

Campus Planning Committee
January 25, 2010 2:00-4:00 p.m.
Minutes

Members Present: Todd Lee, Marc Fisher, Gene Lucas, Henning Bohn, Nancy Gallagher, Michael Young, David Marshall, Larry Coldren

Members Absent: Gary Greinke, Michael Witherell, Gary Leal, Joel Michaelsen, Diana Dyste Anzures, Paul Monge-Rodriguez, Ron Cortez, Diana Dyste Anzures, Gerardo Aldaña, Richard Watts, Linda Flegal

Alternates Present: Andrew Elwood

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee discussed Governor Brown's proposed budget. A shortfall of \$25.4 billion is projected in the budget consisting of \$8.3 billion in the current year and another \$17.2 billion next year. The Governor plans to deal with the shortfall through a proposed extension of temporary tax increases scheduled to end in June (requiring voter approval), restructuring of services between state and local governments and cuts to nearly every state funded program. The Governor has not proposed mid-year cuts for UC. Unfortunately, he has planned for a \$500 million budget overall cut to UC, of which \$39.6 million is anticipated to be cut to the Santa Barbara campus. Hopefully, this amount will be reduced due to mitigating actions taken by the Regents and the Office of the President. In addition to our campus' share of the Governor's cut, the campus still must deal with a number of unfunded cost issues. These total approximately \$25 million and include increased employer costs associated with pensions, increases to employee health benefit costs, salary increases associated with faculty merits and negotiated increases for represented employees.

II. MINUTES

The minutes from December 7, 2011 could not be approved due to lack of voting members. A vote will take place over email.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Preliminary Project Proposal, Parking Structure 22 Photovoltaic Array

Budget and cost estimates will be updated and return to CPC for Action.

B. Preliminary Project Proposal, San Joaquin Apartments

An action could not be taken due to lack of voting members. A vote will take place over email.

IV DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Preliminary Project Proposal, Institute for Energy Efficiency

Acting Dean Larry Coldren presented the College of Engineering's proposal for a new building, the Institute for Energy Efficiency Building. The Institute for Energy Efficiency (IEE) was launched in 2008 and has rapidly achieved national recognition for its leadership in energy efficiency research and new technologies. The Institute integrates faculty research to initiate and secure support for multi-disciplinary projects and

develops partnerships with industry. The institute has been very successful in securing public grants to date and anticipates attracting large private gifts for a building to house IEE once a fund-raising campaign can be initiated.

The proposed Institute for Energy Efficiency Building would be a zero-net energy building housing dry laboratories, research offices and support space and would serve as the hub for energy research activity on the campus. The project would bring together a diverse faculty currently dispersed in various science and engineering buildings across campus and would house the administrative staffs for both the IEE and the Department of Energy's Center for Energy Efficient Materials (CEEM), as well as other large federal programs. The proposed 30,000 asf building would be located on the existing Parking Lot 11, identified as Site 8 in the new Vision 2025 LRDP. This site is in close proximity to engineering, physics, and chemistry facilities. Project proponents prefer the building to be prominently located on the perimeter of campus, helping to define the campus and attract public awareness to its energy efficient design.

The initial cost estimate for the building is approximately \$40-\$50 million. The latter figure includes numerous energy efficient measures such as solar roof panels and building energy management systems such as zero net energy HVAC and related items. The primary funding mechanism proposed for the project will be private donor contributions.

Based on Acting Dean Coldren's presentation, the Campus Planning Committee will act on site selection, the initiation of a fund-raising campaign, and the progression into a Detailed Project Program when sufficient funds are available. DRC will review the site selection for this project as well.

B. Update on Business Case Analysis Process

Interim Director Chuck Haines reviewed the new business case analysis process required for all new capital projects. The Regents approved a pilot program in 2008 to delegate capital project approval to the Chancellor for projects under \$60 million. In 2010, the Regents requested modifications to the pilot program to include Business Case Analysis (BCA). The BCA develops a thorough examination of non-building solutions and alternatives at the earliest identification of need. Options to meet a particular campus need typically include: the construction of a new building, renovation of existing space, leasing private market space, private/public partnerships (3rd Party) or not moving forward with the project. The BCA also includes an executive summary which summarizes the analysis process; a problem statement describing the drivers, goals, and unmet needs; a Context and Objectives section, describing priorities, opportunities, and the basis of decision making; Alternative Solutions section; and a matrix evaluation of each alternative on basis of program goals, plan consistency and stakeholder, organizational, environmental, governmental, community and schedule issues. Each alternative is given a rating as positive, neutral or negative and a complete financial analysis will be required for each alternative. Finally, a discussion outlining the rationale for the selected alternative will be required.

For projects under the Chancellor's Delegated Authority, the BCA is reviewed and approved by the Chancellor. For projects under Regents' Authority, the BCA is reviewed and approved by the Office of the President. Interim Director Haines noted that the BCA is not required for infrastructure projects and that a full BCA is not required for projects under \$10 million. These smaller projects are reviewed under a simplified "checklist" review. If the simplified review reveals larger issues a full BCA process will be conducted. A PPG will still be required for state funded projects and the Capital Development Office anticipates that PPGs for non-state project will be reduced or even replaced by the BCA. The BCA is intended to happen earlier in a project's development. This formalized process with OP has only recently been established. As with any new method, the BCA will likely develop and change from its initial inception.

C. Update on Ortega Seismic Project

Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Marc Fisher reported that the Ortega Seismic Project is consistent with the prior budget presented to CPC in September; \$1.4M construction, \$2.1M total project cost.

D. Student Fee Referendum Projects

Interim Director Haines initiated a discussion about the importance of CPC reviewing student fee referendum projects that make significant land-use decisions or impact campus debt capacity. The 3rd Floor Renovation of the UGen and the Storke Field Artificial Turf and Lighting projects are student fee referendum projects on the upcoming ballot which have not been adequately vetted through CPC. In 2002 the Graduate Students Association proposed a review of the process by which student fee projects are initiated and approved for the ballot. Generally, student councils decide on the ballot language of projects they wish to pursue in November-December, carry out a petition drive in January and elections and hold elections in April. Due to timing issues, many projects are not reviewed by CPC before they appear on the student ballot. The committee felt that the CPC review process for student projects needs to be timed appropriately with the election process, so items are brought to CPC in October. Vice Chancellor Michael Young expressed that student projects do not suddenly appear, but rather gain support over years. One particular class may bring the project forward, but the project idea is circulated over time, similar to a donor funded project. The committee discussed the possibility of bringing student projects to the committee as an information item and possibly moving forward with a business case analysis for those projects which impact debt or land-use commitments. These issues will be a continued discussion item at next month's meeting.

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 Landscape Committee will

meet on Friday. DRC will have a February meeting to discuss siting for the proposed Institute for Energy Efficiency.

C. Status Report: Faculty & Staff Housing

Assistant Chancellor Lee reported that the first phase of the North Campus for-sale faculty housing project is still in construction. It was noted that many units have very nice views of the mountains. The Community Housing Authority will finalize pricing for the 22 units in the next few weeks and intends to sell the units in the following 4-6 weeks. Estimated resident move-in will be in June of this year. Phase II of this project is in discussion, which will likely include 41 more units, the infrastructure for the entire complex and construction of the community center and pool.

D. Status Report: Student Housing

Senior Associate Vice Chancellor Fisher announced that Urban Design Associates (UDA) have just finished a master plan study for the proposed San Joaquin Apartments located near Santa Catalina Residence Hall. This study will inform the direction of the next student housing projects.

E. Status Report: Major Capital Projects

Attached.

VI. Correspondence

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM

Minutes taken by Jasmine Syed, Office of Budget & Planning