

9-24-2015

Long Range Campus Plan -Overview

David Seward

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.uchastings.edu/lrcp>

Recommended Citation

David Seward, *Long Range Campus Plan -Overview* (2015).
Available at: <https://repository.uchastings.edu/lrcp/32>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Hastings Archives and History at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Long Range Campus Planning Archive by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository.

Long Range Campus Planning 3.0 – Project Overview & Structure

The Long Range Campus Plan 3.0 (LRCP 3.0) committee continues the ongoing work of ensuring a viable and sustainable UC Hastings College of the Law. The information below includes the LRCP 3.0 committee’s charge and composition, a project description and timeline, and a list of the work groups designed to distribute the workload and provide substantive input to the main LRCP 3.0 committee.

A. Committee Charge

The LRCP 3.0 committee is responsible for offering advice and counsel to implement the UC Hastings Long Range Campus Plan (LRCP) developed through earlier processes. The committee’s primary task is to facilitate and support the development of the 333 Golden Gate academic building for policy level consideration by the Chancellor and Dean and Board of Directors.

As a framework, Chancellor and Dean Frank H. Wu established the following considerations to shape the committee’s work:

- Relocating functions currently housed at 198 McAllister (the original 1953 building) where the majority of teaching space is located, to the new facility at 333 Golden Gate, and future renovation of the 198 McAllister “Annex.”
- Optimizing design and construction to create the best possible learning environments for our students while balancing budgetary concerns.
- Ensuring sufficient student housing is provided in an affordable, safe, secure, code-compliant manner and also fosters a sense of community.
- Considering high priority deferred maintenance and other actions to protect capital assets.
- Studying potential opportunities to pursue development with appropriate partners.

B. Committee Composition

The committee’s portfolio is broad and will encompass activities that in their full breadth will take years to bring to fruition. The LRCP 3.0 committee is comprised of:

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--------------------|--|
| 1. | Prof. Evan Lee | Faculty | lee@uchastings.edu |
| 2. | Prof. Rory Little | Faculty | little@uchastings.edu |
| 3. | Prof. Osagie Obasogie | Faculty | obasogie@uchastings.edu |
| 4. | Prof. Nancy Stuart | Faculty | stuartn@uchastings.edu |
| 5. | Michael Stonebreaker | Staff | stonebreaker@uchastings.edu |
| 6. | Roslyn Foy | Staff | foyr@uchastings.edu |
| 7. | Oscar Teran | Staff | teranoscar@uchastings.edu |
| 8. | Chip Robertson | Board of Directors | chip@warland.com |

9. Mary Noel Pepys	Board of Directors	mnpepys@pepysinternational.com
10. James E. Mahoney	Board of Trustees	jmahoney@pszjlaw.com
11. Joan Cassman	Board of Trustees	jcassman@hansonbridgett.com
12. Vince Moita	ASUCH	vmoita@uchastings.edu
13. Nicholas Lansdown	ASUCH-Ex Officio	nicholas.lansdown@uchastings.edu
14. David Seward	Staff - Ex Officio	sewardd@uchastings.edu

C. Project Description – 333 Golden Gate Replacement Academic Building

The Budget Bill signed by the Governor contains an appropriation of \$36.8 million in lease revenue bond financing in support of the college’s capital plans for a replacement academic building at 333 Golden Gate. The State of California is to manage all aspects of the project except work associated with space programming and environmental review required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CEQA process will necessitate a review of “all foreseeable projects” flowing from the 333 Golden Gate structure; i.e., the future renovation of the 198 McAllister Annex, the development of new student housing at the site of 198 McAllister and the potential rehabilitation and structural upgrade of 100 McAllister.

The Department of General Services (DGS) will serve as project managers for 333 Golden Gate using a project delivery methodology involving:

- Selection of a Master Architect and Construction Manager to create a detailed specification (i.e., Design Guidelines and Performance Criteria) and oversee the design and construction of the facility.
- Design competition and selection of a Design/Build Contractor team responsible for delivering the project per the specification.

UC Hastings is responsible for near term deliverables including:

- Space Programming
- Environmental Reviews under CEQA
- Institutional Master Plan submittal and Community Outreach

As an instrumentality of the State of California and an affiliate of the UC System, UC Hastings is exempt from the City and County of San Francisco’s planning requirements, including its requirement for post-secondary institutions to prepare and submit for acceptance by the San Francisco Planning Commission, an Institutional Master Plan (IMP). Many of the elements of the college’s existing planning documentation (e.g., the Five Year Infrastructure Plan 2015-2020, etc.) include the criteria of an IMP such as consideration of San Francisco’s Comprehensive Plan, the impact of the LRCP’s development recommendations on the surrounding neighborhood, and methods of minimizing resulting impacts. As we have the substance of an IMP readily available, UC Hastings would prepare an IMP for courtesy review by the Planning Commission in the spirit of comity.

In order to initiate this process DGS has requested a comprehensive space program that articulates all of UC Hastings’ requirements for the building. These requirements include but are not limited to:

1. Space uses and room types
2. Square foot allocations by room/room type
3. Adjacencies (physical relationships of spaces/rooms)
4. Functional specifications (Specific attributes of rooms necessary for effective functioning)
5. Furnishings, fixtures, equipment (including technology, AV, etc.)
6. Prototypical room configurations
7. Other user-driven requirements

The resulting deliverable from this scope of work will be used by DGS to provide the selected Master Architect with UC Hastings’ requirements for the project. In order to ensure a smooth project delivery, DGS has requested that the programming process establish buy-in and commitment from the institution around its requirements. Without this buy-in and commitment, the project may encounter expensive delays and change orders caused by design changes during the design/build phase.

Functions and activities slated to be relocated to the replacement academic building at 333 Golden Gate or available space at Kane Hall:

Function/Department/Activity	Current Location
Classrooms and seminar rooms	Snodgrass Hall
Clinical Programs	Snodgrass Hall & McAllister Tower
LEOP	Snodgrass Hall (4 th floor)
Faculty Offices	Snodgrass Hall (2 nd , 2-M floor)
Fiscal Services, Human Resources	Snodgrass Hall (1 st floor)
General Counsel	Snodgrass Hall (1-M floor)
Student Organizations, Records Storage	Snodgrass Hall (Basement)
Student Lockers	Snodgrass Hall (Basement)
Safety & Security	Snodgrass Hall (Basement)

Additionally, the 333 Golden Gate project offers the College the opportunity to rationalize space allocations and assignments that have evolved organically over time and typically without the benefit of systemic planning. Should the opportunity present itself, benefits could arise by considering the relocation and consolidation of departments and functions currently located in less than optimal settings.

Function/Department/Activity	Current Location
Student Health Center	Kane Hall (2 nd floor)
Communications	McAllister Tower
Office of the CFO	McAllister Tower
Advancement & Alumni Functions	Kane (2 nd) & Snodgrass Hall (4 th)

Discussions with the Research Centers concerning space assignment are in process and ongoing. Thoughtful consideration will be given to their ultimate location. Similarly, it has recently been decided that the McAllister Tower setting for Scholarly Publication/Law Journal functions is most conducive to their operations. During the planning effort, it will be important to bear in mind that the Tower will require major capital investment that will render the building unavailable at some juncture and that opportunities to relocate functions from the building should be considered should the option arise.

D. Project Timeline

DGS is currently preparing a master schedule. The preliminary timeframe prepared by DGS is shown below:

- Advertising, selection, negotiations and contract execution for a Master Architect and Construction Management Consultant will take until approximately November 15, 2015.
- The Master Architect develops Design Guidelines and Performance Criteria based on not only UC Hastings requirements, but also site related CEQA requirements, which takes 8 months until July 31, 2016. Concurrently, DGS is advertising, shortlisting, interviewing and selecting the 3 Design-Build Teams which will enter into a Design Competition. CEQA is being completed.
- DOF and the Public Works Board approves the Design Guidelines and Performance Criteria on September 15, 2016. If necessary, it is DGS' plan that approval may be granted without the Final EIR being completed or a delay could occur here. However, the current schedule for certifying the Final EIR contemplates that it will be certified before this time.
- The three Design-Build Teams are in a competition from October 15, 2016 through January 31, 2017 developing conceptual drawings and project approach, management plans, schedules. Interviews are held in February 2017.
- Final negotiations with the selected Design-Build Team and execution of the Design-Build Agreement occurs March 2017 through May 30, 2017.
- Design-Build Phase proceeds June 2017 through December 31, 2019.

E. Space Programming and Planning Work Groups

To distribute workload and provide substantive input, a series of working groups are to be established to address the following project elements. Their initial focus will be to provide user input to the space programming process.

The workgroups would be led by representatives of the LRCP 3.0 steering committee and would be populated by users, interested parties and subject matter experts (e.g., CIO, classroom scheduler, etc.) and tasked with providing user data to feed into the College's space programming document for transmittal to DGS. The College has retained MKThink to manage, compile, and organize the school's space programming document.

Workgroup	Tasks
Teaching Spaces, educational technology and clinical and other academic programs	Provide programming input to identify core needs to support instructional programs. Assess optimal array of classroom sizes and types and base educational technology installations. Identify project enhancements that could be included subject to funding availability.
Administrative, student service and other miscellaneous functions	Provide programming input into core space needs for administrative and other functions slated for relocation.
Community space, greening, and sustainability initiatives	Provide programming input to achieve sustainability objectives (e.g., energy and water conservation), community space (e.g. “campus heart” and greening), terracing, roof decks, green roofs, etc.). Develop approaches to minimize carbon footprint. Identify project enhancements subject to funding availability.
External relations and alumni engagement	Support external, fundraising and community relations efforts, particularly for CEQA process. Assist fundraising by identifying naming opportunities. Collate and organize project enhancements identified by other work groups.

F. Student Housing Development

Discussions with University of California San Francisco are underway regarding the possibility of joint feasibility review for a new student housing facility at 198 McAllister and potential upgrade of the McAllister Tower at 100 McAllister. Given the preliminary nature of these discussions, the LRCP 3.0 steering committee is the most appropriate vehicle for formulating recommendations to the Chancellor and Dean and Board of Directors. It is highly recommended that the feasibility review for student housing development and upgrading occur concurrently with planning for the 333 Golden Gate building.

G. LRCP 3.0 Committee – Communications

For the project to be successful, an effective communications plan needs to be developed. This would be done under the leadership of Alex A.G. Shapiro in consultation with the Chief Information Officer currently under recruitment.

Thank you for your commitment to UC Hastings.