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Office of the President

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS:

ACTION ITEM

For Meeting of March 18, 2008

ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT OF THE CAPITAL PROJECTS WORKING GROUP AND APPROVAL OF PILOT PHASE OF PROCESS REDESIGN FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to The Regents:


2) Approval of an 18 month “pilot phase” of the process redesign for approving capital improvement projects, within the context of the report of the Capital Projects Working Group. As part of the pilot phase it is recommended that the Executive Vice President-Business Operations establish a committee to oversee the pilot phase and report back to The Committee on Grounds and Buildings prior to consideration of final implementation of the process redesign.

BACKGROUND

In late April 2007, Monitor Group (Monitor) began an initiative with and on behalf of the University designed to identify specific opportunities to improve administrative efficiency and effectiveness within the Office of the President (UCOP) and across the University system, and to clarify and refine the governance role of UCOP in relation to The Regents and the campuses. The specific objectives of the effort are to:

- Document the distribution of the University’s administrative and finance functions and how those services are performing in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and overall support for the University mission
- Redesign the highest priority functions in order to maximize their cost effectiveness and/or their service levels
• Clarify the role of the Office of the President relative to the rest of the system and
design the structures, processes, policies and decision making approach that will
support that role
• Build momentum and capacity in the system to continue an ongoing cycle of
improvement

The first phase of this effort was an organizational assessment involving cost analysis,
interviews and a diagnostic survey to identify and prioritize key organizational effectiveness
and efficiency issues both at UCOP and across the system. This initial diagnostic and
screening component of the work identified several areas of focus for redesign based on their
potential to both generate near-term cost savings and also re-establish UCOP as the
administrative “center” of the University (Monitor Group Report to the Regents: University of
California Organizational Restructuring Effort, September 2007).

The University’s capital projects process was identified as an area of focus, and a working
group of UCOP and campus personnel was charged to develop recommendations for its
redesign. The initial focus of the Working Group’s effort has been on process issues relating
to the involvement of UCOP and The Regents. Subsequent efforts will address process issues
at the campus level.

At a February 2008 meeting, the Grounds and Buildings Committee discussed the proposed
process redesign for capital improvement projects at the University as developed by the
Working Group, and the Committee requested an item be brought before them for action at
the March 2008 meeting. This action would provide for an initial 18 month roll-out or “pilot
phase” of the process redesign in order to examine the mechanics and impact of this process.
A detailed description of the redesigned process and the pilot phase can be found in the
attached documents.

(Attachments)
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

In the spring of 2007, the Board of Regents and President of the University of California undertook a major effort to assess the organization and operations of the University’s finance and administrative functions, centering on the Office of the President (UCOP). The initial diagnostic and screening component of this work identified several areas of focus for redesign based on their potential to both generate near-term cost savings and also rebuild UCOP as the administrative “center” of the University.

With the University’s capital projects approval1 process identified as one area of focus, a working group of UCOP and campus personnel was formed to develop a redesigned process.2 Consistent with the findings of the initiative’s original diagnostic phase, the initial focus of the Working Group’s effort has been on process issues relating to the involvement of UCOP and The Regents. Subsequent efforts will address process issues at the campus level.

This document describes the progress of the Working Group, including a summary of the proposed process redesign. It also provides initial templates and guidelines for the documents which will be used during the pilot phase.

Issues Highlighted by the Working Group

Relying on a range of perspectives, and charged with focusing on pragmatic, actionable solutions, the Working Group identified the following general issues:

- There are several potentially unnecessary steps in the current capital planning process that consequently add unnecessary time, and therefore cost across the entire University system.

- The current management process focuses on project-by-project review for all projects, rather than providing strategic-level guidance and focused review for only the most significant projects
  - Better tools and information for strategic and plan level review and management could be made available to Regents
  - Regental time is spent on transactional, project level approval rather than strategy3

---

1 Throughout this document, “approval” is used to indicate consideration for project approval or denial.
2 Working Group membership is detailed in appendix VII.
3 An estimated 19% of G&B meeting time in 2007 was spent on strategic and planning level discussion
Findings

The Working Group advises the following:

- Implementation of a streamlined capital projects approval process with increased clarity of roles, touch-points, accountability, and policies:
  - **Regents** focus at a strategic level and on projects not conforming to agreed upon parameters (e.g. high value or “complex”)
  - **UCOP** has a clearly defined role and touch-points — with higher-risk projects flagged earlier for Regental review
  - **Campuses** have greater autonomy and accountability

It is estimated that these actions will result in the avoidance of significant annual capital costs and drive an ability to continuously improve the process going forward.
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE STREAMLINED PROCESS

The Working Group’s process redesign for capital projects approval is based on two fundamental ideas. The first is that any process revision must ultimately tie back to Regental priorities. Consequently, the Working Group took Regental priorities around planning, design, and value as their point of departure and addressed concerns with the current process within this framework.

The second idea fundamental to this process redesign is that capital projects vary in their complexity and, thus, a one-size-fits-all review process is inefficient. The current capital project process requires a large and heterogeneous group of projects to go through UCOP and The Regents. The proposed process establishes different approval paths using a mix of absolute criteria and review-based determinations to classify projects as “delegated” or “standard.” “Standard” projects would continue to receive comprehensive project-level review by both UCOP and The Regents. All other projects will be delegated to the Chancellors, subject to specific and limited functional reviews by the Office of the General Counsel and UCOP.

By necessity, this delegation of project approval to the Chancellors for most aspects of capital projects will require a greater level of rigor and consistency in both planning and reporting by participating campuses. At a high level, the model proposes three interlinked components, illustrated in Figure 1, and further described below.

Figure 1: Key model components

1. Planning Cycle:

In the first phase of the proposed process, the Planning Cycle, campuses will invest in creating a refined set of linked design, capital, and financial plans based on guidelines approved by The Regents. These plans enable The Regents to move to portfolio level oversight, focusing on campus-level strategic issues rather than the review of every individual project.
The planning cycle includes the following steps:

- **Campuses** take lead in creating and presenting plans
- **UCOP** provides consultative expertise on campus planning
- **Regents** set expectations for and approve integrated plans

During the planning cycle campuses would create and submit the following set of interconnected plans for approval by The Regents and place them on file with UCOP. Detailed guidelines for the creation of these plans can be found in appendix III and IV:

- **The Capital and Financial Plan** outlines both how the capital program will meet the campus’ academic and strategic objectives, and how the campus intends to fund that program. The plan details the current situation, outlines the campus’ objectives and priorities for the capital program, and details the campus’ financial strategy for meeting those objectives. In providing project-level details, the short term plan also lays the framework for approval at the campus level. The Regents will receive an annual update on any changes to the plan, and review the plan for approval every five years.

- **The Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework** details the current state of physical planning and design on the campus alongside the campus’ physical planning and design objectives. Additionally, the plan provides supporting elements, including campus-level design guidelines and processes for ensuring projects included in the capital plan meet the design objectives. The Regents will receive an update on this plan every five years and evaluate it for approval every fifteen years.

- **The LRDP** remains as is, providing a campus-level framework of land-use designations within which projects can be planned.

2. Project Level Screening:

The proposed process allows for “delegated” capital projects to be approved by the campus Chancellor, provided they are consistent with the above plans, meet standing Presidential and Regental policy requirements, and remain within the criteria classifying a “delegated” project. A **checklist**, as discussed below, is the mechanism by which compliance with these aforementioned items is evaluated and attested to for any individual project. In addition to the checklist all projects will continue to be reviewed by the Office of General Counsel for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance and by UCOP for financial feasibility. Upon campus completion of final documentation UCOP and the Office of General Counsel are provided a finite and pre-determined period of time to channel a project into the process for “standard,” i.e. non-delegated, projects if determined that the project is subject to issues that should be reviewed and discussed by The Regents. Typically, Regental and Presidential project-level review would take place only for “standard” projects.

The redesigned approval process is summarized in figures two and three, below. Figure two shows the process for a project eligible for delegation. Figure three shows the process for a “standard”, non-delegated project. Additional discussion is provided below.
Regents set guidelines for planning and approve plans on a regular cycle.

**Figure 2:** Redesigned approval process for “delegated” projects

---

**Figure 3:** Redesigned approval process for “standard” projects

---

4 In both figure 2 and 3, “approval” is used to indicate consideration for project approval or denial.
As noted in the figures above, the project level screening phase includes the following steps, some of which may occur in parallel, based on the circumstances of specific projects:

- The campus, working with UCOP and the Office of the General Counsel on an informal basis as needed, makes a preliminary evaluation of the project versus a checklist, this includes assessing whether the project is eligible for delegation, is within the ranges approved in the Capital and Financial Plan, complies with the campus’ Physical Planning and Design Framework and is compliant with policy

- The Chancellor reviews the prepared evaluation of the project vs. the checklist and attests that the proposed project is either standard or eligible for delegation

- If the project is deemed eligible for delegation, and upon completion of final documentation, it proceeds to OCG and UCOP for three specific reviews to be completed within 15 business days:
  - The Office of General Counsel reviews the project for CEQA compliance (further detail on this process can be found in appendix I)
  - External Finance reviews the financial feasibility of securing debt for the project
  - The Executive Vice President of Business Operations reviews the project for policy related risks

- Based on the results of these reviews, either the Office of the General Counsel (for CEQA only) or the Executive Vice President of Business Operations may request Regental review of the project

- If Regental review is not requested, the Chancellor may approve the project on a delegated basis

- If Regental review is requested, the project is forwarded to an Action Item Development Meeting. During this meeting, the President guides item development, with input from the campus and UCOP staff, and then refers a recommendation on the project to The Regents for review

As noted previously, Campuses and UCOP use a predetermined checklist to evaluate a project and to document the project review process. More specifically:

- The checklist codifies all the elements against which a project is evaluated for approval by the Chancellor. It allows the Chancellor to attest that the project has not substantially deviated from the plans and complies with Presidential and Regental policies and any applicable legal requirements. The form of the checklist itself will be approved by the Regents

To facilitate administration of the program a copy of the checklist and, as appropriate, other material used during the approval process would be kept in a central file at UCOP. A template for the checklist is included in appendix V.
3. Reporting and Accountability:

An Annual Campus Capital Program Report will be created to inform management of systemwide interests and the University’s strategic direction. By documenting the campus response to both Regental and system-wide priorities, this report will enable accountability and effective feedback during the campus’ next planning cycle. The reporting and accountability phase includes the following steps:

- **Campuses** report on the capital program, creating accountability for delegated responsibility
- **UCOP** compiles data on the campus’ capital program, including project audits
- **Regents** review reports on the campus capital program, prior to the next planning cycle

The Annual Campus Capital Program Report will include the following. Guidelines for the creation of the report are included in appendix VI:

- The **Project Data Report**, reporting the campus’ adherence to plans and aggregated performance on specific metrics of Regental and Presidential interest for all projects completed in the last planning cycle.
- A **Physical Environment Review**, reviewing the campus’ implementation of its Physical Planning and Design Framework through a regular campus visit by the Committee on Grounds and Buildings and by a self-assessment survey of faculty, students, and staff.
- An **Audit**, monitoring the factual validity of information reported by the campus throughout the process, along with Regental and Presidential policy compliance.

III. Summary of the Roles of Participants in the Proposed Process

One of the principles driving the overall restructuring initiative is the importance of clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of the various participants in the process steps being redesigned. Appendix II outlines proposed decision rights for The Regents, UCOP, and the campuses. A summary of the roles follows below.

**The Regents**

Improved planning and reporting documents will enable The Regents to shift emphasis from project-by-project review to more involvement in campus plans and strategic system-wide issues. The Regents would approve plan guidelines, campus plans and the checklist template. Project-by-project review will continue for “standard” projects.

**UCOP**

The role of UCOP is clarified. During campus capital project planning, UCOP is a ‘service provider’ to help campuses identify and mitigate legal or financial risks as early in the process as possible. During project level screening, campus proposed capital projects will be submitted to
UCOP for review by the Office of General Counsel for CEQA compliance and by UCOP for financial feasibility. UCOP's interventions are based on clearly pre-agreed criteria, and on matters of law.

**Campuses**

As experts on local conditions and needs, campuses will adopt responsibility and accountability for ensuring the successful delivery of most capital projects through an investment in planning and the reporting of project data (e.g., variance from plan). For “delegated” projects approval will be by the chancellor.
Appendix I: Approach to CEQA in the Revised Process

The figure below summarizes the approach to CEQA taken in the new process:

---

5 In this “approval” is used to indicate consideration for project approval or denial.
Appendix II: Summary of Decision Rights in the Proposed Process

Decision rights are a way of describing the distribution of authority in a process or organization. They will be introduced in the special session to help explain the proposed process. There are five discrete types of decision right, each of which have accompanying guidelines for allocation:

- **Input**: Right to provide input before a decision is made. Includes information, data, analysis or recommendation. Automatically includes Notify rights.
  - Should be allocated to those who must provide a critical input into the decision-making process

- **Make**: Right to make decision in light of key input gathered. Also entails being held accountable for the decision.
  - Only one person/group should have this right to ensure clear accountability

- **Ratify**: Right to approve or overturn the decision and monitor decision outcomes. Essentially a veto right.
  - Make and Ratify rights must be separated

- **Notify**: Right to be notified of a decision outcome after the fact.
  - Should be allocated to those who will need to use the information elsewhere in the process

- **Appeal**: Ratify right only used to overturn “Make” decisions; may be time delimited
Appendix III: Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of the 10 Year Campus Capital and Financial Plans

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE 10 YEAR CAMPUS CAPITAL AND FINANCIAL PLANS

Overall Document Guidelines

The purpose of these document guidelines is to outline the requirements for the Campus Capital and Financial Plan. The plan itself has two overall goals:

- To outline the capital program of the campus, i.e. the realistic capital needs. This portion of the plan should include capital program objectives and explicit linkages to academic and strategic priorities.
- To describe the associated financing strategies designed to meet those objectives, i.e. the feasible availability of funds.

The document should discuss capital program supply and demand both in the context of the overall campus objectives and in the context of the specific projects in the plan. The document should stand alone without accompanying commentary or explanation.

Proposed Document Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Overview</th>
<th>Example and Reference Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A brief outline of the plan focusing on the key points and changes since the last version of the plan.</td>
<td>University of California 2008-09 Budget for state capital improvements – Davis Campus, “Introduction” (p35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California 2008-09 Budget for state capital improvements – Davis Campus, “Introduction” (p35)</td>
<td>UC Davis: 10 Year Capital Plan – “Introduction - Assumptions” (p ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Situation Analysis

High-level description of the current state of the campus’ capital program.

Would include the campus’ overall strategy, as well as issues and trends affecting that strategy and/or the capital program into the future. Should include consideration of the following:

- Academic / strategic priorities for the campus;
- Description of the current state of the campus, particularly areas to be addressed;
- Assumptions and projections used in the plan, including risks that might affect the ability to implement the planned program.
Capital Program Objectives & Priorities

A list and description of the campus’ objectives for the capital program responding to system-wide and campus-specific needs. The list should be prioritized to the extent possible.

Details changes since the last approval of the plan and highlights those objectives addressed in the short-term. Objectives are to be determined by the campus, but should give consideration to the following Regental priorities:

- Sustainability
- Seismic and Life-Safety Remediation
- Major Capital Renewal and Modernization
- Project Funding and Financial Strategies
- Enrollment Growth

Funding and Financial Strategies & Objectives:

Description of the specific financial strategies and financial objectives for the campus, and analysis of the financing strategy the campus intends to use to meet the capital program objectives listed previously.

Should include a discussion of uncertainties and risk, and potential actions for mitigation. Additionally, should include a selection of visually accessible tables and bar charts showing the total funding, and funding for each year of the plan, broken down by:

- Funding Sources
  - (i.e. debt, equity, gifts, capital reserves, federal, state, 3rd party)
- Funding Uses
  - (i.e. square feet of classroom, office, infrastructure, hospital, housing, lab, library, parking, other)
- Seismic and Life Safety Remediation Spending
  - (showing renovation vs. new building)
- Major Capital Renewal Spending
  - (renovation vs. new building in capital renewal, modernization, and technological obsolescence)
Recommended Principles for Evaluation of the Plan

It is recommended that this plan be evaluated against the following subjects and principles:

- The plan should be a comprehensive and internally consistent strategy for supporting the overall goals and priorities of the campus.
- The plan should demonstrate a feasible funding strategy for meeting capital needs at the campus.
- The plan should demonstrate the campus has a reasonable and responsible plan for executing their capital program.
PLAN APPENDIX 1 – SUPPORTING ELEMENTS: PORTFOLIO OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED PROJECTS

A supporting element of this plan is a list of current and planned projects within the relevant planning cycle. Each project should have a brief narrative description of the project and a bulleted or tabled list of project characteristics. (Example Documentation: UC Davis: 10 Year Capital Plan – “…Projects” pp 1-199)

The following data is required for projects being approved within current planning cycle, but otherwise to be provided as available:

- Total Project Cost (showing 25% range)
- Funding Sources (showing 25% ranges)
- Project Gross Square Feet (showing 25% range)
- Project Type
- “Delegated” or “Standard” Project (as planned and anticipated)
- Project Objectives, Justification and Alternatives Considered
- Delivery Method
# PLAN APPENDIX 2 – EXAMPLE AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of California 2008-09 Budget for state capital improvements – Davis Campus, “Introduction” (p35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5</td>
<td>UC Davis: 10 Year Capital Plan – “Introduction – Goals, Assumptions” (p i-ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UC 2008-2009 Budget for Current Operations Summary of the Budget Request – “Budget Priorities” (p3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 19</td>
<td>UC 2008-2009 Budget for Current Operations Summary of the Budget Request (pp 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Example A (p17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>Example B (pp 7, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Example C (p1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 30</td>
<td>UC Davis: 10 Year Capital Plan – “…Projects” (pp 1-199, <em>three examples provided</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV: Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of Campus Physical Planning and Design Frameworks

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF
THE CAMPUS PHYSICAL PLANNING & DESIGN FRAMEWORKS

Overall Document Guidelines

These guidelines outline the minimum requirements for the Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework. Campuses are encouraged, respecting length and accessibility, to include any additional content that will best communicate their vision. The format of the document is left to the discretion of the campus, though it must include both visual and textual elements. The document should stand alone without accompanying commentary or explanation.

The goal of the document is to create a common vocabulary for planning and design at the campus while demonstrating how processes and standards at the campus support consistent implementation.

Proposed Document Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Document Guidelines</th>
<th>Example and Reference Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A brief outline of the plan focusing on the key points and changes since the last version of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level description of the current state of physical planning and design at the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would include design issues at the campus -- opportunities, constraints, positive attributes worth reinforcing, and problems to be addressed,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of the campus’ principles and objectives for the design of the physical environment.</td>
<td>UC Irvine: <em>Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2008 (p2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principles should discuss successful thematic design elements that are worth extending and reinforcing, as well as</td>
<td>UC Davis Health System:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The example documents are presentations, and as such are only complete with the accompanying oral commentary. These guidelines intend for plans in which narrative description is written alongside visual representations.
differentiating design elements that have proven effective in creating places with important campus meaning. The objectives must be concise, yet realizable, aspirations for the physical environment worth reinforcing and extending across the campus. The objectives provide the framework within which the campus makes physical planning and design decisions. Examples of potential topics for the objective are provided in Appendix 1.

### Detail on Each Design Objective

| UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2008 (pp 38-54) |
| UC Davis Health System: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2006 (pp 30-44) |

A more detailed explanation of each design objective providing visual descriptions of spaces\(^7\) which exemplify the objective. Describes, where appropriate, future designs which will support the objective.

### Supporting Elements

| Campus-Level Design Guidelines & Standards |
| Partial Examples.\(^8\) |
| UC San Diego: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2002 (p36) |
| UC Berkeley: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2002 (p5) |

Describes the most important campus design guidelines and standards in a way that clarifies their link to the Physical Planning and Design Framework. Lists campus level design guidelines and standards documents. Describes how the documents reinforce the execution of applicable design objectives listed in this document. Examples of guidelines and standards to reference are included in Appendix 2.

### Linkage to Campus-Level Project Planning & Design Processes

| Partial Examples: |
| UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2008 (pp 59-60) |
| UC Berkeley: Physical Vision Presentation to G&B, 2002 (pp 8-9) |

Description of how the design objectives listed in the document are referenced and used in the project planning and design process at the campus. Discusses how it is ensured the design objectives are incorporated into project planning and design.

---

\(^7\) “Space” is intended to mean any designed area, whether a building, infrastructure, or landscape feature.

\(^8\) These examples are only partially representative of intent – greater detail is necessary in the formal submission.
Linkage of Framework to LRDP / Master Plan

Discusses the relationship between this plan and the land use and spatial distribution of buildings and other spaces on the campus laid out in the LRDP and/or Master Plan.

Recommended Principles for Evaluation of the Plan

It is recommended that this plan be evaluated against the following subjects and principles:

- The plan should be a comprehensive and internally consistent strategy for supporting the overall principles and objectives of the campus
- The plan should demonstrate the campus has a reasonable and responsible Physical Planning and Design Framework that it is able to execute against
Areas design objectives might discuss could include, but are not limited to:

- Interaction between built and open space
- Architectural vocabulary
- Vistas and sight-lines
- Density
- Growth
- Scale and relationship of users (e.g. students, staff, faculty, community, other) to built environment
- Relationship to the surrounding environs
- Pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular, and service circulation objectives and concepts.
- Sustainability
- Architectural and spatial identity
FRAMEWORK APPENDIX 2 – POTENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES & STANDARDS TO REFERENCE

Potential campus-level documents which could be referenced and described in relation to the Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework could include but are not limited to:

- Architectural design guidelines
- Material quality criteria
- Signage guidelines
- Lighting guidelines
- Landscape design guidelines
- Historical preservation guidelines
- Landscaping material and sustainability guidelines
**FRAMEWORK APPENDIX 3 - EXAMPLE AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2008 (p2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 7</td>
<td>UC Davis Health System: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2006 (pp 30, 31, 35, 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 16</td>
<td>UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2008 (pp 38-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 32</td>
<td>UC Davis Health System: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2006 (pp 30-44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>UC San Diego: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2002 (p36) - <em>Partial Example</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>UC Berkeley: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2002 (p5) - <em>Partial Example</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 – 39</td>
<td>UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2008 (pp 59-60) - <em>Partial Example</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 42</td>
<td>UC Berkeley: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2002 (pp 8-9) - <em>Partial Example</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 – 48</td>
<td>UC Irvine: Physical Vision Presentation to G&amp;B, 2008 (pp 16-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: Draft Major Capital Improvements Project Checklist

**General Project Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name (Number):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Sq Ft:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Project Scope:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Milestones:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED / Equivalent Rating:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Description:**

1) Need to which the project is responding
2) Programmatic objectives for project
3) Alternatives that will / have been considered
4) Input taken / received (e.g. students, staff, faculty, community, other)

**General Eligibility Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Delegated Projects</th>
<th>Standard Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Less than $60 million</td>
<td>Greater than $60 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest Exists</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consistency with Campus Plans**

**Compliance With Approved Campus Plans**

**Capital and Financial Plan**

*Project complies with the campus’ objectives and priorities as described in the Capital and Financial Plan, and the project is financially feasible.*

Please provide detail on the ways in which this compliance and financial feasibility has been achieved:

**Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework**

*Project complies with the campus’ Physical Planning and Design Framework, and supports the design objectives listed below:*

Please provide detail on the ways in which this compliance has been achieved:

**Long Range Development Plan**

*Project complies with the campus’ Long Range Development Plan*
COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS
AND BUILDINGS
March 18, 2008

Project Finances and Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Value per Most Recent Capital &amp; Financial Plan or Plan Update</th>
<th>Current Value</th>
<th>Within Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$ - to -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>(&lt;25% Change) Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Source of Funding</td>
<td>Funding Source A: $ - to -</td>
<td>Funding Source A: $ -</td>
<td>(&lt;25% Change) Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding Source … $ - to -</td>
<td>Funding Source … $ -</td>
<td>(&lt;25% Change) Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>- to -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(&lt;25% Change) Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>- to - x</td>
<td>- x</td>
<td>(Compliant with Policy) Y/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Service Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source A: $ - to -</th>
<th>Funding Source A: $ -</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source … $ - to -</td>
<td>Funding Source … $ -</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction Cost

| $ - | $ - | NA |

Non-Construction Cost

| $ - | $ - | NA |

ASF / GSF

| - to - | - | NA |

Construction Cost per GSF

| - to - | - | NA |

Construction Cost per Unit (where applicable)

| - to - | - | NA |

Compliance with UC Policies

Compliance with Relevant Policies

*Project meets policy all applicable aspects of relevant policies and sections of code, including, sustainable practices, seismic safety, and all applicable sections of the California code of regulations.*

Chancellor Attestation

I attest the project named in this document should be considered a standard project and is both within the allowed plan ranges and in accordance with relevant University of California policies:

Name: ____________________________________________________________  Date: ________________

Signature: _______________________________________________________________________________

Prepared by: ____________________________________________________  Date: ________________

Signature: _______________________________________________________________________________
## Record of Required UCOP / OGC Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Authority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Finance</td>
<td>Financing Approved?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Early consultation completed?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Complete CEQA documentation package?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel (CEQA)</td>
<td>3) General Counsel opinion given?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Ready for Chancellorial review and consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Return for campus for additional administrative review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Return to campus for continued consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Recommend for UCOP consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVP Business Operations</td>
<td>Regental review requested?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Document Guidelines

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the information suggested for reporting on the campus capital program and planning process to the Board of Regents. The intent of the Annual Campus Capital Program Report is to provide information, generally quantitatively, which explains the implementation of goals for the capital program established by the Regents. It is expected those goals will change over time, and as such, so will the metrics included in the document. It is anticipated that analysis of the information included in this document will highlight issues and frame potential future process improvements.

Generally, metrics should show trends over time. Where appropriate, figures should be shown by project type to account for differences in project cost and length. It is expected that the detailed format of this report is approved by The Regents during the pilot phase.

Proposed Document Guidelines

Project Length Metrics

Section should include metrics on the amount of time taken to plan and build projects, might include measures such as projects days per thousand construction dollars.

Project Cost Metrics

Section should include metrics on the cost of building projects normalized to some appropriate measure such as square feet, beds, or parking spaces.

Metrics on Variance from Plan

Section should include metrics comparing the originally planned values for projects, i.e. total project cost, to the final values as constructed.

Seismic Remediation Metrics

Section should show the seismic ratings of projects on the campus, and the impact of planned remediation measures.

Sustainability Metrics

Section should show the sustainability ratings of projects on the campus, and the impact of planned projects.
Physical Environmental Review Results

Summary results from the last campus user survey on the physical environment

Audit Results

Summary results from the last audit of campus capital approval documents and process

Approved Projects

List the “delegated” projects that the Chancellor approved during the past year.
Appendix VII: Capital Working Group Membership

Working Group members are:
Katie Lapp, UCOP
Wendell Brase, UC Irvine
Boone Hellmann, UC San Diego
John Meyer, UC Davis
Mike Bocchicchio, UCOP
Pete Blackman, UCLA
Jack Wolever and Joel Michaelsen, UC Santa Barbara
Pat Romero, UCOP
Regent Joanne Kozberg provided counsel to the Group

Advisory and Staff support provided by:
Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents Diane Griffiths
Office of the General Counsel representatives Steve Morrell, Elisabeth Gunther, Kelly Drumm
Lynn Boland, UCOP
Special Advisor to Chairman Blum Betsy Horan

Analytical and process support provided by Monitor Group LP (www.monitor.com).
DISCUSSION OF PILOT PHASE

(1) A pilot phase is to be established for executing a redesigned process for approving capital projects at the University.

(2) The Regents will consider final implementation of the redesigned process for approving capital projects no earlier than the meeting of The Board of Regents scheduled 18 months from today.

(3) The Executive Vice President-Business Operations is responsible for establishing a committee of campus and Office of the President representatives which will oversee the pilot phase. The committee will be responsible for the following.

a. Editing documents, plans, or reports, or creating further documents as may be required to execute the redesigned process.

b. Developing appropriate recommendations to Bylaws, Standing Orders and Policy based on the process redesign.

c. Evaluating the various aspects of the pilot phase and the process redesign, including documentation, roles and responsibilities, and process timing.

d. Evaluate project eligibility criteria, including total project cost, allowable fund sources (e.g., State funds), and other criteria as appropriate based on the experience with projects which were and were not reviewed by The Regents during the pilot phase.

e. Reporting on the pilot phase and any action taken on items (a), (b), and (c) set forth above to a meeting of The Committee on Grounds and Buildings 18 months from today. The report should include a recommendation for final implementation of the process based on the evaluations mentioned above.

(4) Campus participation in the pilot phase will be approved by The Regents. In order to be considered for participation, campuses must submit the following documents to The Regents and file them with UCOP.

a. A current and previously approved Long Range Development Plan.

b. A Capital and Financial Plan discussing the capital program of the campus over the subsequent ten years; providing campus academic and strategic objectives, and describing a capital program of specific projects and associated financing strategies designed to meet those objectives. The Capital and Financial Plan will be updated and reviewed every 5 years, with an information update provided by the campus to the review body annually.
Committee on Grounds and Buildings
March 18, 2008

C. A Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework, providing objectives guiding the physical development of the campus. The Framework will be updated and reviewed at least every fifteen years by The Committee on Grounds and Buildings. A summary of this plan will be presented at the same time as the Capital and Financial Plan to provide campus context.

d. A Campus Major Capital Improvements Project Checklist

5. The Regents designate the following categories of projects as requiring design and budget approval by the Committee on Grounds and Buildings as part of the pilot implementation phase:

a. Building projects not in compliance with an approved campus “Project Checklist,” within context of the redesigned process.

b. Building projects with a total project cost in excess of $60,000,000.

6. The documentation associated with the pilot phase will be created in accordance with the following guidelines approved by The Regents, and maintained by the (Executive Vice President-Business Operations or their designate). Changes to the guidelines are subject to review by The Committee on Ground and Buildings.

a. University of California Guidelines for the Preparation of Campus Physical Planning and Design Frameworks

b. University of California Guidelines for the Preparation of Campus Capital and Financial Plans

c. University of California Major Capital Improvements Project Checklist Template

7. The approval of building projects on campuses not participating in the pilot phase is governed by applicable Bylaws, Standing Orders, and delegations.

8. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the approval of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, or in appropriate circumstances The Regents, may be required for any project or other action addressed by this policy when, in the judgment of the President, an action merits review and approval by The Regents because of budget matters, fundraising activities, environmental impacts, community concerns, or other reasons.
ERRATA

The following adjustments have been made to the document to correct errors and inconsistencies discovered after publication:

(1) In Attachment 2, Discussion of Pilot Phase, due to a printing error the following language is inconsistent with the main report:

   a. Section 4.b has been changed to read “…the Capital and Financial Plan will be updated every 5 years and reviewed, with an annual information update provided by the campus to the review body”

   b. Section 4.c has been changed to read “Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework,” not “Vision for the Physical Environment.”

   c. Section 4.c has been changed to read “…the Framework will be updated and reviewed at least every fifteen years.”

   d. Section 6.a has been changed to read “University of California Guidelines for the Preparation of Campus Physical Planning and Design Frameworks,” not “University of California Guidelines for the Preparation of “Visions for the Physical Environment.”

(2) In the main body of the item:

   e. On page 7, inside the graphic “Physical Vision Plan” has been changed to “Phys. Planning and Design”

(3) In appendix IV:

   f. On page 20, “Linkage of Physical Vision to LRDP…” has been changed to “Linkage of Framework to LRDP…”

(4) In appendix V:

   g. On page 24, “Campus Vision for the Physical Environment” has been changed to “Campus Physical Planning and Design Framework” and “Project complies with the campus’ Vision for the Physical Environment…” has been changed to “Project complies with the campus’ Physical Planning and Design Framework…”
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DAVIS CAMPUS
2008-2013 STATE PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Founded in 1905 as the University Farm, UC Davis became a general campus of the University of California in 1959. While the campus is an acknowledged longstanding international leader in agricultural and environmental sciences, veterinary medicine, and biological sciences, it has in recent years gained similar recognition for excellence in the arts, humanities, social sciences, engineering, health sciences, law, and management. UC Davis now offers more than 130 undergraduate majors and 80 graduate programs in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the College of Engineering, the College of Letters and Science, and the College of Biological Sciences. These programs, and the five campus professional schools—the School of Law, Graduate School of Management, School of Medicine, School of Education, and School of Veterinary Medicine—combine to provide the most diverse program offerings of any campus within the University of California system. Additionally, the campus is planning two new professional schools in the health sciences—School of Public Health and School of Nursing—to respond to the need for health care professionals in California.

The UC Davis campus strategic plan emphasizes learning, discovery, and engagement. Learning is enriched through high-caliber instructional programs, quality faculty/student interaction, and the expansion of research, internship and international experiences for undergraduates. Discovery is pursued through intensive research, enhancing the role of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in research efforts. Engagement of the university in the lives of the broader community, locally and globally, contributes to solutions of society’s most pressing problems.

To accomplish these goals, many campus programs require specialized land and building resources. The 5,300 acres of the main campus include not only core instruction and research buildings but also major structures for animals, greenhouses, and other academic support facilities, as well as agricultural land used for teaching and research. Because the Davis campus evolved within a rural setting where basic urban infrastructure was not available, the campus operates its own domestic and utility water systems, wastewater treatment plant, and solid waste landfill site in addition to electrical systems, telecommunications systems, and central steam and chilled-water services.

The recent period of rapid enrollment growth has strained the ability of the campus to maintain campus infrastructure and support systems, to correct safety and code deficiencies, and to renew or replace old and obsolete buildings. The campus continues to have significant space deficiencies in basic research, office, and teaching spaces. There is also a continuing need to adapt existing facilities to meet the ever-evolving needs of instruction and research and to maintain the vitality of the academic programs they support. Campus goals to move toward more sustainable facilities must also be addressed.

Additionally, the UC Davis Medical Center and most of the School of Medicine are located on a 140 acre campus near downtown Sacramento. The Medical Center performs a vital role in the region providing all levels of medical care. The School of Medicine is responding to the increasing need for medical professionals. While an active new construction and renovation program is underway, a shortage exists for research space and clinical programs.
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4. Identify the unfunded needs and develop new strategies that would close the funding gap.

5. Prepare periodic updates to the plan and propose policy recommendations for project funding. Distribute these updates to the campus leadership as a guide for policy consideration.

I. Identify Capital Investment Needs

The capital investments by the campus support the three-part mission of the campus—teaching, research and outreach. The Davis campus is expected to increase its enrollment, expand its research activities, and extend outreach efforts to the larger community. To achieve its vision, the campus will need to invest heavily in capital facilities aimed at supporting teaching and research. The following assumptions were used in identifying these investment needs over the next ten years.

Assumptions

- The current Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) is based on an enrollment plan of 32,000 headcount students in 2015, with 30,000 students being on campus. Thus, the campus will need to invest in new teaching and research facilities to accommodate growth of about 4,000 students.

- The campus will accommodate a portion of its planned enrollment through an expanded state-supported summer program. An enrollment goal of 20 percent of the usual regular session enrollment has been proposed. If the campus achieves this goal, about 6.7 percent of the campus’ annual credit hours (FTE) would be generated in the summer.

- The campus will strive to use its classrooms to meet the utilization standards as adopted by CPEC (average of 35 seat-hours per week).

- There is a significant need for investment in new facilities to replace outdated facilities serving various programs, most notably the School of Veterinary Medicine. This need has both growth and program quality implications.
Background
In 2002, the Office of Resource Management and Planning published the first comprehensive Ten-year Capital Plan for the campus. It was developed from a previous (2001) draft long-term capital funding forecast for the campus. The ten-year forecast was undertaken in response to the substantial capital investments required to meet a variety of campus goals. Chief among these goals is to accommodate new enrollment. Each of the campuses has evaluated the feasibility of accommodating the projected enrollments through better utilization of existing facilities, expanded summer programs and adding new space. Other goals include the provision of adequate space to accommodate new research and replace obsolete facilities.

This Ten-year Capital Plan builds upon the prior 2002 publication and the prior capital funding forecast, and proposes what we believe to be the most effective strategy for the UC Davis campus to follow in developing needed capital resources. This plan proposes how to deploy state funds, non-state funds, gift funds, public-private partnerships, enterprise development, and other resources to achieve the specific capital investments to assure long-term viability of the campus asset base.

Goals
The plan has the following goals:

1. Identify the capital investment needs that will be required to (a) accommodate the potential enrollment growth to the year 2013/14, (b) support the academic, administrative, and support program to preserve program quality and achieve new initiatives, and (c) expand campus infrastructure.

2. Identify all possible sources of capital funding and business strategies that are likely to be available to the campus over the planning period.

3. Align the capital needs and the available sources of capital to optimize the campus investment strategy and minimize financial and operational risks.
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To reinvigorate its relationship with California, the University is proposing to ...

- Expand access by continuing to find a place for all eligible California students through enrollment growth (page 9);
- Enhance support for graduate students who are a critical element in the research enterprise, an enterprise that often leads to groundbreaking discovery and innovation (page 14);
- Maintain quality in professional schools to develop California leadership in fields as diverse as health sciences, business and law (page 16);
- Support development of the new campus at Merced to expand undergraduate access, especially for the underserved San Joaquin Valley, and support unique student-centered learning (page 16);
- Partner with K-12, CSU, Community Colleges, and others to address the achievement gap related to the education of California students (page 17);
- Respond to state research needs on the effects of climate change on agriculture and the environment (page 18).

To build and maintain the quality of its teaching and research core, the University is proposing to ...

- Restore competitive compensation to attract and retain quality faculty and staff (page 11);
- Strengthen core academic support by investing in up-to-date instructional technology, equipment, libraries, and ongoing maintenance (page 13);
- Restore instructional budgets and attain adequate student-faculty ratios (page 15);
- Improve student mental health programs (page 15);
- Keep pace with inflation (page 16);
- Address the deferred maintenance and capital renewal needs to ensure that quality infrastructure is available to support quality teaching and research (page 16).
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Overview of the University Budget for Current Operations

As the University of California has thrived, so has the State of California. Economic prosperity, social mobility and cultural opportunity — all have been fueled by far-sighted investments in higher education. But to maintain California’s leadership role and to meet the changing needs of future generations, California must continue to invest, including in supporting the core budget of its world-class research university system.

The operating budget, totaling more than $18.1 billion, funds the University’s core mission responsibilities of teaching, research and public service, as well as a wide range of activities in support of these responsibilities, including teaching hospitals, the National Laboratories, University Extension, housing and dining services, and other functions.
In recent years other fund sources have helped to make up for declines in State support for UC. These other sources include revenue from student fees, which over the last 17 years have come to comprise a dramatically greater share of the total average expenditures for student instruction (see Display 3); UC General Funds; federal funds; teaching hospital revenue; gifts and endowments; and income from self-supporting enterprises. The University’s annual budget plan is based on the best estimates of funding available from each of these sources.

Yet State General Funds remain extremely critical, for they make it possible to attract funds from other sources. For example, for every State dollar specifically invested in research, UC leverages nearly $6 more from the federal government and other non-State sources. State funds also help attract significant private funding, with one example being the California Institutes for Science and Innovation, a unique funding partnership between the State, industry, and the University.

Increased funding for the University is vital if it is to meet its obligations to the people of California. This was the central focus and premise of the charge of the Long Range Guidance Team, which recently released its report, UC 2025: The Promise and Power of 10. The report, which is now helping to inform the work of the new Regents’ Committee on Long Range Planning, underscored two fundamental points:

First, it is impossible to separate California’s challenges from those facing the University. UC, in many respects, is an agent of change and transformation. But it, simultaneously, is subject to change occurring within and without the institution.

Second, four needs loom larger than all others, and are central in addressing the other challenges facing California. These include:

- California’s changing demographics;
- The crisis in K-12 education;
- California’s place in an increasingly global society;
- The growing financial challenges facing California in general and higher education in particular.
Summary of the University’s 2008-09 Budget Request

To meet its goals of reinvigorating its relationship with California and building its teaching and research core, the University’s 2008-09 budget plan includes new expenditures for compensation, including UC’s accelerated faculty salary plan; program growth, including additional enrollment; new research and public service initiatives, most critically to help address issues in K-12 education; and increases in important areas such as graduate student support and student mental health services.

Summary of Proposed Revenue. The University plans to fund these initiatives by achieving sufficient increases in revenue from State funds and non-State revenue totaling $378.2 million, and redirecting savings to be realized from restructuring and other efficiencies that are occurring as part of a major review of the Office of the President and campus functions.

The $378.2 million increase in revenue to support the budget from the sources described above is an increase of about 7.2%, when calculated on a base that includes programs funded from State and UC General Funds and student fees (Educational Fee, University Registration Fee, and the Fee for Selected Professional School Students).
Based on an estimated marginal cost of instruction rate of $11,300 per full-time equivalent student, the University is seeking $62.8 million in State funds, which will fund not only costs associated with faculty and other academic support needed for instructional programs, but also for operating and maintaining new space. Student fee revenue also supports instructional programs. It is estimated that the fee-funded portion of enrollment growth will be $39.3 million, of which $14.1 million will be set aside for financial aid.

The majority of these funds will be used to support general campus undergraduate and graduate enrollment growth. In addition, expansion of health sciences programs is planned as follows:

**Medicine.** A total of $1.8 million is needed to continue expansion of medical school enrollment through PRIME programs (PRograms In Medical Education), designed to attract and prepare more medical students to provide care to underserved populations in the state. In 2008-09, these programs will expand by 69 students, for a total of 147 students at all five campuses with medical schools – Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco.

**Nursing.** The University is continuing its four-year plan to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate nursing students by over 70% — from 823 enrolled students in 2005-06 to a total of roughly 1,440 by 2009-10 — to help the State address major shortages in nurses and nursing faculty. In addition to enrollment increases proposed in the four-year plan, further increases are now being planned for UC Davis and possibly other UC campuses. In 2008-09, the University plans to enroll an additional 100 undergraduate, 22 graduate academic, and 82 graduate professional nursing students. A total of $2.6 million of State enrollment growth funding will be dedicated to nursing enrollment.
Public Health. Beginning in 2008-09, the University is initiating a multi-year plan to expand enrollment in public health programs to address increasing demand due to new and emerging public health threats and demographic trends. In 2008-09, the University proposes to increase enrollments in the Berkeley and Los Angeles public health programs and begin new programs at Davis and Irvine for a total of 126 new professional degree students. State funding totaling $1.86 million is needed to support this new enrollment.

*Restoring Competitive Compensation for Academic and Staff Employees — $188.8 million.* Attracting and retaining quality faculty and staff to the University of California are critical to achieving its goal of building its teaching and research core.

Earlier cuts to the University’s budget have resulted in significant disparities in faculty and staff salaries as compared to the market. UC faculty salaries currently lag the market by about 9.6% and there is a similar problem with respect to staff salaries.

To achieve its goal of maintaining a market-based competitive compensation program for its employees,
the University’s budget plan for 2008-09 includes a compensation package of 5% for faculty and staff funded from State and UC General Funds and student fee income. Consistent with past practice, compensation increases for employees supported from other fund sources, including teaching hospital income, auxiliary enterprises, federal funds, and other sources, must be funded from those sources and must conform to the University’s established systemwide salary programs for State-funded employees.

The 5% compensation package proposed for 2008-09 includes the following elements:

- Continuation costs for salaries and health and welfare benefits that were provided in the previous year, but effective for only part of the year;
- Funding for merit salary increases for eligible employees;
- A cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) effective October 1 for eligible employees;
- Market-based and equity salary increases; and
- Health and welfare benefit cost increases.

Actual salary and benefit actions for University employees may be subject to notice, meeting-and-conferring, and/or consulting requirements for represented employees under the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA).

Closing the Faculty Salary Gap. In 2007-08, to better reflect the market, the University began implementing changes to raise faculty salary scales to be phased in over four years. Corresponding actual salaries for faculty who previously have been on-scale and therefore not market competitive are also being increased. In addition, all faculty will receive general range adjustments each year. These salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC Staff Salary Increase Funding</th>
<th>Market - Western Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Proposed/Estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancing Graduate Student Support

— $10.0 million. Graduate education and research at the University of California have long fueled California’s innovation and economic development, helping establish California as one of the ten largest economies in the world. This was acknowledged in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which charged the University with the responsibility to prepare graduate academic and professional students to help meet California’s and the nation’s workforce needs. However, over the last forty years, graduate enrollment has not kept pace with industry demands.

A key problem inhibiting growth in graduate enrollments is the availability of financial support for graduate students — to attract the best graduate students, the University must provide competitive financial support. The Regents have identified securing adequate support for graduate students as one of their highest priorities. Over the last two years, the University has added $30 million to graduate student support programs from within Compact and other funds. An additional $10 million is proposed for 2008-09.
Restoring Instructional Budgets — $10.0 million.

The Governor’s Budgets for both 2003-04 and 2004-05 proposed increases in the budgeted student-faculty ratio as part of the targeted budget reductions needed to help address the State’s fiscal crisis. In both years, the Regents established a high priority for maintaining quality, including avoiding any further deterioration in the student-faculty ratio, and campuses were asked to absorb unallocated reductions totaling $70 million over the two-year period.

Consistent with the high priority placed on maintaining quality in the instructional program and preventing further deterioration in the student-faculty ratio from that of the 1980s, the University’s budgets between 2005-06 and 2007-08 included increments of $10 million each toward a multi-year effort to recover some of the ground lost in the instructional program during the State’s fiscal crisis. The University proposes once again to include $10 million in the 2008-09 budget plan to continue to address this critical shortfall. With the funding provided in 2008-09, the University will have restored $40 million of the $70 million cut from the budget related to instructional programs.

Improving Student Mental Health — $8.0 million.

The growing number of students in distress and at risk makes enhancement of student mental health services an urgent University priority. Additional funds are needed to restore critical mental health services to fully respond to student needs, to implement targeted interventions through education, and take a comprehensive institutional approach to creating healthier learning environments. The University proposes to increase funding for student mental health services by an additional $8 million in 2008-09, for an increase over two years of $12.0 million.
The University of California has become nationally recognized as a leading institution in enrolling an economically diverse pool of undergraduate students. This accomplishment reflects the success of the University’s financial aid programs, which are guided by policy adopted by The Regents in 1994.

At the undergraduate level, the goal is to maintain the affordability of the University for all students so that financial considerations are not an obstacle to student decisions to seek and complete a University degree. At the graduate level, the policy calls upon the University to attract a diverse pool of highly qualified students by providing a competitive level of support relative to the cost of attending the University. This competitive context reflects the fact that graduate student enrollment is tied most directly to the University’s research mission and helps the State meets its academic and professional workforce needs.

### Display 10

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND PUBLIC COMPARISON INSTITUTION FEES**

2007-08 TOTAL STUDENT FEES *

The University’s average fees for 2007-08 for California resident undergraduate and graduate academic students remain well below the average of tuition and fees at the University’s four public comparison institutions. Even with recent fee increases, UC fees remain very competitive for resident undergraduates and resident graduate academic students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comparison Institutions</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Nonresident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Buffalo (SUNY)</td>
<td>$6,217</td>
<td>$12,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>$11,130</td>
<td>$25,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>$11,111</td>
<td>$32,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$8,690</td>
<td>$27,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$9,287</td>
<td>$24,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>$7,517</td>
<td>$27,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes mandatory systemwide fees and campus-based fees, and nonresident tuition for nonresident UC students. Also includes a waivable health insurance fee for UC graduate students.

**Student Financial Aid**

The University of California has become nationally recognized as a leading institution in enrolling an economically diverse pool of undergraduate students. This accomplishment reflects the success of the University’s financial aid programs, which are guided by policy adopted by The Regents in 1994.

At the undergraduate level, the goal is to maintain the affordability of the University for all students so that financial considerations are not an obstacle to student decisions to seek and complete a University degree. At the graduate level, the policy calls upon the University to attract a diverse pool of highly qualified students by providing a competitive level of support relative to the cost of attending the University. This competitive context reflects the fact that graduate student enrollment is tied most directly to the University’s research mission and helps the State meets its academic and professional workforce needs.
In 2006-07, over half (54%) of UC undergraduates received grant/scholarship aid averaging approximately $9,700 per student; 58% of graduate students received such aid averaging about $13,000 per student. The difference in average grant level is attributable primarily to the different purposes of undergraduate and graduate assistance: while undergraduate awards are sized to make the University accessible, graduate awards must be sized to make the University accessible and to be competitive with the awards that prospective students receive from other institutions.

To mitigate the impact of fee increases as well as increases in other educational expenses, the University has continued to use a portion of the revenue derived from student fee increases to support financial aid. Grant aid increased by 67% from nearly $800 million in 2002-03 to over $1.3 billion in 2007-08 with 44% of the growth funded from new fee revenue, an estimated 28% from the California Student Aid Commission programs, and the remaining in funds from federal, private, and other University sources.

To offset fee increases and maintain the promise of higher education for all Californians, both the University and the State have invested heavily in student financial support. Total gift aid is projected to exceed $1.3 million in 2007-08 – an average of almost $6,000 per student.
Despite fee increases, the University has remained accessible to undergraduate students from all income groups. Enrollments of low-income students at other research institutions range from below 10% to nearly 20%. The average at UC is over 30%, more than any other comparably selective institution. At UCLA alone, nearly 40% of undergraduates are low-income students.

The enrollment of students from middle-income families also has remained relatively stable. Over the past decade, despite fee increases, the percentage of middle-income students enrolled at the University has remained about 43%.

Financial aid also contributes greatly to the University's undergraduate diversity. African American, Chicano/Latino, and Asian American students are disproportionately low income; 35%, 41%, and 34%, respectively, of these students have parent incomes less than $40,000. Collectively, these students receive 69% of all undergraduate gift assistance.

For these reasons, maintaining a robust financial aid program for UC undergraduate and graduate students remains a top University budget priority.
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Summary of Outstanding Debt
Projected June 30 Balances
(in millions)

Current O/S
Gateway
FY08 Issuance
FY09 Issuance
FY10 Issuance
FY11 Issuance
FY12 Issuance
Reserve Capacity
FY13 Issuance

$700
$725
$814
$857
$896
$938
$964
$944

$406 M Reserve Capacity

2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
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Capital Request and Appropriation Summary
(FY00-FY03)

- FY00 Request: $0.8m NGF, $219.8m GF
- FY00 App’n: $0.8m NGF, $3.5m GF
- FY01 Request: $15.5m NGF, $226.4m GF
- FY01 App’n: $16.5m NGF, $69.4m GF
- FY02 Request: $32.6m NGF, $87.7m GF
- FY02 App’n: $37.0m NGF, $29.7m GF
- FY03 Request: $50.2m NGF, $221.8m GF
- FY03 App’n: $17.2m NGF, $19.4m Debt, $2.9m State, $61.7m GO Bond
Capital Appropriation Summary (FY90-FY03)

FY90-99 State funding $254,745.5
FY00-03 State funding $186,643.6
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## Capital Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Funding Sources</th>
<th>($Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated $40M/Yr. - Beyond FY 04/05</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Supported Borrowing</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Funding Carry Forward</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Sciences</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, Housing &amp; Food Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Supported Borrowing</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Economic Redevelopment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 26 -</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$945</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VETERINARY MEDICINE CENTER FOR COMPANION ANIMAL HEALTH

($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>581</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASF: 22,572
GSF: 38,426
Site: Health Sciences District
Construction: 9/02 to 2/04
Current Status: Completed

Project Description/Justification

This project constructed an addition to Veterinary Medicine 2 to house two activities: 1) an expanded Center for Companion Animal Health (CCAH) made up of a feline health unit, a canine health unit, and a veterinary cancer therapy unit and associated outpatient clinic (15,936 ASF); and 2) research space (8,075 ASF) for the CCAH and comparative genomics program. Comparative genomics research program facilities now consist of a suite of research laboratories, research support space, faculty, graduate student, and visiting scholar offices and administrative space. This project provides facilities for further development of the CCAH. The Companion Animal Physical Therapy Center was constructed in conjunction with the CCAH. It is located within Veterinary Medicine 2, and provides approximately 3,051 ASF of physical therapy rooms, offices, and storage.

Secondary Effects

The space previously occupied by the CCAH will be reassigned, with minor renovation, to the canine health unit.
**MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES BUILDING**

($000)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>ASF:</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>GSF:</td>
<td>64,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19,826</td>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Core Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction:</td>
<td>2/04 to 8/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Status:</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description/Justification**

This project will provide new faculty offices and administrative and teaching support for the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics, and a new campus initiative in Computational Sciences and Engineering (CSE). The Mathematical Sciences Building will replace inadequate open laboratory, office, computer, seminar, conference, and administrative support space for Mathematics and Statistics. The building will provide space for Computational Sciences and Engineering. The facility will include 19,000 ASF for Mathematics; 13,500 ASF for Statistics and the Statistics Laboratory; 4,000 ASF for Computational Sciences and Engineering, and 1,500 ASF of seminar space. The Davis campus is expected to grow in student population by approximately 17% from 2001 to 2006. A large proportion of this expected growth will occur in the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Division. Although UC Davis’ state funded capital program is anticipated to address some of the needs generated by the growth, state funding is inadequate to keep pace with planned enrollment increases. Based on California Post-secondary Education Commission (CPEC) space guidelines, the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics will have a space deficit of 13,340 ASF by 2005.

**Secondary Effects**

Released space in Kerr Hall will provide expansion space for the College of Letters and Sciences, which also has a projected shortfall of space in 2005-06 even with anticipated expansion space.
PARKING STRUCTURE III

$(000)

P  1,280  ASF:  TBD
W  1,217  GSF:  TBD
C  23,113  Site:  UCDMC

$25,610  Construction:  TBD

Current Status:  Planning

Project Description/Justification

The proposed project will provide an above ground parking structure with 1,500 parking stalls for patient, visitor and staff parking. The structure will be located in the current parking lot 4 area. It will serve future hospital patient and visitor needs and provide additional employee parking.
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Goals and Objectives

- Timeless architecture that conveys an experience of permanence and quality
- Projects that create an “identifiable place”
- Density management (through buildout)
- Reconcile scale vs. density dilemma
- Exemplary energy efficiency
- No major maintenance for twenty years
- On-time, on-budget
- Circulation and parking that reinforce campus design goals
- Most attractive research campus in U.S.
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Campus Design Objectives

- Take advantage of site, building and program opportunities to create and reinforce our identity
- Create bright, uplifting open spaces and buildings
- Focus on campus core for UC identity, and on surrounding site for healthcare identity
- Keep the campus integrated

III. Campus Vision
III. Campus Vision

GOALS

- Define land uses to support institutional goals
- Define vehicular and pedestrian routes and destinations
- Respect neighbors and minimize traffic impacts
- Promote campus stewardship and responsible land utilization
III. Campus Vision

GOALS

- Use landscape to reinforce circulation, way-finding and campus identity
- Establish the campus as a healing environment
- Use landscape materials for shade and climate protection
- Maintain a consistent use of plant materials, paving, furnishings, signage and lighting
Promote a vision of a state-of-the-art UC academic medical center

Maintain coherent architectural composition and forms

Consistent use of building materials and features

III. Campus Vision
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Campus Design Objectives

- Take advantage of site, building and program opportunities to create and reinforce our identity
- Create bright, uplifting open spaces and buildings
- Focus on campus core for UC identity, and on surrounding site for healthcare identity
- Keep the campus integrated

III. Campus Vision
III. Campus Vision

GOALS

- Define land uses to support institutional goals
- Define vehicular and pedestrian routes and destinations
- Respect neighbors and minimize traffic impacts
- Promote campus stewardship and responsible land utilization
STRUCTURED PARKING

Future Parking Structure

Future Parking Structures

Land Use / Circulation
Other potential building sites

Potential site for future research buildings

Land Use / Circulation
III. Campus Vision

GOALS

- Use landscape to reinforce circulation, way-finding and campus identity
- Establish the campus as a healing environment
- Use landscape materials for shade and climate protection
- Maintain a consistent use of plant materials, paving, furnishings, signage and lighting
Tree-lined sidewalks

Landscape/Open Space
COURTYARDS

Urban Wildlife Preserve

Patient Support Services Building Courtyard

North Wing Court

MIND Institute

Landscape / Open Space
Landscape / Open Space
CONSISTENT FURNISHINGS AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Landscape / Open Space
III. Campus Vision

GOALS

- Promote a vision of a state-of-the-art UC academic medical center
- Maintain coherent architectural composition and forms
- Consistent use of building materials and features

LAND USE / CIRCULATION
LANDSCAPE / OPEN SPACE
ARCHITECTURE / IDENTITY
CONSISTENT MATERIALS and FORMS

Architecture/Identity
MID-RISE / HIGH DENSITY

Ellison Ambulatory Care Center
PHYSICAL CONNECTIONS

Architecture/Identity
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New Century Plan and the LRDP

**Academic Plan:** Demand

- How much should the academic enterprise grow?
- How should this growth be distributed?
- What existing and potential synergies should we foster?
- What new academic initiatives should we anticipate?

**New Century Plan:** Supply

- How can the existing inventory be optimized?
- How can growth be accommodated on and around the core campus?
- How can new investment be directed to improve the campus image and the quality of campus life?

**Long Range Development Plan:** Action

- What is the campus’ investment program through 2020?
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UCI Irvine

UCI Review & Approval Process for Design & Planning Issues

1. Project Proposal
2. Campus Staff (Campus & Environmental Planning, Design & Construction Services, Facilities Management)
3. Design Review Team
4. Campus Physical & Environmental Committee

Academic Senate

- 38 -
UC Irvine

UCI REVIEW & APPROVAL PROCESS FOR DESIGN & PLANNING ISSUES

PROJECT PROPOSAL

CAMPUS STAFF
(CAMPUS & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING,
DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION SERVICES,
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT)

ACADEMIC SENATE

CONSULTING ARCHITECT

DESIGN REVIEW TEAM

CAMPUS PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE
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Project Approval Process

Concept
- Project Objectives
  - Strategic Review
    - Design Framework Review
      - ECPC Review
  - Design Guidelines Review
    - DRC/ECPC Review

Feasibility
- Program Concept
  - Options Analysis
    - Define Project
      - Project Guidelines Review
        - DRC/ECPC Review
  - Design Guidelines Review
    - DRC/ECPC Review

Program
- Project Program
  - Budget Schedule
    - Design Concept
      - Design Guidelines Review
        - DRC/ECPC Review
  - Design Guidelines Review
    - DRC/ECPC Review

Design
- Schematic Design
The New Century Plan prescribes a design framework and guidelines for the campus as a whole.

More specific guidelines are prescribed for certain areas:
- Classical core
- Places of interaction
- City interface

Project design guidelines are prepared for each major new construction and renovation project, to address:
- Local site conditions
- Local contextual relationships
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UC Irvine

UCI Landscape Zones
- Ring Mall/Radial Malls
- Academic Core Landscape
- Outer Campus—Residential Landscape
- Outer Campus—R&D Landscape
- Open Space—Recreation
- Open Space Corridors/Habitat Areas
- Streetscape

"GREEN AND GOLD" LANDSCAPE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
UCIrvine

Long Range Development Plan → Master Plan Studies/Design Guidelines → Project Implementation → Development Monitoring
Central Core:
- 343 acres
- Existing academic and support: 3.2 million GSF
- Targeted academic and support: 6.6 million GSF
- Capacity: 8.6 million GSF
UCIrvine

Key Issues:
❖ Managing density
❖ Human scale
❖ Cohesive campus environment
UCIrvine

Central Core, Existing Development
UCIrvine

[Map of the UC Irvine campus, showing the Central Core and Ultimate Development areas.]
UCIrvine

Central Core, Ultimate Development
UCIrvine

University of California, Irvine

Campus Entries
UCIrvine