

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), Division  
Council (DivCo), and VC for Planning and Budget Dan Feitelberg  
Minutes of Project 2020 Meeting  
February 12, 2015**

Attendees:

Professor Jian-Qiao Sun, Division Council Chair  
Professor Cristián Ricci, Division Council Vice Chair  
Professor Anne Kelley, CAPRA Chair  
Professor Kathleen Hull, GC Chair  
Professor Jack Vevea, UGC Chair  
Professor Patti LiWang, CoC Chair  
Professor David Noelle, COR Chair  
Professor Fanis Tsoulouhas, CAP member  
Professor Robin DeLugan, Division Council at-large member  
Professor Lin Tian, CRE Vice Chair  
Professor Tanya Golash-Boza, FWDAF Vice Chair  
Professor Marilyn Fogel, CAPRA member  
Professor Jan Wallander, CAPRA member  
Dan Feitelberg, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget  
Cindi Deegan, Executive Director of Business Services  
Abigail Rider, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Real Estate  
Steve Rabedaux, Director, Academic Facilities Planning  
Richard Cummings, Principal Planner  
Fatima Paul, Senate Assistant Director  
Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst  
Mayra Chavez-Franco, Senate Analyst

VP Feitelberg began the meeting by announcing that in December, Chancellor Leland and UC CFO Nathan Brostrom recommended moving forward with the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. Six teams submitted proposals and the campus has selected three teams for the Request for Proposals (RFP) phase. The teams are internationally-renowned, highly qualified, and look forward to meeting with campus stakeholders, including faculty, this spring. The dates of the RFP team meetings are

February 19, March 10, and March 12. The Regents will be informed before the final RFP is released.

CAPRA chair Kelley asked what the RFP teams will do with the input that faculty provide to them and what the purpose of these meetings is. VC Feitelberg responded that he needs faculty input on mixed-use development, including laboratory and instructional space. The teams want to know what is most important to the faculty and what flexibility is needed for academic space.

A CAPRA member asked if there will be subsequent points of input from the faculty. Director Rabedeaux replied that, as with the SE 2 building, there will be a programming phase where he will meet with the affected deans and faculty to discuss space details.

A Division Council member asked if the RFP will only be conceptual or will it contain designs. AVC Rider confirmed there will be schematic designs. VC Feitelberg stated that in fall 2013, there were a number of programming sessions in which faculty provided their input.

**ACTION:** AVC Rider will distribute the input from those sessions to Division Council and CAPRA members.

A CAPRA member inquired about the process for allocation across the different types of space and when that specification will be provided. VC Feitelberg replied that his office has worked with Provost/EVC Peterson during the strategic academic focusing process to complete projections on the types of faculty space that will be needed within the context of the planned, average 25 new faculty hires per year. VC Feitelberg has the assignable square footage for academic space; while he wants to meet the campus's macro needs, the campus also requires buildings that will be flexible and durable.

CAPRA chair Kelley pointed out that it would be useful for faculty to know what the RFP teams have already been told and what they were provided in terms of assignable square footage. VC Feitelberg responded that he can share what he provided the teams in the RFQ phase. He is finalizing the macro numbers for the RFP and those will be shared with faculty members.

**ACTION:** VC Feitelberg will distribute the macro data to Division Council and CAPRA members.

A Division Council member inquired about the timeline and associated milestones. VC Feitelberg acknowledged that the developers have two years to reach phase one. But he emphasized the importance of flexibility rather than mandating needs.

VC Feitelberg then began an overview of the Power Point presentation he delivered to the University Committee on Planning and Budget on February 3, and which the Chancellor will deliver to the Regents. (A CAPRA member pointed out that the slide that lists the thematic areas in conjunction with strategic academic focusing needs revision as one of the areas has split into two new ones. VC Feitelberg responded that he is aware of the split and will revise the presentation accordingly.) The presentation essentially provides the rationale for establishing UC Merced and for expanding the campus within the context of the 2020 project. Division Council members expressed concern that in the plan, assignable academic space per faculty member is substantially lower than at peer institutions.

CAPRA chair Kelley confirmed with VC Feitelberg that assignable square feet includes laboratory, office, and classroom space.

A CAPRA member asked if other UC campuses went through similar building phases and if they had to limit their growth. VC Feitelberg pointed out that other UC campuses had the benefit of state funding; the state used to fund academic facilities with lease revenue bonds and those universities also had the capacity to institute auxiliary buildings.

A Division Council member pointed out that other institutions have used naming rights as a revenue source. VC Feitelberg replied that he looks forward to an increase in philanthropy dollars and donor money will eventually be part of our model, however, at this time, we cannot assume donor funding.

Another Division Council member mentioned that when Project 2020 was first discussed, the plan was to build on the current campus footprint; however, the new plan appears to involve expanding the campus. VC Feitelberg confirmed that the expansion area will include 219 acres from Scholars Lane to Bellevue Road.

A Division Council member asked for an update on the status of the plan to build on the Le Grand parking lot. VC Feitelberg explained that a year ago, UCOP gathered a

list of building projects across the UC system to make a case for a General Obligation (GO) bond measure for the 2014 ballot. One of Merced's submitted requests was a research building on the site of the Le Grand lot. The GO bond did not materialize, however, nothing is "off the table". But, VC Feitelberg assured the faculty members that he is mindful that the Le Grand lot is a prime area.

VC Feitelberg highlighted the slide in his presentation that defined the "DBFOM" model: designing, building, financing, operations, and maintenance. These five components are included in all the capital projects the campus has undertaken by managing it ourselves but contracting with the private sector. VC Feitelberg is proposing to bring all five components into one contract. This special purpose entity (SPE) will manage the architecture firms and UC Merced would remain owners of the buildings. It is not a lease transaction. If the firms default, the campus would not have to pay.

In response to a Division Council member's inquiry about profit margins, VC Feitelberg stated that contracting with a SPE represents a 10-15% savings to the campus. The project is not entirely financed by the SPE and is subjected to negotiations from the Regents. Under [Assembly Bill 94](#), the campus would finance half of the facilities with a revenue bond and the campus is considering proposing a budget trailer bill. The assumption is that there will be three phases of the project with completion slated for 2024.

A CAPRA member expressed concern about the lack of appropriate consultation with the faculty and the fact that this Project 2020 plan is predicated on the strategic academic focusing proposals which faculty had to complete in a short period of time. Director Rabedaux responded that he received data from the Provost/EVC's office. The campus could not exceed the guidelines set by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). AVC Rider mentioned that there are mitigating factors surrounding the apparent lack of adequate academic space: the expanded campus needs to build amenities for students in order to attract a high quality student body. While the academic component of the project has received the most focus, planners must also take into account student needs. VC Feitelberg also pointed out that the project must take into account increased staffing numbers within the context of workforce planning.

VC Feitelberg confirmed that UC Merced is working with city and county partners in the campus expansion project.

CAPRA chair Kelley asked whether faculty members can alter the talking points outline provided by the administration as long as the same talking points are used in each RFP team meeting. VC Feitelberg agreed.

In response to faculty members' continued concerns about the usefulness of the numerous meetings they have previously attended to discuss space with teams of architects, VC Feitelberg reiterated that consistent dialogue is important and he would be willing to attend future Division Council or CAPRA meetings.

A Division Council member was concerned that the designs for space for certain disciplines may be not be interpreted correctly in the building phase. AVC Rider confirmed that each component of space is carefully monitored and the design teams have a plethora of experience with academic facilities.

Division Council chair Sun announced that Division Council and CAPRA will become more involved in the Five-Year Planning Perspectives document. The document includes UC Merced's requests for additional Schools.

**ACTION:** CAPRA Chair Kelley will distribute her suggested talking points, to be used in the RFP team meetings, to Division Council and CAPRA members. Committee members are asked to forward their comments to her for final compilation.