Members Absent: Henning Bohn, Joel Michaelsen, Richard Watts, Gerardo Aldana
Alternates Present: Andrew Elwood, Rolf Christoffersen

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee welcomed new members to the first meeting of the new academic year. He announced that we are ninety days into the new year and still without a state budget. It was reported last week that a framework on the budget had been agreed on, but no details were released. The general feeling is that a budget agreement will be reached soon, maybe even this week. Funding for higher education still has strong support from the Governor, as well as the State Senate and Assembly. Hopefully in October Assistant Chancellor Lee will provide details of an approved budget and provide information on the proposed UC budget for the 2011-12 academic year.

II. MINUTES
The minutes from June 4th were approved as written.

III. ACTION ITEMS
A. Aquatics Center
The Committee, by consensus, recommends that the Chancellor accept the proposed Preliminary Project Proposal and approve design and siting of the Aquatics Center project.

IV DISCUSSION ITEMS
A. Update on LRDP, Ten-Year Capital and Financial Plan and Physical Design Framework Regents Presentations
Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher and Assistant Chancellor Lee gave an overview of their presentations to the Regents on the LRDP, Campus Physical Plan and Ten-Year Capital and Financial Plan. The Regents approved all three plans at the September Regents meeting, which officially gave delegated authority to the Santa Barbara campus. The plans are still contingent on approval from the California Coastal Commission.

Mitigation Agreements with the county and city prior to the meeting were critical for the swift approval of the campus plans. The campus academic plan, approved in 2005, was the basis for the extensive land-use document. The LRDP outlines the campus’s enrollment size, vision statement with core values and set of principles and includes our campus commitment to diversity and fostering a collaborative culture. The campus set
the enrollment plan at 25,000 students over the planning horizon to 2025, growing more at the graduate level. Growth and replacement of staff, housing half of all students on campus and resource management are challenges the campus anticipates facing. Interestingly, the Regents did not think we were growing big enough given the diversity of our campus. The LRDP adds one million, eight hundred thousand ASF to the campus. Sustainability and the protection of open space continue to be important to the campus. Additionally, in this planning horizon 1,800 units of faculty and staff housing will be added to the campus.

It was noted that our planning process was characterized as collaborative and consultative. Our spectacular physical setting sets us apart from sister campuses as open space continues to dominate the campus landscape. The campus has proven to be strong in habitat restoration. The plan makes a commitment to reduce car traffic on campus, by enhancing pedestrian bicycle routes. Overall, our campus engaged in more consultation than any other campus in the system; the campus already has four major agreements and the support of the city and county.

The Campus Physical Plan outlines the campus’s architectural vision based on six planning principles. This plan identifies landscape on the campus as a connective design element. The campus will continue its huge commitment to sustainability by efficiently planning in accordance with the campus climate orientation. Design elements addressed in the plan include color, texture, arcades, skyline, clearly defined entries, courtyards, gardens and paseos. Design and Construction Services has prepared a checklist for the physical design of capital projects to match requirements for the new Business Case Analysis.

The Ten-Year Capital and Financial plan identifies capital projects that will support the academic plan and are consistent with the LRDP and physical design framework. This document will be updated on an annual basis. This plan focuses on housing and renewal projects, even when student growth is slow initially. The campus is heavily concentrating on housing growth through university financing and privatized development. Renovation is a big component of the plan (i.e. seismic and life safety). All buildings that are rated seismically poor will be upgraded in this planning horizon. The majority of expense occurs in the last five years of the plan and is not as clearly defined. Capital projects identified in the first five years total $325 million, of which 67% of required funding has already been approved and should be in place in the next few months. State funding will be used for the Library project and the Garamendi funding mechanism will finance the majority of the Bioengineering project, leaving reserve funding for small student housing projects. Gift funding is a significant part of our funding plan. The campus has raised about $60 million in previous ten-year period and would need to raise $251 million in this next ten years to achieve what the plan has outlined. If funding is not available, then projects will be delayed. In the new Business Case Analysis process, the campus will need to identify operation and maintenance money, as gift funded buildings do not usually have this included. Campus debt will be reduced over this planning horizon from 54% to 38%. Details of the mitigation agreements for the LRDP were also discussed in detail.
The new delegated authority shifts the responsibility for all approval phases of Major Capital Improvements under $60 million from UCOP to the campus. Hopefully, this will be a more streamlined and cost-effective process. Under delegated authority our campus will be approving design, CEQA, financing and the Business Case Analysis for projects under $60 million. In our Business Case Analyses we must review all options for Capital Improvements (i.e. constructing a new building, Renovating existing space, lease of private market space, private/public partnerships or not going forward with the project at all). The process establishes a certification checklist and 15-day period of review. When we are ready to go forward with a project the Chancellor would authorize a memo to UCOP confirming that the project has undergone the Business Case Analysis and has concluded that the capital project is the best option for moving forward. UCOP then will review all items. After 15 days, UCOP would initial that the given project does meet all requirements, allowing the Chancellor to give final approval. This will be required for all capital projects in the future. Interim Director of Capital Development Chuck Haines believes that this will be a straight forward process for our campus because we do not have large volumes of rental space in our area. It was noted on occasion a project could be identified as high interest and would still be asked to go through the traditional Regental review process.

B. Preliminary Project Proposal Ortega Dining Commons Seismic Corrections
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher explained this seismic fix project. The major problem with the Ortega Dining Commons building is that the roof connection is weak with the building walls. The project is slated for next summer and would be complete by the start of fall 2011. The new project cost is $2.163 million. The housing reserve will finance the entire project and will have no impact on student rates.

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 DRC is currently planning series of meetings with emphasis this fall on landscaping.

C. Status Report: Faculty & Staff Housing
Assistant Chancellor Lee reported that the first phase of the North Campus for-sale faculty housing project is under construction. The Chancellor did appoint a new group called the Community Housing Authority that will guide all faculty and staff housing projects in the future. The campus plans to hire an Executive Director for the Community Housing Authority sometime before Thanksgiving. Expected move-in of the 22 units is late spring 2011.

D. Status Report: Student Housing
Assistant Chancellor Lee announced that the Sierra Madre Family Housing project is moving forward. The campus is working with third-party local developer, the Towbes Group. We currently have a site plan, interior plans and exterior elevations and are in
the process of completing an appraisal for a ground lease. The campus is hoping that this could be under construction next summer.

E. 2010 Long Range Development Plan- vision 2025
Reported on above.

F. Status Report: Major Capital Projects
Attached.

VI. Correspondence

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM
Minutes taken by Jasmine Weiss, Office of Budget & Planning