

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**

November 12, 2013

The Committee on Grounds and Buildings met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents De La Peña, Feingold, Flores, Makarechian, Ruiz, Schultz, and Zettel; Ex officio member Napolitano, Advisory members Barton, Coyne, Jacob, and Leong Clancy

In attendance: Regent Newsom, Regent-designate Engelhorn, Faculty Representative Gilly, Secretary and Chief of Staff Kelman, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President Brostrom, Chief Financial Officer Taylor, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice President Lenz, Chancellor Khosla, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 3:35 p.m. with Committee Chair Makarechian presiding.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of September 17, 2013 were approved.

**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

***Approval of External Financing, Solar Energy Research Center, Berkeley Campus/Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory***

The President recommended that:

- A. The President be authorized to obtain additional external financing not to exceed \$30 million (plus related interest expense and financing costs) for the Project. This authority, together with the previously authorized \$14.4 million, equals \$44.4 million of total authorized external financing. The President shall require that:
  - (1) Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
  - (2) The primary source of repayment of the requested additional external financing of \$30 million plus related interest expense and financing costs shall be from State appropriations.

- (3) The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- B. The President be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz stated that this consent item would allow the President to seek external financing not to exceed \$30 million for this project. The Helios Energy Research Center was originally approved in the State Budget Act of 2007 as a single \$70-million project. In 2009, the project was amended into Helios West and Helios East (Solar Energy Research Center), to be funded by State lease revenue bonds: \$40 million for Helios West, and \$30 million for Helios East. The State sold bonds for Helios West, but funding for the Solar Energy Research Center was never included in a lease revenue bond sale, because of the State’s fiscal condition. The University was successful in securing legislation allowing it to fund projects that had already been approved, such as the Solar Energy Research Center; the State would pay the debt service and the cost of the bond issuance.

Regent Zettel asked if there was any risk in relying on State appropriations for capital projects. Mr. Lenz responded that funding for the debt service for this project was already built into UC’s budget assumptions, since the project had been approved a number of years ago.

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

**3. APPROVAL OF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 2013-14 AND 2014-15 BUDGETS FOR STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE 2013-23 CAPITAL FINANCIAL PLAN**

The President recommended that:

- A. Subject to concurrence of the Committee on Finance, the amended 2013-14 Budget for State Capital Improvements as shown in Attachment 1 be approved.
- B. Subject to concurrence of the Committee on Finance, the 2014-15 Budget for State Capital Improvements as shown in Attachment 2 be approved.
- C. The *2013-23 Capital Financial Plan* be accepted.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz stated that the State Budget Act of 2013 changed the way the UC’s State-eligible capital facility projects would be funded. Historically, such projects were funded either by a voter-approved general obligation bond or by a State lease revenue bond. There had been no general obligation bond since 2006 and no State lease revenue bonds to address UC’s capital facilities needs in the past few years. The University has worked with the State administration to try to find a way to address the University’s critical capital facilities projects, particularly a debt restructuring proposal to assist UC’s overall support budget. In the past year, a budget trailer bill, Assembly Bill 94 that provided the debt restructuring, was passed. UC was able to issue bonds that would result in UC’s saving \$100 million in annual debt service payments for the next ten years, freeing up funding to address some additional support and capital budget items. The current item proposed \$87 million for seven additional projects, the majority of which are fire, life-safety and seismic improvements that had been under consideration for several years.

The item also requested acceptance of the 2013-23 Ten-Year Capital Financial Plan, which includes reports on the Annual Budget for State Capital Improvements, the UC Five-Year Capital Outlay for State Funds, and the Annual Report on Campuses’ Ten-Year Capital Financial Plans. Following the Regents’ acceptance of the 2013-23 Capital Financial Plan, the University’s Five-Year Capital Plan would be submitted to the State, as required by State statute.

Regent De La Peña asked whether any of these projects could exceed their budgets by up to 25 percent without being brought back to the Regents for further approval. Mr. Lenz noted that some of the construction projects were still in the preliminary planning stage so their final budgets were not known, but he expressed confidence that the budgets would be fairly close to the amounts anticipated, since these projects have been considered for several years. He clarified that the policy regarding projects’ budget augmentations was completely separate from the approval requested in the current item, which seeks Regents’ approval for the purpose of working with the Governor and the Legislature as part of the State process, during which the Legislature would thoroughly review these projects. Committee Chair Makarechian clarified that these projects would be brought back to the Committee for approval. There was no guarantee that the projects would be approved at the State level; these were projects that Mr. Lenz’s office was recommending.

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

4. **EXTENSION OF THE PILOT PHASE OF THE DELEGATED PROCESS FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz recalled that in March 2008 the Regents authorized the pilot phase of a delegated process for capital improvement projects. Each campus was required to submit for Regents' approval its Ten-Year Capital Financial Plan and Physical Design Framework demonstrating integrated academic, physical, and capital planning; these had been approved for the ten campuses and the UC Davis Medical Center, allowing the campuses to participate in the delegated process. Authority was delegated to the President of the University, who re-delegated authority to the chancellors for approval of budgets and design for projects of \$10 million to \$60 million. The chancellors are required to attest to the projects' eligibility under the delegated process and submit documentation for a 15-day review by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) primarily for issues related to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the UC Office of the President (UCOP) Department of Capital Markets Finance regarding the feasibility of securing the debt, and the UCOP Department of Budget and Capital Resources and the Executive Vice President – Business Operations for policy-related risk. As of September 2013, 67 projects totaling almost \$1.5 billion had been approved under the pilot phase of the delegated process, but only 30 have been completed. To ensure the credibility of the delegated process, the UCOP Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services was asked to perform an audit of the delegated approval process, to determine whether the campuses had applied the appropriate rigor in reviewing projects compared with the Regents' process of review. The audit verified the availability and completeness of documents referenced at each campus, and that each campus had complied with meeting the terms of the required checklist based on applicable law and Regents' policy.

Mr. Lenz advised that the next step would be to continue to evaluate the projects according to various performance outcome measures that are being established in order to be able to recommend to the Regents whether or not the pilot phase of the delegated process should become permanent. The pilot phase is scheduled to end March 31, 2014; his office would request an extension of the pilot phase to March 31, 2015 to allow time to evaluate a sufficient number of projects completed under the pilot phase.

Committee Chair Makarechian commented that during the one-year extension of the pilot phase, a full audit would be conducted of the completed projects including whether the projects had changed in scope or budget. He also clarified that no projects could be divided into smaller phases to qualify for the delegated process and that the \$60 million limit for projects eligible for the delegated process be maintained.

Committee Chair Makarechian asked Vice President Lenz for information about the policy that allows a project to be up to 25 percent over budget without being brought back to the Regents. The Committee would like to review this policy for possible revision or elimination, given that projects often have a 15-percent contingency in their budgets in addition to the 25 percent. Regent Schultz asked how cost overruns greater than 25 percent were approved. Mr. Lenz stressed that his office had not and would not approve any projects that were submitted for approval in phases of less than the projects' total budgets. Any project with a total budget of more than \$60 million had to be brought back to the Regents for approval of a budget augmentation of more than 25 percent. Any requested budget augmentations for projects valued from \$10 million to \$60 million were

reviewed by his staff for appropriateness. Mr. Lenz reported that no augmentations have been requested for any projects under the delegated process. He clarified that Committee Chair Makarechian's concern related to policies about budget augmentations for all capital projects, not only those under the delegated process. Mr. Lenz said his office would report to the Committee at a future meeting about the various thresholds for approval and any changes that his office would recommend. Committee Chair Makarechian asked that this discussion include changes to project scope as well as budget. Mr. Lenz clarified that any changes in project scope automatically come back to the Regents for approval.

Regent De La Peña asked whether new projects could be submitted during the extension of the pilot phase. Committee Chair Makarechian and Mr. Lenz confirmed that new projects could be submitted during the extension.

Committee Chair Makarechian added that this item when brought back to the Committee for approval would include improvements that had been discussed earlier. He added that Mr. Lenz would also report on ways to ensure that capital projects not under the delegated process were not excessively delayed because of lengthy review processes at the Office of the President.

Mr. Lenz said that when the proposed extension of the pilot phase is brought to the Committee for approval, it would be for a one-year extension and would include improvements suggested by the Committee.

Regent Ruiz expressed his understanding that purpose of the pilot phase was to offer campuses more autonomy to approve their own projects in order to enable faster decision-making and delivery of projects within their budgets. Since the pilot phase has been in existence for approximately five years and was supported by all the campuses, Regent Ruiz expressed surprise that any outstanding questions about the success of the pilot phase had not been resolved. Mr. Lenz agreed that the process had been lengthy. He noted that, after the Regents initially approved the pilot phase, a good deal of time had been spent developing the program's components. Subsequently, the campuses were required to develop and gain approval for their Ten-Year Capital Financial Plans. Mr. Lenz clarified that the main benefit of the pilot phase of the delegated process has been an increase in the ability to have projects reviewed in a timely manner, so that the approval process does not become stalled. Mr. Lenz assured the Regents that, even if a project were valued under \$60 million, his office would not recommend it for the delegated process if the project involved unique issues appropriate for the Regents' review. Committee Chair Makarechian agreed that a reason for developing the delegated process was to alleviate delays resulting from the UCOP review process. He said that Mr. Lenz would also report on possible ways to eliminate the delays in the UCOP approval process.

Regent De La Peña asked Mr. Lenz and the OGC to report to the Committee on ways to obtain bids for projects without disclosing the project's budget to the public, so that contractors might propose lower bids.

**5. APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PLANS FUNDING AND EXTERNAL FINANCING, OUTPATIENT PAVILION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that:

- A. The 2013-14 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended to include the following project:

San Diego: Outpatient Pavilion – preliminary plans – \$4.78 million to be allocated to the UC San Diego Health System from the Century Bond proceeds previously allocated to the campus.

- B. The President be authorized to direct the campus to allocate to the UC San Diego Health System preliminary plans funding not to exceed \$4.78 million for the Outpatient Pavilion project from the Century Bond proceeds previously allocated to the campus. The President shall require that as long as the allocation is outstanding, the UC San Diego Health System gross revenues be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the annual principal and interest on the preliminary plans funding allocation.
- C. The President be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz recalled that the Committee had discussed the UC San Diego Outpatient Pavilion in July, and the Committee on Health Services had subsequently discussed the project in September. The 77,500 assignable square foot Outpatient Pavilion would address significant outpatient growth and provide space for clinical programs currently dispersed throughout San Diego County. This item requested approval of \$4.78 million for preliminary plans.

Committee Chair Makarechian remarked that questions about the Outpatient Pavilion’s projected days cash on hand would be discussed when the project is brought back to the Committee for budget approval.

Regent Zettel asked why a 140,000 gross square foot building would have only 77,500 assignable square feet. UCSD Health System Chief Executive Officer Paul Viviano said that it was standard for an outpatient facility to have 55- to 60-percent space efficiency, since clinical space requires a good deal of infrastructure support.

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

**6. APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOLLOWING ACTION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, STUART HOUSE REPLACEMENT, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Stuart House Replacement Project, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and CEQA Findings.
- C. Approve the design of the Stuart House Replacement Project, Los Angeles campus.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz stated that this item requested approval of design following action pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration under CEQA, adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and CEQA Findings, and approval of the design of the Stuart House Replacement Project at UCLA. Currently UCLA provides a multi-service program to meet special needs of sexually abused children and their families at Stuart House, a 5,400 gross square foot (gsf) facility constructed in 1988. The program provides 24-hour consultation to first responders in the field for new disclosure reports and discovery of child sexual abuse cases. The current facility was intended to house about 150 children and their families; demand has grown to more than 300 families. This project would construct a 22,266 gsf facility on a site currently used as a 19-space surface parking lot near the current Stuart House.

Vice Chancellor Steven Olsen informed the Regents that this is a gift-in-kind project. In 2008 the Regents approved a gift agreement between The Regents and The Rape Foundation (TRF), under which TRF would raise the funds and undertake full responsibility for the design and construction of the new facility, which would then be gifted to the Regents upon completion. He noted that, if the project were constructed on the main campus, it would be covered under the delegated authority process because the project's value is approximately \$10 million. However, the project is located near the UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica, which is not covered by the campus' Long Range Development Plan. Mr. Olsen observed that the Stuart House and the services provided there through the Rape Treatment Center (RTC) provide extraordinary, cutting-edge programs serving an extremely vulnerable population.

Director of the RTC Gail Abarbanel explained that the RTC provides an innovative, internationally recognized model program at Stuart House to improve the way in which victims of sexual abuse are treated. The RTC sees three to four new victims daily, half of

whom are children. In traditional treatment programs, a sexually abused child and his or her family would have to go to five or six agencies in different locations, and be re-interviewed by a different stranger at each institutional location. Many children never receive expert medical care, forensic examinations, or therapy services, and few cases are prosecuted. The purpose of Stuart House is to change this system. By forming exemplary private-public partnerships with the public agencies involved in child protection and investigating abuse cases, the RTC co-located these agencies under one roof in Stuart House to offer a multi-agency immediate response for these children when they are the most vulnerable at the time of first disclosure. Stuart House also provides comprehensive, state-of-the-art treatment, access to medical care and evidentiary examinations 24 hours a day, and specialized therapy. Ms. Abarbanel pointed out that the Stuart House building itself is part of the treatment by creating an environment where children feel safe. The Stuart House model has been the subject of much research and has been replicated in many communities throughout the nation.

The replacement project would double Stuart House's capacity to provide treatment for sexually abused children and enable establishment of a training center for first responders. Ms. Abarbanel explained that TRF, a separate organization that has raised funds for decades to support the programs of the RTC and Stuart House, has launched a capital campaign to raise funds to construct the replacement for Stuart House, which will be given as a gift-in-kind to the University. Every year there are several hundred victims of sexual abuse or rape who receive medical care at UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica, but cannot be seen at Stuart House because of a lack of space.

Campus Architect Jeff Averill displayed slides showing the location of the UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica, and the site for the replacement project, just one block from the existing Stuart House. The first floor would contain a reception area, interagency team offices, and interview rooms; the second floor would house child and family therapy rooms; the third floor would be devoted to training and education. The building would have a residential scale and character, meant to be non-threatening to children. The project would meet UC sustainability standards, with at least a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver rating, and possibly a gold rating.

President Napolitano noted the importance of work in this very difficult field, and complimented Ms. Abarbanel and her staff on their accomplishments. President Napolitano asked Ms. Abarbanel whether an arrangement exists with UCLA to have law or social science students work in a supervised setting at Stuart House. Ms. Abarbanel said that this type of arrangement exists with UCLA's medical residents and UCLA law students occasionally perform legal research for Stuart House. Lack of space has limited Stuart House's ability to provide opportunities for students from other disciplines, but such collaborations could be considered with the expanded space in the replacement project.

Regent Newsom expressed his strong support for Stuart House's extraordinary programs and its new ways of breaking down barriers to solving problems relating to child abuse.



Ms. Abarbanel responded that housing various service agencies in one building fundamentally changes the way in which child sexual abuse victims are approached.

Regent Zettel congratulated Ms. Abarbanel on her leadership of such an excellent program and asked about the financial sustainability of the expanded Stuart House program. She also asked whether Stuart House would receive any reimbursements from agencies such as the police department or the District Attorney's Office, which utilize the space. Ms. Abarbanel said that, while Stuart House does not receive reimbursement from these agencies, it does receive the benefit of their personnel without having to pay their salaries. The expansion would not double Stuart House's budget, 90 percent of which is devoted to personnel costs. Ms. Abarbanel confirmed that she does a great deal of fundraising to support Stuart House programs.

Regent Zettel asked whether the expansion would affect parking, particularly since the new site had been a 19-space parking lot. Mr. Olsen said that the campus' initial study analyzed parking effects and found them not to be significant since sufficient parking capacity exists in the area. Regent Zettel also asked about plans for the existing Stuart House building. Mr. Olsen said there are no current plans for the use of the current property, which is owned by the Regents. The University also owns the adjacent property that was used for construction management for the UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica project. The two parcels together could present a future development opportunity.

Committee Chair Makarechian suggested incorporating more open space into the floor plan, to make more home-like spaces. Ms. Abarbanel said that Stuart House has special interview rooms that are furnished in a way to make the children feel safe, while providing sufficient privacy. Committee Chair Makarechian thanked Ms. Abarbanel for her work in providing UC with this gift in kind, at no cost to the University.

Regent Ruiz thanked Ms. Abarbanel for her service and suggested exploring whether such a facility could be added to the other four UC medical centers.

Regent De La Peña asked for clarification of the relationship between the University and Stuart House. Mr. Olsen explained that UCLA is the owner-operator of the RTC and Stuart House. TRF is a separate 501(c)(3) support group that raises money to support these programs. The UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica incurs costs for the support of the Stuart House facility and staffing costs, which are offset in part by funds from TRF. UCLA would continue to have costs associated with support of the facility, as part of UCLA's mission. Ms. Abarbanel added that the program's medical care and forensic examinations are provided in the UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica.

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

**7. UPDATE ON PLANS FOR EXPANSION OF STUDENT HOUSING, IRVINE CAMPUS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz advised that he would provide an update on plans for expansion of student housing at UC Irvine in relation to the campus' Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) goal to provide on-campus housing to 50 percent of its students. The campus currently offers a two-year housing guarantee to incoming freshmen and a one-year guarantee to transfer students. The campus fell 1,000 beds short of its 50-percent housing goal the past fall and, given the campus' enrollment growth, would fall short by 2,100 beds by the fall of 2016. The campus would bring an item to a future meeting for budget approval for replacement of its Mesa Court residence hall complex, built in 1968, as well as renovation of related dining and other support services.

Vice Chancellor Wendell Brase discussed plans for UCI student housing to 2020 and the campus' LRDP goal to provide on-campus housing for 50 percent of its students. UCI currently provided on-campus housing for 46 percent of its students and had a shortfall of 1,000 beds. Providing on-campus housing for students is fundamental to creating a strong, vibrant university community and important academically, giving freshmen the opportunity to begin their college experience in a supportive residential setting. The campus' immediate need is to provide additional beds for incoming freshmen in the academic core area of the campus, with programs and services geared toward supporting the academic success of freshmen. Plans include a 500-bed expansion of the Mesa Court residence hall complex and replacement of the commons building, which houses dining, study rooms, recreational space, and staff offices.

Mr. Brase discussed projected student housing demand and availability at UC Irvine through 2020. All apartments developed on campus at UCI during the past ten years have been privately developed, and another apartment project that would add 2,200 beds would be undertaken through a private-public partnership when demand is sufficient. In the past ten years, UC Irvine has developed more on-campus housing through private-public partnerships than any other university in the nation, successfully increasing the proportion of students living on campus from 28 percent to 46 percent. However, the campus has concluded that the Mesa Court expansion project would not be suitable for a private-public partnership because of its location and ongoing dining and student-support services.

Committee Chair Makarechian requested more information at the campus' subsequent presentation to the Committee about the decision that the Mesa Court expansion was not suitable for a private-public partnership, including an analysis of the benefit of using its current location over another location, given that UC Irvine has much available land. He also asked the campus to present only its design budget, and not disclose its total project budget, so that the campus could receive the best possible bids from contractors.

Mr. Brase expressed the campus' determination to secure the most favorable price and value for its projects.

Regent Schultz asked whether the campus had any information about the academic and social effects of students' living in triple rather than double rooms, since he has heard concerns from students' parents about possible negative effects of students' living in triple rooms. Regent Schultz also requested information about the demand for triple rooms vs. double rooms. Mr. Brase said he would provide that information at the campus' next presentation to the Committee.

Regent-designate Leong Clancy asked about local area's ability to absorb the 50 percent of students living off campus, particularly as enrollment grows. Mr. Brase responded that the campus analyzed these effects during preparation of its LRDP. The campus' goal of housing 50 percent of its students on campus was adopted in part to decrease the effect of students' commuting to campus and the effect of student demand on local housing supply. A letter of support from the mayor of the City of Irvine and endorsed by the City Council recommended approval of UCI's LRDP, and supported the campus' 50-percent housing goal. Directly across the street from the campus, a large, privately owned rental community houses 20 percent of UCI students.

Regent Flores asked for information at the campus' next presentation about plans to provide dining facilities for existing residents of Mesa Court during the construction period.

Staff Advisor Coyne asked whether the planned apartments would provide housing for graduate students as well as undergraduates, in view of projected enrollment growth. Mr. Brase explained that the additional 500 beds in the Mesa Court expansion would be for freshmen and the 2,200 in the planned apartments would be primarily for upper-division undergraduate students. The nearby private rental complex has provided more than an adequate supply of housing for graduate students.

Regent Feingold asked the campus staff to consider ways to make housing more affordable for students, for instance by increasing room size to house four students at a reduced rate, given concerns about student debt levels. Mr. Brase expressed appreciation for the concern about the cost of student housing and would provide information about ways to reduce students' housing costs at a future presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**2013-14 BUDGET FOR STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS (\$000s)  
CCCI 6077**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>CAMPUS</b>	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>PHASE</b>	<b>2013-14 REQUEST</b>	<b>FUTURE STATE FUNDS</b>	<b>NON- STATE FUNDS</b>
Shovel Ready	MC	Classroom & Academic Office Building	C	\$ 45,144	\$ 4,079	
Equipment	MC	Science & Engineering Building 2	E	4,220		
Infrastructure	SD	SIO Nimitz Marine Facility Berthing Wharf	C	5,000		\$ 20,053
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATED</b>				<b>\$ 54,364</b>	<b>\$ 4,079</b>	<b>\$ 20,053</b>
Capital Renewal	ANR	Ext Centers Renewal & Improvements	PWC	1,850		200
Seismic/Life Safety	DV	Walker Hall Renewal & Seismic Corrections	PW	2,731	28,081	
Shovel Ready	LA	CHS Seismic Correction & Fire Life Safety	C	48,349		
Infrastructure	MC	Central Plant/Telecomm Reliability Upgrade	PW	1,400	15,000	
Seismic/Life Safety	SF	Clinical Sciences Building Seismic Retrofit	W	2,800	21,735	66,933
Shovel Ready	SF	Academic Support Facility	C	26,505		7,395
Previous Growth	SC	Coastal Biology Building	W	3,530	64,443	3,985
<b>TOTAL PROPOSED</b>				<b>\$ 87,165</b>	<b>\$ 129,259</b>	<b>\$ 82,319</b>
<b>TOTAL STATE PROGRAM</b>				<b>\$ 141,529</b>	<b>\$133,338</b>	<b>\$102,372</b>

**Note:** The State adopted legislation in 2013-14, Assembly Bill No. 94, Chapter 50, Section 8 (AB 94), which adds, among other provisions, sections 92495 et seq. to the Education Code. AB 94 required that the University submit its *2013-14 State Capital Outlay* request by August 1, 2013. The submittal of seven additional projects totaled \$87 million. This item requests approval of the seven projects plus the projects previously approved for a total \$141.5 million.

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**2014-15 BUDGET FOR STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS (\$000s)  
CCCI 6151**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>CAMPUS</b>	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>PHASE</b>	<b>2014-15 REQUEST</b>	<b>FUTURE STATE FUNDS</b>	<b>NON- STATE FUNDS</b>
Modernization	ANR	Intermountain Research Extension Center	PW	\$ 200	\$ 1,786	\$ 100
Seismic/Life Safety	DV	Walker Hall Renewal & Seismic Corrections	C	27,917	509	
Seismic/Life Safety	DV	Chemistry Seismic & Life Safety	PW	3,482	30,418	
Equipment	IR	Business Unit 2	E	1,094		3,281
Infrastructure	IR	Primary Electrical Improvements Step 4	DC	19,462		
Infrastructure	MC	Central Plant/Telecomm Reliability Upgrade	C	15,183		
Seismic/Life Safety	SD	Campus Life/Safety Improvements	WD	49,010		
Infrastructure	SB	Infrastructure Renewal Phase 1	C	12,136		
Previous Growth	SC	Coastal Biology Building	C	64,127	1,100	
Seismic/Life Safety	SC	Life Safety Upgrades	PWC	10,201		
<b>TOTAL STATE PROGRAM</b>				<b>\$ 202,812</b>	<b>\$ 33,813</b>	<b>\$ 3,381</b>