

Campus Planning Committee
October 27, 2009 2:00-4:00 p.m.
MRL 2053

Members Present: Todd Lee, Marc Fisher, Joel Michaelsen, Gary Greinke, Vickie Scott, Reginald Archer, Michael Young, David Marshall, Jane Mulfinger, Ron Cortez, Margaret McMurtrey, Larry Coldren

Members Absent: Charlie Arreola, Michael Witherell, Gerardo Aldana, Richard Watts, Gene Lucas

Alternates Present: Jody Kaufman, Karen Hanson, Josue Aparicio

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Committee members introduced themselves.

II. MINUTES

The minutes from September 29th were approved as written.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Faculty Club Task Force Report

The Chancellor has asked for the Committee's comments by December 1st on the Faculty Club Task Force Report. Dean Bruce Tiffney, Co-Chair of the Task Force, explained the charge and recommendations of the Faculty Club Task Force Committee, which met in the spring and summer of 2009. The group was called together because the Faculty Club is no longer financially sustainable and is in need of major repairs.. Dean Tiffney reported that the Task Force focused both on the services provided to the campus by the Faculty Club and the status of the physical building which is an early work of Charles Moore, a distinguished architect of the 20th century. Dean Tiffney stressed that the faculty club was not intended to last more than 30-years. The Faculty Club has become a major maintenance problem and is slowly falling apart. The pool locker rooms are closed, the roof and walls are leaking and the kitchen does not meet code. The building at some point will close down due to safety issues. An estimated \$3-7 million needs to be invested in the building to fix these various problems. The Task Force has concluded that the Faculty Club does serve a very important purpose as the campus's living room providing fine dining and an ambiance that is necessary for a campus of UCSB's caliber, and is in huge asset when attracting donors. In addition the Faculty Club provides a small number of guest rooms and attractive location for events and meetings.

The first recommendation by the Task Force is that the campus should go forward with a detailed study to investigate the viability of a proposal from Housing and Residential Services, which proposes to incorporate the Faculty Club into Housing, build thirty guest rooms, and finance the renovation of the existing space. The money generated from the guest rooms would allow Housing and Residential Services to pay itself back for the cost of renovation. The conditions of this proposal include that the total cost for renovation could not exceed \$10 million worth of investment and that they would use housing reserves to finance the cost with a conservative twenty-year payback time. This solution retains the Charles Moore Building, the faculty club as a membership entity, and expands the opportunities on campus for guest rooms and public service. The appropriateness of the use of campus Housing reserve money was not something that the Faculty Task Force Committee felt they could determine.

The second recommendation by the Task Force is proposed as an alternative if the first recommendation does not pencil out. The committee recommends further study of the first floor

of the Mosher Alumni House as a possible new site for the faculty club. There are a lot more unanswered questions with this solution. This recommendation was predicated on the future siting of a larger campus hotel on the site of lot 16. The location would provide desirable views of the mountains and better serve campus and community members attending Arts and Lectures events at Campbell Hall. But the space at the Alumni House was not originally designed for a kitchen.

Director Martie Levy, brought to the attention of the committee the results of the Faculty Club survey, which indicated that the highest priority of respondents was the white-tablecloth dining service. Secondly, the survey indicated that on-campus guestrooms are a high priority for the campus. The Housing Reserves issue is a big discussion because there are other uses for the Reserve. The Chancellor is looking for consultation on this issue, with CPC making an action next month. Members should go back and talk about these recommendations with the various groups they represent, particularly with respect to the use of the Housing Reserve. The Ten-Year Plan submitted by Housing to the Office of the President does not have this project on it. Therefore, it was noted that other projects will have to be taken off the plan or delayed to make room for the Faculty Club project.

B. Ten-Year Plan Non-State Program

Assistant Director Chuck Klein presented to the Committee on the Non-State project component of the Ten-Year Capital and Financial Plan following a review of planning assumptions, including enrollment and projected space needs. Director Levy discussed the format of the entire Plan and schedule.

Assistant Director Klein showed a ten-year history of projects. The campus has spent \$600 million on the non-state capital program in the last ten years. The Committee was handed a list of projects generated from responses from control points to the EVC Lucas's call letter. Some needs were collapsed into single projects. Over the next couple months the committee should be addressing criteria for prioritization because, it is clear that not all of these projects will go forward in the next ten-years. In projecting cost, the housing numbers came from housing. Cost projections are made in today's dollar amounts. These numbers were arrived at from looking at UC Davis's plan, looking at the campus's history, and in meeting with Executive Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher and Director Jack Wolever.

There is no parking structure currently included in the plan due to no increased in enrollment. But, there could be a need for replacement parking if a building replaces a parking lot. Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher stated he intended to have his staff examine the need for a structure based on geographic parking shortfalls, as well as meeting parking needs through alternative transportation. Some building renewal projects are listed as unmet needs in the State program, although we could incorporate these projects into the Non-State program if outside funding can be identified. Third Party or privatized projects are also included on the plan. We have included Sierra Madre and the North Campus Faculty Housing phase II into this category. The committee discussed the possibility of having a third party projects for an academic or student building. Over the next few months, the Committee needs to identify prioritization for the campus. The final plan needs to be flexible to allow for new opportunities in the future. Mr. Klein then reviewed potential Criteria for selection of projects to include in the Ten Year Plan. At the December 1st meeting, Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee will present a Financial Analysis of the Ten Tear Plan.

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

No report.

D. Status Report: Student Housing

No report.

E. Long Range Development Plan- vision 2025

No. report.

F. Status Report: Major Capital Projects

Attached.

VI. Correspondence

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM

Minutes taken by Jasmine Weiss, Office of Budget & Planning