Campus Planning Committee  
September 29, 2009 2:00-4:00 p.m.  
MRL 2053

Members Present: Todd Lee, Marc Fisher, Joel Michaelsen, Gene Lucas, Gary Greinke, Richard Watts, Michael Witherell, Vickie Scott, Reginald Archer, Michael Young, David Marshall, Jane Mulfinger, Gerardo Aldana, Ron Cortez, Margaret McMurtrey  
Members Absent: Charlie Arreola, Larry Coldren  
Alternates Present: Chris LaVino

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS  
Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee announced the CPC meetings will be held in MRL 2053 for the remainder of the 2009-10 academic year. All members proceeded to introduce themselves.

II. MINUTES  
The minutes from July 28th were approved as written.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Ten-Year Plan – State Program  
Director Martie Levy began her presentation by describing it as part of a series of presentations on the Ten-year Capital and Financial Plan. Background: the Regents retained the services of the Monitor Group to do an organizational analysis of the President’s Office to identify cost savings. The capital program was identified as one of the main areas to improve. The Monitor Group recommended that The Regents should focus on policy and the “big picture” and provide the campuses with more authority to implement it’s capital program. The Office of the President should provide oversight to the campuses and ensure that campus projects are consistent with plans and policies approved by The Regents.. Pilot Program: each campus will be required to present to the Regents three documents: 1) Long Range Developments Plan, 2) Ten year Capital and Financial Plan and 3) Physical Plan. The Building and Grounds Committee and the Regents will need to approve all three plans before a campus can become part of the pilot program. Once approved, the Regents will delegate to the Chancellor authority to approve capital projects up to $60 million. So far, three campuses have all three documents approved. All campuses are required to prepare these documents. The LRDP must be approved by The Regents before the Ten-Year Plan and Physical Plan can be presented.

Since the Regents adopted the recommendations of The Monitor Group, Director Levy announced that the planning environment has shifted dramatically. She then reviewed the impact of the economy on capital planning, including the significant changes in enrollment. UC is reducing enrollment to 2007-08 level (22,000 FTE for UCSB). This will hold steady through 2015-16. with growth resuming at 1% per year through 2020. By 2018-19 we will not have caught up to where we are projected to be this year which is approximately 20,600 3-quarter headcount. For 2018-19 currently we are estimating that we will have slightly below 20,000 3-quarter headcount students and for faculty 1,168.4 FTE. Faculty will still grow during the period because from a budget point of view we have not received new faculty FTE since 2007-08.

Ms. Levy the reviewed the projected campus space (~600,000 ASF) need based on the new enrollment and faculty FTE projections. She also reviewed how the campus Instruction and Research space need looks using State CPEC standards, Based on CPEC standards the campus will be at or above estimated allowable space standards for I&R space.
Current capital needs: The campus is experiencing continuing growth especially with new research initiatives. The largest need currently is in building renewal and deferred maintenance. Most of the UC campuses are in the same position. Affordable housing for faculty and staff is still a major priority. State funding: Director Levy presented a list of projects eligible for State funding. In italics are the projects that came out of the EVC Lucas’s request to the control points for space needs. Total need is estimated to be over $880 million. Cost per square foot numbers for these projects have been derived from discussions with Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher and Director Jack Wolever in conjunction with data from other campuses with approved Ten-Year Plans.

Director Levy presented two alternative models for State funded projects on the campus Ten-Year Plan. The basis for the project list is projects on our campus Five-Year Plan that have already received some level of funding. Alternative 1 and 2 has several projects (Ellison, South Hall, HSSB) combined into one general title Campus Buildings Renewal for $33 million. By combining their funding and giving a general title, this provides the campus more flexibility with renewal money in the future. Alternative 1 has kept the Music building and the Physics/Engineering building at the $35 million level to keep consistent with our current Five-Year Plan and maximizes the number of building renewals, such as Engineering I and Broida Hall. Alternative 2 shows more realistic budget numbers for the Music and Physics/engineering buildings bumped up to $62 million each. Realistically, using the cost per square foot numbers, the physics/engineering building will probably be more like $125 million in total. Alternative 1 as a strategy is saying, the campus doesn’t know what the future will be like, so the goal is to maximize the amount of projects on the plan in terms of need. Alternative 2 as a strategy is saying, plan for the amount of money that you need upfront and get it on the plan. Ultimately, the Committee needs to make a recommendation on what will be the Ten-Year State-funded program be and what types of projects are on the plan. However the campus will be able to update the State-funded Five-Year Plan every year.

The Committee discussed the alternatives and members were asked to review the presentation with their constituents. The Non-State funded portion of the Ten Tear Capital and Financial Plan will be presented at the October meeting.

IV. INFORMATION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

A. Status Report: Special Projects Subcommittee
No report.

B. Status Report: Design Review Committee
No report.

C. Status Report: Faculty & Staff Housing
Director Levy reminded the Committee that the campus will go forward with the first phase of the North Campus Faculty Housing Project (22 units) using construction financing through Office of the President. All financing models were very favorable to the campus. Construction bids will go out next week.

D. Status Report: Student Housing
Richard Watts explained that the student housing committee is reviewing capital needs, including seismic and life and safety.

**E. Long Range Development Plan- vision 2025**
Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas reported that the campus has restarted conversations with the City of Goleta and the County. The tone of the conversations has changed with the County expressing their recognition of the importance of the University to the economy of the region. The LRDP will be ready to go to the Regents sometime next year.

**F. Status Report: Major Capital Projects**
Attached.

**VI. Correspondence**

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM
Minutes taken by Jasmine Weiss, Office of Budget & Planning