
Staff Present: C. Morrison, S. Paris.

- Chair Catherine Lucey emphasized that the members of the committee are serving both as users of CSB and as liaisons to their units/departments or Faculty Council/Faculty Senate, who should share information and obtain feedback so that programming issues for academic space reflect the broadest views possible. The Committee will send final recommendations to the Parnassus Heights Seismic Oversight committee for consideration no later than early November.
- The Parnassus Heights Long Range Renewal Plan calls for remediation of seismic risks at Parnassus, renovation of obsolete laboratory space in existing high-rise lab buildings, increase in housing and academic space and reduction of the space ceiling overage to less than 5% by 2035 (to address the 1976 Regents commitment to the community). The space ceiling will be reduced through a series of demolition of small buildings and conversions of other space to housing (which, except for Aldea housing, does not count against the space ceiling).
- UCSF’s Ten-Year Capital Plan allocates fixed capital resources. Capital resources must fund both capital and operating needs, and these expenditures are expected to be constrained given projected flat revenue and higher operating expenses. Fixed Budgets have been established for seismic projects though project scope and professional estimates.
- CSB and UCH are rated at a level VI and V respectively, per UC seismic ratings. Levels range from I-VII, with level I being the best rating.
- The decant, retrofit and renovation strategy for CSB and UCH is to vacate CSB first, with some offices moving temporarily to UCH, some offices moving permanently to other buildings at UCSF and all labs (including labs from UCH) moving to renovated space in HSIR and MSB, we will then vacate UCH office occupants to CSB once CSB is fully renovated. UCH would then be retrofitted and renovated for three floors of housing and three floors of academic work space, with potential conversion to housing in the future.

Questions and Answers

1) It’s not possible to raise the space ceiling limitations?
   Correct, the community/neighbors feel strongly that UCSF maintain the current space ceiling. They are concerned with parking, traffic and circulation, and believe that the space ceiling is a critical way in which these impacts can be contained. When UCSF
updates its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), the community is apprised of the status of the space ceiling overage, and they continue to voice interest in keeping the space ceiling at its current limit. The last LRDP update was in 1996 and UCSF committed to reducing the overage. UCSF demolished 735 Parnassus (check address) Avenue this year, and has plans to demolish an additional building this year, and two more small buildings as part of the seismic program over the next few years.

2) What types of housing are we considering and why doesn't it count against the space ceiling?
   We are considering student and trainee housing. When the Regents created the policy in 1976 it was thought that housing would serve as a buffer in the community as opposed to institutional uses, and that housing could mitigate traffic impacts related to commuters. By housing people near campus we help mitigate traffic concerns and have less of an impact on an already impacted rental market in the inner Sunset District.

3) How did the Stem Cell Building get built at Parnassus given the space ceiling implications?
   UCSF had promised to demolish UCH and several small buildings and the LRDP allowed for construction of up to 85,000 GSF as part of this plan. However, UCSF determined that demolition of UCH was not recommended because it would create a "hole" in the street wall along Parnassus (i.e. would interrupt the pattern of buildings along the street) and demolition would be very costly. By converting UCH to housing and office, UCSF can reduce the space ceiling, meet some of the very high demand for UCSF housing, and maintain the visual connection of buildings along the south side of Parnassus Avenue.

4) What impact does retaining CSB have on the space ceiling?
   The GSF of CSB will not change as a result of retrofit and renovation and thus will have no impact on the space ceiling. {CSB was not previously considered for demolition in the LRDP as it was only recently rated as Level VI.}

5) How do these seismic projects get funded?
   These projects are funded through a combination of Chancellor’s Fund and debt financing.

6) Where do the SFGH buildings fit into the seismic program?
   UCSF must vacate the space it occupies at SFGH that is seismically unsafe per UC policy. UCSF does not own this space; the buildings belong to the City/County of San Francisco. UCSF has proposed construction of its own building at SFGH to accommodate the UCSF programs that must vacate the seismically unsafe buildings.

7) Is there a difference between the city’s seismic tolerances vs. the Regents/UCSF?
   The City has different requirements than UCSF pertaining to when they must retrofit seismically poor buildings. They hope to have a bond measure in the next few years to
fund retrofit of some projects at SFGH. This bond measure would cover retrofit of Building 5 (the “old” hospital). A separate bond measure would be required to address the brick buildings. It is not clear when that would occur. It would be less costly and involved to retrofit Building 5 for outpatient uses, and that is why the City voted to build a new hospital. The inpatient facilities must meet a more stringent standard.

8) When were the budgets fixed for the CSB and UCH retrofit and renovation projects? These budgets were established in 2010 and are updated every year to account for escalation. If the project costs change significantly, it would affect the ability to implement other capital projects in the Ten-Year Capital Plan.

9) What will the work environment be like in CSB after renovation? Will it be over-crowded in order to accommodate the high demand for office space? This committee is charged with making recommendations on a work space layout that will be both efficient and meet faculty needs as well as the overall program needs. The hope is to find a solution that is both highly efficient and of high quality. A recommendation to the CEC regarding the layout approach is required by mid-November 2013.

10) Will there be funding for other related renovations? Funding is available for decant of CSB and UCH occupants and includes laboratory renovations in HSIR and MSB (HSIR 6, 7, 8 and MSB 2 and 8), a clinic relocation (MSB 7), and office-based program relocations (to various locations).