

CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 18, 2019 Meeting

PRESENT

Adrian Borsa
Tara Cameron
Ramona Ferreira
John Hughes
Jeff Kaplan (co-chair)
Russ King
Marlene Shaver
Frank Silva
Joel Watson
Cristy Winter

ABSENT

Neal Devaraj
Tal Golan
Ken Hall
David Hickman
Noah Palafox
Charles Sprenger (co-chair)
Rand Steiger
Andrea Tao
David Traver

CAMPUS PLANNING STAFF

Robert Clossin
Matthew McCreary
Ginger Stout

GUESTS/CONSULTANTS

Dennis Brown, Capital Program Management
Nicole Cheng, Capital Program Management
Walt Kanzler, Design and Development Services
Joel King, Design and Development Services

Business Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the February 21st, 2019 meeting were unanimously approved without further comment.

Information Item: Future College Living and Learning Neighborhood (Ginger Stout)

Ginger Stout presented the Future College Living and Learning Neighborhood (FCLLN) site evaluation for information and potential site approval. Resource Management and Planning is requesting site approval for an approximately 11-acre mixed-use development to accommodate student housing, academic and administrative space. There is a current shortage of on-campus housing and an extensive wait list for students. FCLLN would help achieve the 2018 Long Range Development Plan's (LRDP) goal of housing up to 65% of eligible students by providing approximately 2,000 beds. FCLLN would include an additional square footage for college and administration space, retail, classrooms, and a warehouse, a maintenance shop and conference rooms for housing and dining. In addition, FCLLN would provide approximately 1,200 underground parking spaces, realign the campus loop road (Scholars Drive South), and provide programmable open space and improved connections along Ridge Walk.

Stout introduced the proposed undergraduate housing summary and the overall undergraduate housing plan for UC San Diego. Marlene Shaver asked what will happen to the existing transfer housing. Robert Clossin answered that the transfer housing will become Seventh College. Future housing plans include providing transfer and upper division housing in locations like Pepper Canyon West housing and Rita Atkinson Apartments.

The project is consistent with the 1989 Master Plan, the South Gateway Planning Study and is within the Housing land use designation within the 2018 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). Although the project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, it is not within the Coastal Zone and would not require review for conformance with the California Coastal Act. Stout listed potential environmental considerations that include visual quality, air quality, hydrology and water quality, emergency services, and traffic and circulation.

Stout provided the project site location, existing conditions and the surrounding area's context. The 2018 LRDP's Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identified roughly 100' from the campus boundary as a Perimeter Development Zone (PDZ). This project site falls within the PDZ. The PDZ identifies areas along the western and southern borders of West Campus where future development would be most visible to the surrounding community and special consideration should be given to building placement, architecture and massing, and landscaping to help preserve or enhance the scenic resources. Joel King asked to provide the 2018 LRDP's community planning goals to the Capital Program Management (CPM) project manager assigned to FCLLN. Stout explained that she provided the information but will provide it again for reference.

Adrian Borsa inquired if adjusting the loop road will impact the Historic Grove. Stout explained it is not the intent to impact the Historic Grove but Campus Planning will not know potential impacts until receiving the first concept plan.

Joel Watson is concerned about tree removals required for the FCLLN and asked if a replacement policy exists for trees not protected within the Open Space Preserve. Clossin explained that a replacement policy does not exist but the project would add trees, vegetation and open space within FCLLN.

Jeff Kaplan asked how to address the loss of the existing basketball courts. The courts are currently identified as rec space and act as a stormwater basin. Stout answered FCLLN would provide rec space but the design may not prescribe basketball. It is also not know yet if the existing basketball courts would be displaced by the project.

Joel Watson asked about the project's process. Stout explained a Building Advisory Committee (BAC) has been formed and the BAC kickoff meeting has been completed. CPM is currently completing the Request for Proposals process before interviewing design teams and making a final selection. The design team is anticipated to be selected by early June.

A concept design will be presented to the Committee at a future date. The neighborhood is anticipated to open 2023.

The Committee endorsed the site with the understanding that pre-design direction will include protecting the Historic Grove.

Information Item: Chiller Plant Expansion (Chiller Addition) (Matthew McCreary)

Matthew McCreary presented the site evaluation of an approximately 52,000 SF chiller addition to the Central Utility Plant (CUP). The addition would include space for up to five chillers, five cooling towers, one thermal energy storage (TES) tank, and associated equipment.

The campus' expected population and development growth will necessitate an expansion to the CUP as the existing plant reaches cooling load capacity in the next 2-3 years. McCreary explained the three alternatives to an expansion at the existing site: 1. Replace and upsize the existing CUP, but due to limited space there is not sufficient room to install increased capacity chillers; 2. Install 12 portable chillers, which would require additional staff, would be an interim solution only, and comes with excessive cost; or 3. Identify an alternative location for a new chiller plant. The three alternatives were identified but each rejected due to cost, necessity of an LRDP amendment, coastal/environmental permitting requirements, and/or additional staff required.

The proposed project site is located west of the existing CUP, just south of York Hall and east of Galbraith Hall. The Revelle College Provost Office would require relocation and removal and would need to be timed so as to not happen during the academic year. Up to 13,000 of Historic Grove may be impacted, but this is dependent on the future design. No-net loss and the 2:1 tree replacement policies would be applicable in the Historic Grove. The projects construction would be phased over time with two chillers, chilling towers and related equipment initially installed, and additional equipment added over time. The proposed building footprint may shift due to underground utility conflicts on the north side. The site constraints and considerations include the proximity to the Open Space Preserve, the Stuart Art Collection, and the Provost Office. Noise impacts will be studied as part of the siting and design process and appropriate mitigation identified that would be a requirement of the project to implement.

The project is consistent with the 2018 LRDP "General Services" land use, and no additional parking would be required.

The Request for Proposals went out last week and a consultant team should be on board by mid-May. Access to the site will remain from Scholars Drive South and would remain shared access. The project design and access road will be reviewed by the Fire Marshal.

Tara Cameron asked about the existing noise levels of the CUP. McCreary answered that the project would include a noise inventory and analysis. Crossin stated that the final design cannot exceed the noise levels listed in the 2018 LRDP EIR, and would have to mitigate for noise levels exceeding the EIR requirements.

Joel Watson inquired about the requirements of the chiller equipment, specifically height and width, and if it is possible to build vertically (i.e., stack equipment) instead of horizontally. McCreary answered that building vertically would be difficult and requires a firm and flat foundation, but that the design team would assess building stacking to best utilize the site. Nicole Cheng, Capital Program Management (CPM) project manager, stated the Thermal Energy Storage (TES) Tank needs to be installed at the same elevation as the existing CUP's TES.

Adrian Borsa asked if the existing CUP can expand directly to the west. Cheng answered that the consultant will look at various alternatives and provide concept designs based on this Committee's concerns and input. Borsa suggested realigning Herbert York Lane (i.e., the existing access to the CUP). McCreary explained the difficulties

with moving the road, specifically the existing grades slope toward Scholars Drive, Herbert York Lane is the only access point to the CUP and realigning the road would impact the Historic Grove. Cheng explained that CPM has not selected a consultant nor received a concept plan to review, but that those design options would be further developed once a team is on-board.

Cameron inquired if an additional expansion will be required in the future. Cheng explained that the proposed expansion will provide an additional 15,000 tons of chiller capacity, which will meet the future loads estimated in the 2018 LRDP (up to 2035).

Ken Hall expressed concerned with removing the existing Revelle Provost Building and the timing of the chiller's construction. Cheng stated construction needs to finish by June 2022 to handle loads that will be coming online. To meet the deadline, Cheng explained construction needs to begin by December 2020, which would require moving the Provost office by August 2020 (before the fall quarter). Clossin explained Campus Planning in collaboration with Academic Affairs is reviewing options.

John Hughes understands the difficulties in defining the project boundary. Clossin explained that CPM and Campus Planning studied many sites on campus, and that the site presented is the best location. Clossin continued by stating it is best to maintain a flexible project boundary until a consultant is hired.

Watson expressed concerned about tree removals required for the expansion and asked if a replacement policy exists for trees not protected within the Open Space Preserve. Clossin explained that a replacement policy does not exist but the intent is to add trees and vegetation to help mitigate noise and visual impacts. Watson asked what the site's land use is currently designated. McCreary explained that per the 2018 LRDP, the land use designation is General Services, consistent with the CUP. Clossin explained that the LRDP land use plan was reviewed several times by C/CPC, and has been completed and approved.

Jeff Kaplan suggested increasing the project boundary to incorporate the existing CUP so that all siting options can be considered, adding a cross section of the site to help visualize the topography and providing a mitigation plan for the Revelle Provost building.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ginger Stout". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ginger Stout
Associate Planner