Campus Physical Planning Committee
Thursday, January 19, 2012
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Location: KL 232

Members Present:
De Acker, Assistant Dean – Natural Sciences (for Juan Meza, Dean’s Representative)
Keith E. Alley, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; (Co-Chair)
Susan Amussen, Professor – Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts, (Academic Senate Representative)
Tom Atkins, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Facilities Management
Jane Fiori Lawrence, Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs
Jan Mendenhall, Associate Vice Chancellor of Development - Development & Alumni Relations
Mary E. Miller, Vice Chancellor – Administration; (Co-Chair)
James Nardello, Assistant Director – Parking Services (Staff Assembly Representative)
Peggy O’Day, Professor - Natural Sciences, (Academic Senate Representative)
Samuel Traina, Vice Chancellor – Research
John O. White, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Capital Development
Marko Zivanovic, (ASUCM Representative)

Staff Present:
Michael Chow, Director of Design - Physical Planning, Design & Construction
Richard Cummings, Principal Planner - Physical Planning, Design & Construction
Brian Gresham, Assistant Director - Capital Planning & Space Management
Steve Rabedeaux, Technical & Space Allocation Manager, Academic Affairs
Philip Woods, Director of Physical & Environmental Planning – Physical Planning, Design & Construction

Others Present:
Ramona Dai’ Re, Educational Facilities Planner, Capital Planning & Space Management

Call to Order

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

Approve December 2011 Minutes

Vice Chancellor Lawrence moved for approval of the December 2011 minutes; seconded by Vice Chancellor Traina. Lawrence proposed to amend the minutes to indicate the expected occupancy date for the Recreation Center North Project was 2012. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved as amended.
Planning Ahead for 2012-13 Capital Financial Plan Update

Assistant Vice Chancellor White informed the committee that the campus will soon begin preparation of an updated long-range Capital Financial Plan (CFP). White noted that the 2012-13 CFP will be informed by a number of factors. The State program will be informed by previous CFPs; along with State and University priorities and economic considerations, CPEC space allowance adequacy; instructional space utilization, workload growth and available funding. Implementation of the Non-State program will largely depend on the ability to finance or fund the projects identified in the CFP.

Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost Alley inquired about the timeline necessary to prepare the 2012-13 CFP update. White responded that he would lead a discussion of the CFP for CPPC during its next meeting in March. A draft CFP is typically submitted to UCOP during the spring (May). The CFP moves through an iterative process of review and refinement involving UCOP and the campus to vet projects and to their funding or financial feasibility. The CFP is typically finalized during summer and formal approval is sought by The Regents each Fall.

White added that approval by The Regents does not provide the funding for approved projects and that project funding is dependent on a number of factors. Vice Chancellor Miller remarked that, although projects contained within the Regental approved CFP are not necessarily funded, projects omitted from the Regental approved CFP are very rarely allowed to move forward for funding. White further added that non-State projects must meet financial feasibility thresholds in order to move forward.

Greenhouse Site Recommendations

Principal Planner Cummings presented Greenhouse site recommendations as indicted in the meeting materials.

Site A is located across from the Social Sciences and Management Building and across the LeGrand Canal. Site B is located in the site near planned North Bowl Parking Lot, Phase 2. Site C is located next to the 1 MW solar array. Site D is a location at the Castle Commerce Center in Atwater adjacent to other UC Merced research facilities.

Technical and Space Allocation Manager Rabedeaux asked Traina if the facility was to be considered a core facility. Traina responded that the facility is anticipated to be a core facility and, moreover, that the expectation is this facility or one like it will evolve to be a part of the educational program as well as the research program.

Alley inquired whether the proposed site is suitable for expansion. Associate Vice Chancellor Lollini indicated the site would be suitable for expansion.

Academic Senate Representative O’Day questioned whether Site B would not be preferable for reliable temperature control. Traina responded that temperature control is mechanical and facility independent.
Assistant Vice Chancellor Atkins remarked that the facility would likely require dual power feeds. Lollini responded that dual power would be one viable option and that an emergency generator would be considered as well.

Miller asked if there would be an infrastructure premium for Site C. Lollini remarked that there would be a premium in the neighborhood of 5% to 10%.

Lawrence inquired as to how the facility would be accessed. Lollini responded that there is already a gravel access road and that the campus intends to provide additional access routes as part of future capital projects.

Traina moved to approve Site C as presented in the meeting materials; the motion was seconded by Lawrence. The committee unanimously approved Site C as the selected location for the future campus Greenhouse.

**Naming Subcommittee**

Cummings presented the Naming Subcommittee proposal as indicated in the meeting materials.

Miller noted that original intent for the establishment of a Naming Subcommittee was to create an efficient process utilizing a small subset of CPPC members and that the subcommittee, as currently proposed, includes nearly the full membership of CPPC. Assistant Vice Chancellor Mendenhall added that the original proposal was for a five member committee that would meet outside of CPPC, making recommendations directly to the Chancellor (Provost, VCA, Campus Architect, Development and Academic Senate).

Academic Senate Representative Amussen suggested that the subcommittee could forward items to the CPPC membership as proposed, allowing for electronically means (email or other) to approve urgent items, noting that such is a typical manner of business for the Academic Senate and its various subcommittees.

Amussen moved to approve the Naming Subcommittee proposal; Lawrence seconded the motion. Miller amended the motion to have the subcommittee members including the following (or their designees): Academic Senate Chair; Vice Chancellor for Development; Vice Chancellor for Administration, and the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost. The committee would elect its own chair. Majority vote required for approvals. The committee unanimously approved the proposal as amended. There was a request by Amussen to send out the revised membership and policy to the new committee members by email to pilot the electronic voting process.

**Castle Modular Units Location**

Director of Environmental and Physical Planning Woods presented the Castle Modular Units site proposal as indicated in the meeting materials, noting that the campus is evaluating the best way to procure and pay for the units.
Lollini asked how many modular units were under consideration. Woods replied that the current proposal is for two double-wide units (about 4,000 square feet to about twenty staff).

Atkins remarked that the trailers should be located as proximate each other as is reasonable to minimize infrastructure costs.

Lollini noted that it might be in the interest of the campus to consider bidding the project as a modular building with slab, as opposed to modular structures only. Lollini added that the units be low-VOC (volatile organic compounds) certified. It was recommended that the specs should include University requirements and encourage innovation.

Traina suggested the campus consider incorporating Professor Winston’s research as part of the building energy systems. There was agreement to plan thoughtfully with respect to infrastructure and utilities.

There was discussion of whether the project should be considered as a modular building or a simple procurement of trailers. White commented that the Academic Affairs had to this point been considering trailers and that the total project budget and timing are important factors for them in their decision-making.

Atkins noted that the campus needs to go forward with an electrical capacity study as there are already significant challenges with building systems at Castle. Traina and Alley supported Atkins’ suggestion, noting that there are research proposals under consideration that could significantly increase the system loads at the Castle facilities. Miller suggested Facilities Management and Academic Affairs present an analysis of challenges and potential solutions associated with the Castle Facility at a future CPPC meeting. The client is Academic Affairs.

Miller moved to approve the site as presented, with the understanding the committee’s feedback would be considered in the development process; Traina seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved by the committee.

**Corp Yard Relocation Update**

This item had been discussed previously with CPPC. Lollini presented the Corporation Yard Relocation Proposal as indicated in the meeting materials. The recommended location is near the North Bowl Parking Lot, Phase 1. The current location will be needed for construction of the new Student Services Building. Lollini indicated that environmental clearances are in place and that the campus has concurrence with the future location by UCOP. The location is referenced in the State-funded Site Development and Infrastructure, Phase 4 project. On a campus map he indicated the location of the corporation yard expansion and a relocated fuel tank.

Traina moved to approve the proposal as presented; Miller seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved by the committee.

**Construction Project Updates**

Lollini provided updates on current construction projects as indicated in the meeting materials.
• The Recreation Center North project is in construction and remains on schedule to open in Fall 2012.

• Student Housing Phase 4 is in construction. Results of additional bid packages/re-bidding are expected the first week in February. The project is still scheduled to open in time for Fall 2013.

• Preliminary Plans for the Student Services Building are complete and the campus is working toward getting access to University (UCOP) funding for the next phases of work.

• Science and Engineering 2 is about to begin construction with a planned completion in time for Fall 2014.

Lollini queried the committee if there were additional suggestions as to how to communicate construction-related updates to the campus community. In response to Lollini’s request, the committee provided a number of suggestions including: collaborating with the Student Affairs to add messaging to the wall-mounted video displays in the Kolligian Library; major road closures utilize electronic signage on roads; a dedicated Twitter feed; a dedicated voicemail number.

Amussen remarked that the faculty have expressed concern regarding the loss of parking associated with construction projects, such as Library Lot and LeGrand lot. Miller responded that parking considerations are a part of every capital project and indicated that there are challenges because the campus is growing.

O’Day asked if the campus can guarantee that, particularly with the tiered parking system, there will continue to be options for campus constituents to park very near their workplaces. Miller responded that, given the ongoing construction considerations, the campus cannot make such a guarantee. Atkins added that TAPS is considering reducing the pricing for some of the lots currently considered “premium” and that the number of permits sold in that category relates directly to the actual number of spaces available and the process it is reviewed annually.

**Administrative Space Self-Assessment**

White update the committee on the status of the Chancellor’s Administrative & Support Staff Space study, indicating that the initial phase of examination had concluded, results and recommendations were being shared with senior management and that a formal campus communication regarding the results of this initiative would be forthcoming.

**Other Business**

Alley inquired as to where the current Academic Office Building modular buildings (AOB) would be relocated to allow for construction of the Classroom & Academic Office Building, given that the Student Services Building is now being constructed on the site where the AOB facility had been anticipated to be relocated. Lollini responded that no final site has been identified, adding that, given the current State capital funding program, the campus will have some time yet to examine potential relocation sites for AOB.