# **CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE**

# Minutes of September 19, 2019 Meeting

#### **PRESENT**

Manu Agni Tara Cameron Ken Hall David Hickman

Jeff Kaplan (co-chair)

Joel Kapian (co-char Joel King Russ King Elizabeth Owen Keith Pezzoli Marlene Shaver Frank Silva Joel Watson Cristy Winter

# **ABSENT**

Adrian Borsa Neal Devaraj Ramona Ferreira Tal Golan

John Hughes

Charles Sprenger (co-chair)

Rand Steiger Andrea Tao David Traver

#### **CAMPUS PLANNING STAFF**

Petia Yanchulova

Robert Clossin Ginger Stout Todd Pitman Elyse Sanchez

#### **GUESTS/CONSULTANTS**

Walter Kanzler, Design Development Services Joel King, Design Development Services Steve Jackson, Facilities Management Matthew McCreary, Campus Planning Renato Nerida, UC San Diego Police Sean Parker, UCOP Michelle Perez, Sustainability

# **BUSINESS ITEM: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes from the August 15th, 2019 meeting were unanimously approved without further comment.

# **BUSINESS ITEM: SUSTAINABLE BUILDING POLICY UPDATE**

Michelle Perez introduced the presenting members of the Sustainable Buildings Policy & Guidelines Update (SBPG) core team, which includes Walt Kanzler, Sara McKinstry, Kimberly O'Connell, Sean Parker, Michelle Perez,

and Elyse Sanchez. With the campus undergoing tremendous growth, now is an optimal time to update policies regarding how the campus sustainably plans and constructs buildings. The campus is 68% developed with over 630 buildings totaling 15.7 million GSF, with another 3.3 million GSF under construction or approved. The University of California system has sustainable practice policies in 8 different areas: clean energy, procurement, water, carbon neutrality, zero waste, food, alternative transportation and Green Buildings. The Campus currently tracks energy use in buildings by space type and use. Blink is home to an energy dashboard by Vice Chancellor area. Investments in energy efficiency are ongoing.

Kanzler informed the Committee that the UC San Diego campus has over 30 recently constructed LEED silver or better certified Green Buildings. A newly developed Green Building class for Urban Studies and Planning students was created in partnership with the design of North Torrey Pines Living and Learning. Part of the 6+ month SBPG workgroup process has included creating of the following guidelines: inclusion of environmental and human health and wellness; guidance to choose the right design/build teams; training for key staff; incorporation of sustainability into contracts and real estate leases; metrics to measure progress; student learning opportunities; and periodic engagement of stakeholders. Various Campus entities and departments have been included in the SBPG workgroup sessions to provide feedback on the development of the policies and guidelines. Jeff Kaplan inquired if the VC area for Academic Affairs and for Health Sciences has been included, and it was explained outreach is ongoing. The SBPG planned to follow up with these VC areas.

Kanzler explained that three committee subgroups were formed for the SBPG. The first is a Policy & Standards group which examines what sustainability goals already exist and how the future campus buildings can work toward those goals. The recommendations of this committee include the following: LEED Gold or better for new construction; and pilot new rating systems such as WELL, FitWel, Living Building Challenge, TRUE, and ParkSmart. Kanzler explained these rating systems will be evaluated for pilot with upcoming large projects to see how well they work. The Committee discussed how the collected data will be distributed back to the user groups, and how these make the occupants' buildings more sustainable. Kanzler said that LEED programs have surveys and metrics that track building performance. Additionally, post occupancy evaluations could be performed by building occupants. The second subgroup is Metrics & Life Cycle Cost Analysis, which is tasked with creating metrics to measure progress towards meeting the policy goals. Current recommendations include: build upon existing energy, water and waste metrics; develop feedback for continuous improvement; and add new metrics for topics like pounds of waste per square foot of building space; operation and maintenance costs per square foot of building space; occupant satisfaction; and space utilization.

Sanchez presented the third subgroup for SBPG. The group is Real Estate and is tasked with incorporating sustainability requirements into real estate transactions. Recommendations include completing sustainability readiness questionnaires early in negotiations to create awareness, alignment, and assistance. SBPG members are also participating in UC-wide UC Green Building Working Groups that look to extend sustainability goals and policy requirements to real estate projects.

Expected benefits to the campus community include providing guidance and training that translate into healthier buildings that help promote faculty, staff, and student health and productivity. Additionally, building level information could help students with class projects and create research opportunities for students as part of the 'living laboratory' and can provide internship opportunities.

The next step of the SBPG team is to develop Sustainability Implementation Guidelines for the following:

- 1. Energy, water, and materials in new buildings
- 2. Minor and Major Renovations
- 3. Operations and Maintenance
- 4. Zero waste
- 5. Real Estate transactions
- 6. Metrics
- 7. Life Cycle Cost Analysis

Sanchez opened up the discussion to the Committee for comments. Jeff Kaplan inquired about the impact on the Health System, and it was explained they are creating their own goals. Kaplan encouraged the program to be shared with Facilities Management to keep systems in top shape, and Steve Jackson ensured FM will have ongoing training. Tara Cameron asked if tweaks to buildings are made once occupants enter, and Perez explained there is already a test case at ACTRI and it is currently performing well and is continually being tracked. Sanchez explained the guidelines will continue to evolve with new technologies and new standards. David Hickman asked if dorms are included in the standards and are LEED certified. Kanzler mentioned Future College is examining the standards and HDH is interested to work closely to incorporate the standards. Marlene Shaver inquired if vehicular recharging stations will be included in the policies to which Perez responded that is a goal and grants and funding for more are being requested. Robert Clossin asked if site planning is integrated within the policies and guidelines, and Sanchez mentioned this is already within the guidelines outline, and concepts such as like building orientation are already typical site planning considerations. Site planning will require coordination to ensure incorporation into the guidelines per Kanzler. Todd Pitman suggested the policies not ignore existing resource systems on a site, and asked to consider the best use of existing resources. Sanchez mentioned this coincides with first evaluating space utilization before proposing a new building. The Committee expressed interested in and is supportive of the SBPG developing further.

# INFORMATION ITEM: PEPPER CANYON AMPHITHEATER & PUBLIC REALM (Matthew McCreary)

Matthew McCreary presented the Pepper Canyon Amphitheater & Public Realm for information and potential site endorsement. The amphitheater would support the campus and the upcoming Pepper Canyon Neighborhood, and help create a live/learn/play campus, and be a part of the enhanced new entry and arrival experience from the Light Rail Trolley station. The planned location is at the north end of Pepper Canyon, between the under-construction Design & Innovation Building (DIB) on the east, Visual Arts building on the west, and Structural and Mechanical Engineering (SME) building to the north. Planned improvements at the 5 acre site include creating a pedestrian corridor along Lyman Lane which would be called Lyman Walk, from the LRT station to University Center.

The proposed amphitheater would have 1,500 fixed seats, and space for 3,000 people total. The project would include circulation improvements, restroom facilities, and a Stuart Art Collection piece would be incorporated into Lyman Walk.

The amphitheater would be located in the Academic Land Use per the 2018 Long Range Development Plan, aligns with the 1989 Master Plan, and aligns with the Pepper Canyon Neighborhood Planning Study (PCNPS). The PCNPS envisioned the area as a welcoming gateway to the campus with enhanced wayfinding, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and a community-like feel. McCreary reminded the Committee that the PCNPS had been presented to C/CPC three times previously.

Russ King walked the Committee through what the amphitheater site would entail, and explained the stage location at the southwest, permanent seating just in front of the stage, a pathway through the site from the southeast to the northwest corner of the site with the ability to place fencing during events to block access, restrooms, and a ticket office or vending location at the opening of the pathway. The project would include public realm improvements surrounding the new Design & Innovation Building as well.

Elizabeth Owen inquired if noise had been considered for daytime events for the surrounding academic buildings. Bryan Macias, the project manager, mentioned noise studies will be completed, and the speaker system of the amphitheater can be designed to direct the noise towards the attendees. Noise and vibration testing are part of the scope of the project during design. Robert Clossin said there are campus noise thresholds identified in the 2018 LRDP EIR, and the campus has a major events policy that would be followed. Studies would be conducted to ensure the speakers are calibrated to reflect their location on campus, within an area that has housing and research buildings nearby. Upcoming housing at Pepper Canyon West is also adjacent and will be designed for up to 1,400 beds for upper division undergraduate students.

The Committee questioned safety and security at the amphitheater, both during major events and on a day to day basis. Safety during the day to day needs to be considered due to proximity to the LRT and the potential concerns associated with non-campus affiliated visitors arriving via LRT. The Committee suggested having a plan in place to address security, and special attention should be placed during non-event times. Macias mentioned there is a fine balance between securing for events versus non-event times and the project team is working on solutions. Clossin discussed security at the LRT has been an ongoing consideration and the project will include cameras and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which is a multi-disciplinary approach for reducing crime through the built environment. Pitman said a challenge exists between creating a safe space while still allowing porosity through the space, and studies show that people will use a space more often if they feel safe within it.

Elizabeth Owen inquired about the public realm improvements on the east side of the LRT. Clossin said the near-term improvements will be associated with the LRT which will include access to nearby buses and shuttles. The improvements will need to consider the existing infrastructure and access points from the east side of the canyon. Joel King mentioned the buildings surrounding the amphitheater could be used as part of the event fencing, but the majority of the time there needs to be open pathways for connectivity and accessibility. Owen pointed out the desire line to the parking lot west of SME and asked about improvements at that location. That lot is a service yard and is not being considered as part of this project.

Tara Cameron pointed out the coastal fog that leaves everything damp, and wondered if this location falls within the fogs range. Owen pointed out students don't typically use Camp Snoopy lawn because it is wet, but do use Triton Steps in the mornings. The design team should be made aware of this.

Proximate parking for the amphitheater will be at Gilman Parking Structure, and it is anticipated that Pepper Canyon West Housing residents will not need cars due to their proximity to LRT and bus access.

The Committee endorsed the site.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ginger Stout Associate Planner