

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

February 3, 2009

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

Members present: Regents Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Reiss, Ruiz, Schilling, and Shewmake; Ex officio member Yudof; Advisory members Bernal and Powell

In attendance: Regent Scorza, Regent-designate Stovitz, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Executive Vice President Lapp, Vice President Lenz, Chancellor Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 2:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Schilling presiding.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Committee Chair Schilling explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Committee.

- A. Ms. Caitlin Vavasour, representing the California Student Sustainability Coalition (CSSC), commended the Regents for their commitment to sustainability and their willingness to work in collaboration with student leaders.
- B. Mr. Michael Tank, representing the Education for Sustainable Living Program, emphasized the importance of pursuing innovative sustainable policies. He believed that investment in a green infrastructure program is in the best financial, ecological, and social interests of the University. He advocated the establishment of an annual UC sustainability conference.
- C. Ms. Allison Reed, representing CSSC, recalled that the student coalition has worked for the past four years to encourage the University to establish sustainable campus food systems. She thanked the Regents for their endorsement of the practice of buying from local organic food producers.
- D. Ms. Alexandra Cole-Weiss, representing CSSC, recalled that there is a statewide food systems working group to continue efforts to set minimum-level thresholds, baseline indicators, and metrics for best practices for contracted and in-house food service vendors. The group has scheduled a conference to be held on the Santa Cruz campus that will be attended by over 200 students from across California's higher education system.

- E. Ms. Catherine Kunkel, a UC Berkeley graduate student, offered observations on the UC climate action plan process. She believed the action plan could be administered more effectively by updating job descriptions with a view toward supporting campus climate goals, particularly with respect to energy efficiency projects, and rewarding employees who make an extra effort to enhance campus sustainability.
- F. Mr. David Corson-Knowles, representing the CSSC, believed that, although the University has taken some positive steps with respect to ethical investing, it would benefit from the establishment of a policy on sustainability and responsibility in investing and an oversight committee to implement that policy.
- G. Mr. Ricky Mack, representing the CSSC, noted that, despite a due date of December 2008 for the system, UC Berkeley is the only campus to have posted a climate action plan on the Office of the President's website. He noted that climate action plans are crucial for continuing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. He urged the Regents to encourage all the campuses to press forward with respect to their individual action plans.
- H. Ms. Karen Makovian, a UC Berkeley student, commended the Regents for adopting Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) construction standards, but she noted that missing from the policy on sustainable practices is LEED certification of existing buildings. She believed that the potential exists for significant savings with respect to future energy and maintenance costs.
- I. Ms. Claire Evans, an advocate of building sustainability at the Berkeley campus, believed that all campus buildings should be required to reach LEED certification standards, preferably the Gold level.
- J. Mr. Blake Holland, a UC Berkeley graduate student, asked the Regents to encourage campuses to complete and implement their individual climate action plans. He believed the action plans should cover a wide range of sustainability policy goals, including the implementation of small-scale, local renewable energy sources.
- K. Mr. Alberto Ortega Hinojosa, a UC Berkeley graduate student, described some of the effects of food production and consumption on the environment. He emphasized the importance of buying local products and choosing sustainable options for the University's food service programs.
- L. Ms. Irene Seliverstov, a UC Berkeley sustainability activist, believed that interest in sustainable practices should be encouraged at every level throughout the University community.

2. **ANNUAL REPORT ON SUSTAINABILITY POLICY**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Assistant Vice President Bocchicchio presented the fifth annual report on sustainability. Mr. Bocchicchio recalled that the Committee had requested a feasibility study and clean energy policy. The Committee then approved policy principles that required an annual report. The President issued the first policy in 2004; it was updated in 2006 and 2007. In March 2008, the Committee voted to add sustainable food goals to the policy and to consider increasing green building goals for the University.

Mr. Bocchicchio announced that the presentation would address each component of the policy individually. He reported that, with respect to the first component, green buildings, 15 buildings have been certified by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program. Four of those were certified in the past year. Thirteen of the 15 were certified at Silver level or better. Since the LEED program's inception, 119 new construction projects with green building goals have been established. Forty-three of those were established in 2008. UC projects are required to exceed Title 24 requirements by 20 percent, which is the energy standard for the State of California. Each project goes through a process called "Savings by Design," which is a partnership with investor-owned utilities. The utilities make grants available to encourage owners and designers to go through the savings program during the design phase of the project. Mr. Bocchicchio reported that, by having those designs go through the process, the University has received \$5.5 million in incentive grants and achieved \$5.4 million in annual cost avoidance with respect to utility bills. This is an example of how the policy has brought funds to the University and achieved ongoing cost avoidance for the future. He pointed out that the \$5.4 million represents current utility costs. As those costs continue to escalate, the amount of cost avoidance will increase over the lifetime of the buildings. About 180 projects have gone through the Savings by Design program.

Mr. Bocchicchio next discussed clean energy. He reported that, between 2004 and 2008, the University has been involved in another partnership with investor-owned utilities, a partnership that allows the University to carry out energy retrofit projects. During those years, over 150 projects were implemented under this partnership, providing \$22 million in grant money. Projected savings for these retrofits is close to \$12 million annually. This is another example of how the policy is benefitting the University financially. As in the previous example, as utility costs escalate, savings will increase over the life of the buildings.

Mr. Bocchicchio reported that progress is being made in the use of photovoltaic (PV) cells, which in the past have been marginally cost-effective, especially on smaller projects. Photovoltaic cells are used on the Irvine, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Berkeley campuses. This year, a strategic energy plan was completed, representing the next round of the partnership with industrial utilities. In this plan, approximately 1,000 projects have been identified that have the potential to effect energy

savings through retrofitting. In an upcoming Regents meeting, the University's plan for financing the project will be submitted. The University has planned for between 900 and 1,000 projects in the next three years. The value of those projects is about \$260 million. The investor-owned utilities will provide grant money close to \$54 million to provide for these projects. The annual estimated savings from the implementation of these retrofits is nearly \$36 million annually.

Moving on to climate protection, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that all but one of the campuses have completed their climate action plans. All campuses have joined the California Climate Action Registry, which provides a common protocol for greenhouse gas emissions inventory. All campuses reported emissions to the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, a broad effort by the nation's higher education institutions to address global warming by tracking, reporting, considering best practices, and accelerating research in this important area. UC Santa Cruz has joined a compact with City and County officials to implement five greenhouse gas emission reduction projects.

The next category Mr. Bocchicchio addressed was transportation. He reported that campuses are now tracking transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions, which account for about 26 percent of UC's carbon footprint. By comparison, transportation accounts for an average 38 percent of the state's carbon footprint. The residential aspect of the University's campuses accounts for much of the difference. Campuses are expanding their transportation demand management programs, which include car sharing, vanpools, shuttle busses, free and discounted passes for public transportation, and incentives to carpool. The programs reduce the number of cars on campus, which affects capital expenditures for parking lots and structures. Also, every project is accompanied by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation, which usually has mitigations attached, many of which involve city and county roads affected by the projects. Through transportation demand management, the campuses have been able to reduce the number of improvements that might have been necessitated by increased traffic, thereby realizing cost savings.

Mr. Bocchicchio reported that there is now a LEED category for existing buildings. The University has had three buildings certified under this program, including the Office of the President. Four campuses have submitted buildings for certification. The Santa Barbara campus plans to seek certification for 25 buildings in the next five years; the Merced campus will submit all its buildings.

Concerning waste reduction, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that, in 2007, UC Davis opened a zero-waste, multi-use stadium. Everything sold in it can be recycled or composted. All campuses increased diversion rates during the last year, several exceeding the 50 percent target.

With respect to sustainable purchasing, which Mr. Bocchicchio noted was added to the policy recently and requires vendors to track sustainable product purchases, greater than 10 percent of the tracked purchases are for green products, which represents an increase

of 3 percent over the previous year. There were offerings in 24 categories of products, an increase from 17 the previous year. All office equipment must be Energy Star or equivalent rated.

Mr. Bocchicchio commented on student-faculty-staff cooperation, which he believed accounted for the rapid advances in the University's sustainability programs. The University community is enthusiastic about continuing to make significant progress with respect to sustainability. He reported that the UC campuses joined other colleges and universities in January 2008 to organize Focus the Nation, a ground-breaking, national teach-in on global warming. The gathering included chancellors, Nobel Laureates, elected officials, and students, staff, and community members from all UC campuses. Another program, Green Business Certification, recognizes entities for not only complying with codes and regulations but for implementing best practices to reduce waste, conserve energy, and ensure workers' safety and health. Students and staff at UC Santa Cruz have worked to secure these certifications for eight of the eleven campus dining facilities. In another example, campus living laboratories provide students with hands-on, service-learning opportunities. At UC San Diego, a program called Decision Making Using Real-Time Observations for Environmental Sustainability represents a living laboratory concept. Students and professors from the Jacobs School of Engineering and the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology are installing a network of temperature, rain, humidity, wind speed, and other sensors that will help the campus maximize natural cooling and solar power potential. Another example is the Berkeley campus' program in which students administer energy, water, and waste audits and building occupant surveys and use the resulting information to create sustainability action plans for individual campus buildings.

The final component is external recognition. Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the University's accelerated sustainability program has produced significant results, garnering it national recognition. The University won 20 sustainability awards in 2008, including the State's highest environmental honor, the Governor's Environmental and Economic Leadership Award, for the transportation demand management program at UC Irvine.

As a final note, Mr. Bocchicchio reported that the *Princeton Review* conducted a survey in 2008 of graduating high school seniors which revealed that 63 percent of them believed that a university's level of campus sustainability would influence their choice of college. This surprising statistic underscores the importance of the University's advances in sustainability.

Regent Scorza applauded the efforts of those in the Office of the President and the student leadership on all campuses. He noted that UC Merced anticipates becoming the first green campus in the nation. He asked about reporting mechanisms for food systems. Mr. Bocchicchio, recalling that the Committee had strongly recommended the inclusion of more detailed direction on food systems in the President's policy, reported that an update to that effect is being prepared for submission to the President.

In response to a further question asked by Regent Scorza, Mr. Bocchicchio reported on the progress of campus climate action plans. He indicated that one campus is finalizing its plan but that all others have been submitted.

Regent Scorza recalled that the systemwide sustainability committee meets yearly and asked how it tracks progress and provides follow-up. Mr. Bocchicchio responded that, although Office of the President staff monitor projects on the campuses, the primary vehicle for reporting is the collection of data at the Office of the President to be presented to the Committee annually.

Regent Scorza commented on the amount of work that has been devoted to increasing the University's sustainability programs. He asked whether these efforts have been significantly beneficial to the University financially and whether a push to continue them is warranted. Mr. Bocchicchio explained that some sustainability efforts are beneficial in the short term, many others produce savings in the longer term, and there are some that are integral to the building design and can be achieved without adding to the budget of the project.

In response to a question asked by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Bocchicchio commented that UCLA will benefit from grant money provided by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power in a program similar to Savings by Design. Negotiations continue with Sacramento and Riverside municipal utility districts to take part in their energy efficiency programs.

Regent Reiss observed that the University's efforts with respect to sustainability are commendable. UC has more representatives on the International Panel on Climate Change than any other institution. It has taken on an important leadership role in such efforts as developing and using renewable energy and creating transportation systems with less potential to pollute the environment. She noted that many banks and finance companies are entering the field and are ready to provide funding for retrofits to older buildings with a view toward saving energy. This development may allow the University to retrofit more buildings without incurring increased costs.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 18-19, 2008 were approved.

4. ADOPTION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, MISSION BAY NEUROSCIENCES LABORATORY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH BUILDING (19A), SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS

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

- A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. Adopt the Findings and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- C. Approve the design of the Mission Bay Neurosciences Laboratory and Clinical Research Building (19A), San Francisco campus.

[Background material, including the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Schilling reported that the item requested adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and design approval for the construction of the Mission Bay Neurosciences Laboratory, a clinical research building for the San Francisco campus. Each member of the Committee had been provided with environmental documents prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act which analyzed the impact of the proposed action, and with copies of all public comments received and responses prepared by the University. The members of the Committee had reviewed and considered the information contained in the environmental documents, including all comments received in writing or presented to the Committee to date.

Senior Vice Chancellor Spaulding introduced Campus Architect Yamauchi, who reported that the project is to be constructed through a public-private partnership. The developer will lease the footprint from the University, build, own, and operate the building, and lease the building back to the University under a long-term space lease. The Regents have endorsed this alternative delivery method generally, and specifically for this project.

Ms. Yamauchi noted that the building is located in Block 19A, which is in the center of the campus and completes the northern edge of the quadrangle. The site is bounded by the major pedestrian spine to the campus and the campus' main servicing street and is adjacent to Rock Hall, which contains related research programs. The design was developed consistent with the Mission Bay Master Plan and the planning principles of collegiality and connectivity. The site is located at a key juncture where cross-campus pathways meet. The building's ground floor contains clinical research space, shared common space, and mechanical service space. The architects have related the building design to the other buildings on the Mission Bay campus by relating to their color, material, massing, and five-story horizontality. High-performance glazing will control solar gain and reduce energy consumption. In keeping with the Master Plan, buildings and columns at the ground floor are recessed to create a greater sense of openness. The base along the façade is defined by pre-cast panels, and the middle is defined by buff-colored horizontal bands that echo the palette of the other research buildings. The west façade is broken up by recessing the plane of the entrance to the clinics.

Ms. Yamauchi noted that the design will incorporate a number of sustainable features and achieve LEED Silver certification, at the minimum. Details of the sustainable design

features are being determined as the architects complete the schematic design. Of note is the use of natural ventilation in an atrium lobby. In addition, the architects are striving to improve the performance of the building further and reduce consumption of natural resources, which will reduce operating costs.

Regent Hopkinson observed that the view from the southwest is very compatible with the adjoining buildings and consistent in color, form, and material. She expressed concern about the view from the south. Ms. Yamauchi responded that, by the use of glazing and metal, the architects attempted to relate this building to Byers Hall and Rock Hall, although the interpretation differs because of the building's relationship to the quadrangle. The plan relates more closely to that of the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences building (QB3), which is diagonally across the quadrangle. Mr. Spaulding noted that the glazing approach used for QB3 has been successful and popular with surrounding neighbors. He reported that this building provides a new model in terms of cost savings. Costs for the exterior treatment have been a major consideration. Regent Hopkinson expressed her view that changes should be made to that side of the new building to make it more attractive and contemporary.

Regent Johnson believed that the building complements the campus and that it represents a significant next step in global health.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, with Regent Hopkinson abstaining.

5. **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. *Amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program and Approval of External Financing, Student Athlete High Performance Center, Berkeley Campus*

The President recommended that:

- (1) The 2008-09 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Berkeley: Student Athlete High Performance Center – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$117,448,000, to be funded from gift funds (\$17,448,000) and external financing (\$100,000,000).

To: Berkeley: Student Athlete High Performance Center – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$153,000,000, to be funded from gift funds (\$17,000,000) and external financing (\$136,000,000).

Deletions shown by ~~strikeout~~; additions by underscore

- (2) The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed ~~\$100~~ \$136 million to finance the Student Athlete High Performance Center (SAHPC) project. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. As long as the debt is outstanding, Berkeley campus football program gross revenues ~~and the income earned on the SAHPC Initiative Funds~~, shall be maintained in amounts to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. Among all the uses of Berkeley campus football gross revenues, debt service will be the priority.
 - d. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.

- (3) The President be authorized to obtain standby financing not to exceed ~~\$6,248,000~~ \$10.9 million, prior to awarding a construction contract for any gift funds not received by that time and subject to the following conditions:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. Repayment of any debt shall be from Berkeley campus football program gross revenues, and as long as the debt is outstanding, Berkeley campus football program gross revenues shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.

- (4) The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

B. *Amendment of the Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program and Approval of External Financing, Biomedical and Health Sciences Building, Berkeley Campus*

The President recommended that:

- (1) The 2008-09 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Berkeley: Biomedical and Health Sciences Building – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – \$266,153,000, to be funded from gifts (\$108,716,500), State funds (\$52,700,000), California Institute for Regenerative Medicine grant funds (\$20,183,500), campus funds (\$1,000,000), and external financing (\$83,553,000).

To: Berkeley: Biomedical and Health Sciences Building – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – \$266,953,000, to be funded from gifts (\$104,807,500), State funds (\$52,700,000), California Institute for Regenerative Medicine grant funds (\$17,602,500), campus funds (\$1,000,000), and external financing (\$90,843,000).

Deletions shown by ~~strikeout~~; additions by underscore

- (2) The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed \$83,553,000 to finance the Biomedical and Health Sciences project. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. As long as the debt is outstanding, the Berkeley campus’ share of the University Opportunity Fund and University Education fund shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (3) The President be authorized to obtain external financing, not to exceed \$7,290,000 to finance the Biomedical and Health Sciences project. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. As long as the debt is outstanding, the Berkeley campus’ share of the unrestricted earnings of the Short Term Investment Pool shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (4) The President be authorized to obtain standby financing not to exceed \$49,429,000 and interim financing not to exceed \$39,807,500 prior to

awarding a construction contract for any gift funds not received by that time and subject to the following conditions:

- a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. Repayment of any debt shall be from gift funds. If gift funds are insufficient, and some or all of the debt remains outstanding, then the Berkeley campus' share of the ~~University Opportunity Fund~~ Short Term Investment Pool shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (5) The Officers of The Regents be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

C. *Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Approval of Design, Health Sciences Graduate and Professional Housing Project, San Diego Campus*

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

- (1) Certify the Environmental Impact Report.
- (2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- (3) Approve the design of the Health Sciences Graduate and Professional Housing Project, San Diego campus.

Committee Chair Schilling announced that for this item, which proposed a design approval, the Committee members were provided with environmental documentation analyzing the impact of the proposed project, as well as copies of all public comments received and responses prepared by the University, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. She confirmed that the members of the Committee had reviewed and considered that information and had balanced the benefits of the project against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

[Background materials for items on the Consent Agenda, including the Environmental Impact Report, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for item C, were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

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

6. CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, NAVAL ARCHITECTURE BUILDING RESTORATION AND ADDITION PROJECT, BERKELEY CAMPUS

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as described in the Addendum to the 2020 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR), the Committee recommend that the Regents:

- A. Adopt the Findings.
- B. Approve the design of the Naval Architecture Building Restoration and Addition, Berkeley campus.

[Background material, including the Findings, was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Schilling announced that this item requested approval of the design of the Naval Architecture Building Restoration and Addition Project on the Berkeley campus, which is a component of development in Berkeley’s Long Range Development Plan. Each member of the Committee had been provided with the EIR certified by the Regents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, in November 2005, which analyzes the environmental impacts of the LRDP and Addendum to the EIR prepared by the campus to address the specific impacts of the project in relation to the LRDP. The members of the Committee had reviewed and considered the information contained in the environmental documents, including all comments received in writing or presented to the Committee to date.

Vice Chancellor Denton observed that the Naval Architecture Building Restoration and Addition is a project based on a gift-in-kind approach. The University will grant a ground lease to a donor, who will provide the design and construction team. Upon completion, the project will be gifted to the campus. The process follows University policies and procedures. The site is on Hearst Avenue, adjacent to North Gate Hall and the Engineering quadrant of the campus. The building was designed by John Galen Howard in 1914, in what is considered Bay Area Shingle Style. It is on the National Register of Historic Places, mandating sensitivity with respect to any renovations, and adherence to Department of the Interior criteria. The existing three-story building is 11,000 gross square feet. It is rated seismically “poor” and is inaccessible to the disabled.

Mr. Denton noted that the campus wishes to restore the Naval Architecture Building and create a home for the Blum Center for Developing Economies and the Department of Systems Innovation in Engineering, and knit together a number of shingled buildings in the area. Besides seismic upgrades, the project will include a 13,000 gross square foot addition which will have a new basement and a new wing of 8,100 square feet, and a

podium to connect the two buildings. An exterior plaza will be created. The location will be the terminus of a major circulation element into the Engineering quadrant that will be on axis to the Campanile. LEED Silver certification is planned. He showed slides to illustrate that the Naval Architecture Building addition is not aligned with the original building, so as not to detract from the original building's significance. Materials for the new wing include cedar, which blends but also provides new elements. The first floor will house a student collaboration space that will be a significant element and should result in creating a popular gathering area. A bridge will connect to the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS) Building, and stairs under this walkway will lead to Hearst Avenue. Exterior siding and the roof of the addition will be consistent with the Naval Architecture Building. While the window system is different, the proportions of the windows within the wall will be similar to those of the original building and North Gate Hall. The landscape plan recognizes that the donor has made a commitment to landscape the entire area. Building materials are asphalt shingles, aluminum sunshades, insulated glazing units with aluminum framing, and cedar panels that will age consistently with the new shingles on the Naval Architecture Building. Its cementitious base is consistent with that of the CITRIS Building. The project has an efficiency rating of 68 percent and a cost per square foot of \$669, for a total project cost of approximately \$16 million.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the renovation and new building were lovely and well integrated and the landscape was attractive. She believed that detailed financial budget information should have been provided. She asked about the procedure to establish a short-term lease to the donor, and for assurance that the building design is the University's and is approved by the Committee in a process that is well articulated. Mr. Denton responded that the project is delivered with a memorandum of understanding between the University and the donor. Ultimately, the memorandum is signed by the President. The project is designed by an architect hired by the donor and built by a contractor hired by the donor, but they must follow all University processes and procedures. The University provided the design guides used by the architect. The design was approved by the University's Design Review Committee and the Campus Architect. The donor assumes the risk if the project comes in over budget, as stated in the memorandum of understanding, which also includes a time frame in which the development must be completed and turned over to the University. The memorandum stipulates the processes that must be followed for design approval, which is the action sought today from the Committee. Regent Hopkinson restated that all pertinent information should have been provided to the Committee.

Regent Johnson asked about the short-term ground lease with the donor. Mr. Denton responded that the donor has asked that the ground lease be for the period of construction plus two years. He will be using that period not only to ensure that the building is complete but also to interest another donor in the project.

Regent Kozberg believed that the project will enhance the entire quadrant. She was satisfied that the Committee received the necessary information about the project.

Mr. Denton assured her that the full budget breakdown would be submitted to the Committee in the future.

Regent Hopkinson asked whether there were a precedent for the methodology. Mr. Denton informed her that 12 or 13 similar projects have been carried out at UCLA. The Berkeley campus has undertaken one such project. He noted that the memorandum of understanding was drawn up in collaboration with the Office of General Counsel.

President Yudof noted that there are risks attached to the proposal. General Counsel Robinson assured him that the project had been reviewed by his office and indicated that he would undertake a further review.

President Yudof commented that it may be preferable to make the memorandum of understanding subject to Board approval, unless that would delay the project. Mr. Denton explained that the donor hopes to start early utility work in March. Committee Chair Schilling suggested approving the proposed action in anticipation that the cost breakdown will be provided to the Committee.

Regent Hopkinson offered an amended motion, as shown below, to adopt the Findings and approve the design, subject to the memorandum of understanding's being approved by interim authority of the Chairs of the Committees on Finance and Grounds and Buildings, as well as by the President.

Upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as described in the Addendum to the 2020 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (LRDP EIR), the Committee recommends:

- A. Adoption of the Findings, and
- B. Approval of the design of the Naval Architecture Building Restoration and Addition, Berkeley campus.
- C. Paragraphs A. and B. are contingent upon approval by the Chairs of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, prior to execution, of a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the donor, with the donor's project budget attached thereto.

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

7. APPROVAL OF DESIGN, LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT DAVIS CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as evaluated in the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Addendum #1 thereto, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the California Environmental Quality Act Findings.
- B. Approve the design of the Los Rios Community College District Davis Center Building, Davis campus.

[Background material, including the Findings, was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Schilling announced that the item requested design approval for the Los Rios Community College District Davis Center at the Davis campus, which is a component of the UC Davis Master Plan and the more specific West Village Implementation Plan. The Regents approved the Neighborhood Master Plan in November 2003 and the West Village Implementation Plan in November 2006, based on an EIR and an Addendum thereto, respectively. Each member of the Committee had been provided with the previously certified EIR and Addendum to the EIR and with Findings prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which analyzed the impacts of the proposed project in relation to the EIR and its Addendum. The members of the Committee had reviewed and considered the information contained in the environmental documents, including all comments received in writing or presented to the Committee to date, and had balanced specific benefits of the project against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

Chancellor Vanderhoef commented that the item represents the partnership that has developed between the Davis campus and the community college district. The project builds on a base that is important for UC Davis. The facility was approved by a district bond and is aimed particularly at enhancing the community college-UC transfer rate.

Chancellor Vanderhoef introduced Mr. Brice Harris, Chancellor of the Los Rios Community College District, who commented that the partnership between Sacramento City College, Los Rios Community College, and UC Davis goes back more than 20 years. He expressed the hope that, by the time the new center opens, combined enrollment of campus sites will have exceeded 5,000 students.

Campus Architect Halliday showed slides to illustrate the design. The building, which is scheduled to open in 2011, is expected to achieve a LEED Silver rating. At the heart of the West Campus development is the Village Square, which consists of mixed-use buildings surrounding an open green space. The Center will serve as an educational anchor for the square. The L-shaped configuration of the building helps develop an urban design character for the area by providing façades on both the north and east edges of the site. The east-west orientation of the building helps minimize solar heat gain from the west while maximizing opportunities for daylight to reach the classroom areas and interior spaces of the building. The parking lot will accommodate 180 vehicles. The site is master-planned for two future buildings.

The structure will have two stories, with exterior materials consisting of cement plaster, metal-panel soffit siding, and wood beams. The shed roofs highlight the main entrance. The façades are articulated by horizontal bands of warm-colored plaster, metal siding, and sunshade devices. The sides of the buildings seen from the road to the West Village have been articulated by the use of bands of cement plaster and metal-panel siding.

Regent Hopkinson was supportive of the environment being created in that area of the campus. Regent Kozberg added that, during his term, Chancellor Vanderhoef had overseen a beautiful transformation of the Davis campus.

Regent Ruiz asked how to quantify the benefits of the program. Los Rios Community College Chancellor Harris informed him that the synergy created by such a program will have myriad benefits. The facility will enhance the college's identity and increase the chances that its students will wish to transfer to the Davis campus, as the community college students will feel connected to the campus. In addition, both institutions will benefit financially. A local bond measure will fund this project and four others in the Sacramento region. The University's support of the project through its help with the infrastructure and the property makes it beneficial for the citizens and taxpayers of the region as well as for both educational institutions. Chancellor Vanderhoef believed that the community college students who attend school in the midst of UC students will gain the confidence necessary to transfer to the University. He noted that there may be instances when the two campuses can share the facility.

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

8. **APPROVAL OF DESIGN, BREWERY, WINERY, AND FOOD PILOT FACILITIES, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Brewery, Winery, and Food Pilot Facilities project, as indicated in the Findings, the Committee:

- A. Adopt the California Environmental Quality Act Findings.
- B. Approve the design of the Brewery, Winery, and Food Pilot Laboratory, Davis campus.

[Background material, including the Findings, was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Schilling announced that this was an action item requesting design approval for the Brewery, Winery, and Food Pilot Facilities project, Davis campus, which is a component of the Robert Mondavi Institute, for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Regents in November 2003. Each member of the Committee had been provided with the previously certified EIR and with Findings

prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which analyzed the impacts of the proposed project in relation to the EIR. The members of the Committee had reviewed and considered the information contained in the environmental documents, including all comments received in writing or presented to the Committee to date, and had balanced the specific benefits of the project against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

Chancellor Vanderhoef recalled that the Davis campus has supported the state's wine industry since 1938. It also has a long-standing program in the brewing sciences. These programs, in addition to those that research food processing, are housed in some of the most antiquated facilities on the campus. The gift-supported Brewery, Winery, and Food Pilot Laboratory will provide production facilities worthy of the academic programs. The winery and food pilot programs will be located immediately adjacent to the newly opened Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science.

Campus Architect Halliday commented that this building and the new vineyard will complete the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science. He showed slides to illustrate the design. The ratio of assignable square feet to gross square feet is 78 percent and the design is cost effective, at \$384 per gross square foot. The project is being delivered using the design-build contracting method. Three teams were pre-qualified, which in turn competed for the project, submitting full schematic design proposals. The winning proposal from BNB Norcal of San Mateo and Flad Architects of San Francisco was chosen through a best value selection process.

Mr. Halliday reported that the baseline target for the project had been LEED Gold. A continuing gift campaign has raised additional funds for sustainability measures, resulting in the likelihood that LEED Platinum will be achieved for the building. The project is located in the south campus district and is integrated with the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science. A new 14-acre vineyard will create a new entry to the campus. Some site planning goals for the project include completing a central courtyard space and strengthening the alignment of the courtyard and the views toward the vineyard to connect pedestrian paths to the heart of the campus. Future expansion is envisioned south and west of the project.

The building is a single-story structure that includes a winery, fermentation area, brewery spaces, and a food processing area. The main entry is oriented toward the campus. A main program goal was to allow public and industry tours of the project while not having any adverse impact on ongoing research and teaching. Glass partitions allow a view into the fermentation room and the brewery. The building is nearly all program space.

Mr. Halliday showed slides of the recently completed Mondavi Institute to provide architectural context. The new building will frame the courtyard space. The exterior materials of the Institute consist of cement plaster, clear glass curtain walls, metal wall panels, metal roofing, and wood trellises. The goals for the new project's architecture were to match the character, colors, and materials of the Institute and to create an integrated complex opening onto the vineyard.

Regent Hopkinson commented that, although the building must have been difficult to design, it has been integrated beautifully with the Institute.

Regent Ruiz cited the need for research and education in food science, a huge industry in California.

Regent Johnson stated that the new building complements the entry to the campus. She asked about a stated connection to Anheuser-Busch. Mr. Halliday recalled that the corporation was one of the main donors to the project for the design and construction costs. The project is totally gift-funded.

In response to a question asked by Regent Kozberg, Mr. Halliday reported that this is UC Davis' second performance-based, design-build project. The first was the Graduate School of Management and Conference Center.

Regent Scorza asked about the economic impact on the region. Chancellor Vanderhoef believed that the project will provide not only a positive economic impact but also a positive visual impact. The Davis campus has been a major player in the wine industry, and this project will complete a complex that will emphasize the campus' connection to that industry.

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

9. **ADOPTION OF FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, SOUTH CAMPUS STUDENT CENTER, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

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

- A. Determine the South Campus Student Center project to be Categorical Exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act and adopt the Findings.
- B. Approve the design of the South Campus Student Center, Los Angeles campus.

[Background material, including the Findings, was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Schilling stated that each member of the Committee had been provided with Findings for the project prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which analyzed the impacts of the project and concluded that it is exempt from CEQA and will not have a significant impact on the environment. The members of the Committee had reviewed and considered the information contained in the Findings.

Vice Chancellor Olsen commented that the project plays an important role in campus life at UCLA. The South Campus Student Center will replace an obsolete food service facility on the Court of Sciences. UCLA has made large investments in the development of buildings on the perimeter of the Court of Sciences during the past several years.

Campus Architect Averill presented slides and a video of the project. He reported that the project will strengthen and unify the Court of Sciences as a space. It includes a conceptual landscape plan for the entire court. Building materials include brick and buff concrete. The kitchen and dining areas feature green roofs. A grade change between the north and south sides necessitates the addition of stairs for access to a garden and dining area. The project is expected to be certified LEED Silver, based on, among other things, its natural ventilation, the use of recycled brick, and the use of native plants that need minimal water. The project is categorically exempt with respect to CEQA and is consistent with the campus' Long Range Development Plan.

Regent Kozberg noted the use of jacaranda trees for landscaping. She observed that these trees, while beautiful, drop blossoms that can make pedestrian walkways slippery. Mr. Averill responded that alternate species are being considered.

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

10. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF DESIGN, NORTH CAMPUS HOUSING PHASE 2, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice Chancellor Matthews, along with Campus Architect Hellmann, presented a preliminary review of additional student housing in the north campus. Mr. Matthews recalled that the North Campus Housing Phase 2 was planned to house 750 upper division students and provide two apartments for staff. As a result of the design-build competition, it will accommodate 807 upper division students in 147 four-, five-, and six-bed apartments, and a small dining facility. EIR certification and design approval will be sought at the March 2009 meeting.

Campus Architect Hellmann reported that, besides housing, the 266-gross-square-foot project will include a marketplace store, a bistro café, conference and meeting rooms, and laundry facilities. The design-build teams submitted their plans based on a fixed budget. The winning team was Clark Design/Build of California. The project is located in the north portion of the campus and is in compliance with the 2004 Long Range Development Plan, which sets that area aside for housing, and with the 1989 UCSD Master Plan with respect to the physical development of that part of the campus.

Mr. Hellman showed slides to illustrate the location and design of the project, which is compliant also with the campus' north campus neighborhood planning study, which

issues design guides. The building's east-west orientation offers opportunities for sustainability. The landscape plan includes residential courtyards and outdoor gardens that will help to break up the space. The building consists of a tower, which houses the larger units, and flats. The colors employed for building materials complement the earth tones found in the nearby School of Management as well as the first-phase north campus housing. The project is expected to achieve LEED Silver certification but may have the potential to reach Gold status.

Regent Hopkinson remarked on the large size of the project and expressed concern that the building colors are monochromatic and imposing. She suggested using warmer colors.

In response to a question asked by Regent Reiss, Mr. Hellmann reported that the roofs are planned to house solar panels.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff