Campus Planning Committee  
February 23, 2010 2:00-4:00 p.m.  
Phelps 2536

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

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee announced that the Davidson Library Addition and Renewal Project may be included in the Governor’s May revise for Lease Revenue Bond funding. The allocation would cover all funding including equipment.

II. MINUTES
The minutes from February 5th were approved as written.

III. ACTION ITEMS

IV DISCUSSION ITEMS
A. Five-Year State Funded Program
Director Martie Levy explained that in the next few months the campus will need to put forward its proposed projects for Lease Revenue Bond funding for 2011-12. The Library project will be added to this list if the Legislature does not approve Lease Revenue Bond funding for 2010/11 as proposed by the Governor. Director Levy explained the worksheet she prepared and handed out to the Committee, which outlines the campus’s major capital needs eligible for State-Funding. Infrastructure projects do not meet the criteria for Lease Revenue Bonds because there is no collateral to put up. In order for the campus to put forward a project, we need to have already have hired an architect and have already done a Detailed Project Plan (DPP) with consultants to arrive at a realistic cost estimate. Director Levy has started categorizing this project list in terms of building type (ie. new building vs. code/renewal/addition) and sense of urgency (i.e surge space, donor funding, grants, etc.). The campus’s infrastructure projects fall into high urgency category, but they do not quality for Lease Revenue Bond funding. The campus has decided to proceed with Infrastructure projects as far as we can with auxiliary funding and then wait for available State funds in the future.

The Bioengineering Project has been categorized as high urgency because it has a large component of non-state money. It requires additional funding as the building program has expanded to include a new vivarium to meet a critical need on the campus. The Bioengineering Project would be a new project added to the State Five-Year Plan. Associate Dean Frank Doyle presented a summery overview of the project to the Committee to inform new members about the project. He explained the vision for the building, siting, program and vivarium details included in the project. Vice Chancellor Micheal Witherall reiterated the critical need for a new vivarium on campus. Director Levy said within the last year or two the poor physical conditions of vivarium has become a crisis requiring significant investment of funds for repair and replacement of outdated infrastructure. There has been a study done about alternate options for the vivarium including expanding in its current location, Biological Science II. An outside veterinarian consultant hired for the study has concluded that the best and most logical option for expanded vivarium space is to start from scratch and do so in the basement of a new building.
Director Levy explained using the analysis presented on the hand-out, the campus has several projects that are ready to put forward for Lease Revenue Bond funding, particularly the Bioengineering Building and Davidson Library projects. In response to a question, Director Levy explained what is involved in preparing a Detailed Project Program (DPP). Her office internally develops a space plan with proponents. An Executive Architect selection is undertaken by Design and Construction Services. The selected architectural firm is retained by Budget and Planning to prepare the DPP. A major goal of the DPP is to understand all the factors that influence cost, such as site related issues, size and scale of the proposed building, complexity of the program. Oftentimes, the campus has one opportunity to develop a budget with State funding. The project might have to live within that budget for years after it has been developed. Not every project has a DPP because it costs the campus roughly $250,000 to $500,000 to complete the such studies.

Director Levy did develop a revised Five-Year Plan which included the Bioengineering Building at $22 million and excludes the Davidson Library project (assuming it receive its full money in the Governor’s budget). If the Bioengineering project does not get Lease Revenue Bond funding the campus has several options: 1) to come up with the $22 million ourselves, 2) shell the basement (at a cost of roughly $5 million), or 3) delay the project for the next General Obligation Bond in 2012. The Bioengineering Project will come back to CPC next meeting for schematic design review.

B. Ten-Year Plan Capital and Financial Plan
Director Levy presented several spreadsheets included in the Ten-Year Plan. In this version, the projects put forward on the plan are based on the 1990 LRDP with enrollment being capped at the 2007-08 numbers. Assistant Chancellor Lee noted that the campus does not know whether it will move forward with the 1990 or the 2025 LRDP. The spreadsheets indicates (by grey shading) which projects would be included if the campus did go forward with the updated LRDP.

C. Ten-Year Physical Plan
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher explained that the campus Physical Plan is still being worked on and needs to go through the Design Review Committee before it is brought to CPC. In his presentation, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher looked back at the 1990 LRDP to show the Committee where the campus is in terms of expansion space and site capacity. There were 40 building sites identified in the 1990. Today we have 14 sites left, leaving 14,000 ASF when you take out the Library and Bioengineering projects. Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher warned the Committee that if we do go forward with 1990 Plan there are site constraints which might lead to difficulties with the Coastal Commission in the future. With Bioengineering and the Library taken out we’ve used 100% of our building footprint sites, but we still have 175,000 of ASF left. The campus has built buildings more recently with bigger footprints and lower densities (examples: Theater and Dance and the Student Resource Building. The 1990 plan has served the campus very well over the twenty-year period. Director Levy explained that how building sites are utilized are influenced: 1) aesthetics, 2) program, and 3) how the money flows (most significant factor). Smaller amounts of money result in smaller buildings. In order to provide needed facilities, the campus must be more diligent about maximizing site capacities in the future if enrollment is increased to 5,000 by 2025. This means that larger increments of funding will be needed in the future.

V. INFORMATION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS
A. Status Report: Special Projects Subcommittee
No report.

B. Status Report: Design Review Committee
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher announced that the Committee will be meeting on March 12th on the Pool and Master Plan project. On April 9th there will be a separate meeting for the Bioengineering Building.

C. Status Report: Faculty & Staff Housing
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher announced that the campus has received bids back on the North Campus project, which are 8% below budget. Karen Rothberg and the Office of Budget and Planning are working on property issues. The Coastal Commission is reviewing the drawings currently. The campus is aiming at May 1st to start construction.

D. Status Report: Student Housing
No report.

E. Long Range Development Plan- vision 2025
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher announced that they are continuing negotiations with the County and the City of Goleta.

F. Status Report: Major Capital Projects
Attached.

VI. Correspondence

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM
Minutes taken by Jasmine Weiss, Office of Budget & Planning