake fault; the impact upon cultural resources; and the effects of expanded use of a renovated Stadium, including emergency access, noise, and lighting impacts.

Detailed responses to these concerns are contained in the Final EIR. Comments and responses on the Alquist-Priolo Act, structural and seismic safety, and emergency planning and services received since the release of the Final EIR are on file.

The Berkeley campus will be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures identified in the EIR as an element of the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) included in the Final EIR. The MMP provides a reporting mechanism for the changes to the proposed project which are made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

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

Regent Hopkinson asked for clarification of the project's scope. Campus outside counsel Mr. Charles Olsen affirmed that the EIR analyzes multiple related projects. The High Performance Center is the only one addressed in this recommendation. If subsequent projects brought to The Regents require supplemental environmental review, based on this EIR, that will occur prior to bringing the approval action to The Regents. The determination with respect to the need for additional review will be based on whether there are a substantial change in the project, a substantial change in the circumstances under which the project would be implemented, or new information.

Regent Ledesma asked about the total number of trees in question. Vice Chancellor Denton responded that of the total 139 trees on the site, 48 trees will be retained and 91 will be removed, including 26 coastal live oak trees and 16 mixed specimen trees. He noted that, although transplanting a mature tree is difficult, one redwood tree is planned for replanting. One hundred forty-two new trees will be planted around the stadium.

Regent Johnson asked about the geological condition of the site. Mr. Olsen reported that the campus has worked with consultants during the past year to prepare a scope

of work for the High Performance Center that has been subjected to peer review by other consulting firms. The scope of work was deemed to be appropriate for clearing the footprint for the High Performance Center, and the California Geological Survey and the U.S. Geological Survey have confirmed that the majority of the site has been cleared.

Regent Coombs thanked members of the public who had voiced concern about the oak trees on the athletic facility site. He noted the extensive efforts that the campus is taking to preserve 26 of them as well as other specimen and non-specimen trees. He recalled that the High Performance Center would be reinforced to make sure it could manage a potential collapse of the west wall of the stadium. Mr. Denton indicated that the performance center roof is being designed to support fire trucks, a load that would likely be unequaled by any piece of structure falling on it. Also, trenching of the site has determined that the soil under the west wall of the stadium is very stable, and it is doubtful the wall would collapse.

Regent Schilling asked about the suggestion to move the stadium to Edwards Field. Mr. Denton responded that Edwards Track includes an important historic building. Also, the site could not accommodate a stadium large enough for 62,000 fans and any such structure would overshadow all adjoining buildings.

Committee Chair Kozberg asked how structural safety is determined when a building is on or near a fault. Mr. Denton responded that a performance-based design method is used that allows expected ground motion to be determined. Each element of the structure is then designed to withstand it. The campus has developed ground motion spectra for the entire campus. All its facilities are designed to the highest level of seismic resistence using the latest technology.

Regent-designate Bugay asked about the construction timetable. Mr. Denton reported that the campus would like to go out to bid in January 2007 and begin excavation and stabilization of the soil in March, finishing the entire building and grounds by February 2009. In the interim, games may be played in the stadium. One of the first things that must be done is to build a platform to provide fire truck access and circulation.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, Regents Coombs, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Ledesma, Schilling, and Schreiner (7) voting "aye."

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Attest:

Acting Secretary