November 28, 2022

To: Gerry Bomotti  
Vice Chancellor for Planning, Budget & Administration

Jacqueline Norman  
Campus Architect & Associate Vice Chancellor

From: Sang-Hee Lee  
Chair, Riverside Division

RE: Consultation: Site Analysis - Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Facility (UTLF)

Dear Gerry and Jacqueline,

I write to provide comments regarding the subject item. During Executive Council’s November 22, 2022 meeting, members had no additional feedback to add to that provided by the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, Committee on Planning and Budgets, and the faculty executive committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences. Though solicited, comments were not received from the faculty executive committees for the Bourns College of Engineering or the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

Thank you for your continued partnership and time to comment on important matters for UC Riverside.

Sincerely,

Sang-Hee Lee
October 27, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee  
   Chair, Riverside Division

From: Linda Walling, Chair  
   Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: [Campus Review] (Consultation) Site Analysis - Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Facility (UTLF)

The Physical Resources & Planning (PRP) Committee discussed the proposal for the site of the new Undergraduate Teaching & Learning Facility (UTLF) provided by the UTLF Site Analysis Executive Summary at their October 18, 2022, meeting. The Committee discussed the advantages/disadvantages of the proposed UTLF location in Lot 19 and the proposed alternative sites.

The PRP Committee supports the Lot 19 location of the UTLF based on its relative proximity to CHASS, BCOE and CNAS, its access to all major utilities and the fact that the site is relatively flat. PRP concluded that the alternative sites had significant disadvantages in terms of ease access for students and faculty (the site west of MRB I) and disruption of a critical green space on the campus (Olmstead lawn). PRP also discussed another alternative location for UTLF (lot 9). The distance of Lot 9 to BCOE and CHASS is less optimal than Lot 19. It was also noted that this site might be used for future development of new greenhouses for CNAS in the future.

PRP recommends that the issues iterated below be seriously considered in the UTLF planning process.

1. As the UTLF is in a critical stage where programmatic function of the building is being decided, consultation with department chairs in CNAS, CHASS and BCOE should occur as soon as possible. This consultation should occur prior to the working group deliberations to assure that all teaching and learning needs are seriously considered in the next planning phase.

   • While college representatives are currently on the UTLF working group, it is unclear if these representatives understand the full needs of each of the colleges. PRP makes this statement based on the fact that the process that was used by each college to determine programmatic priorities is unknown to PRP. PRP provides a few examples of needs known to PRP committee members.

   • The need for new laboratories for introductory level courses in the life sciences and physical sciences is acute as many of these laboratories are in buildings greater than 60 years old and contemporary spaces are needed.
• There is need for shared laboratories in the life sciences to accommodate upper-
division undergraduate classes. Some classes are being taught in faculty laboratories,
which is disruptive to research programs, and others are in spaces that are not
designed for contemporary teaching and learning. Departments impacted include
Botany & Plant Sciences, Entomology, Microbiology & Plant Pathology, and
Nematology. Currently outdated department-“owned” spaces are being used; these
spaces were not designed for sharing as storage spaces are inadequate for
contemporary needs.

• There is a need for new dance studios that provide appropriate flooring and space.
From committee discussions with Jacqueline Norman, it is not clear if other studio
spaces to support Art or other creative activities will be proposed.

• As PRP does not have a representative from BCOE, it is not possible to highlight
their most acute teaching and learning needs and priorities. In addition, other needs of
CNAS and CHASS are not iterated here.

2. A discussion about the requisite support spaces and personnel needed to deliver
contemporary laboratory experiences for students in a location at significant distance
from CNAS needs serious consideration in the planning process.

• The proposed site for the new UTLF imposes significant challenges. Support spaces
will be needed for laboratory preparation and storage of equipment (i.e., microscopes)
and materials.

3. The current conclusion that Lot 19 is currently underutilized needs to be re-evaluated.
The campus is only now returning to its new “normal” and the underutilization of Lot
19 parking spaces needs to be rigorously re-evaluated.

• There is concern about eliminating parking spaces as the campus is expanding and
alternative spaces have not been proposed. Therefore, the committee would like to
know where the Lot 19 permit holders will be relocated, as parking is limited on the
campus.

• Some consultation with faculty and staff and documentation of Lot 19 utilization in
the fall 2022 would strengthen the decision to eliminate the red lot parking spaces.

4. The future transit center is adjacent to the proposed location of the new UTLF building.
The interaction of the two spaces should be thoroughly addressed in this planning
process.

• The future transit center may lighten the parking needs of the campus.

5. PRP would like to have an open communication channel and be informed about the
decisions made in the UTLF planning process.

• Gerry Bomotti (Vice Chancellor for Planning, Budget & Administration) and
Jacqueline Norman (Assistant Vice Chancellor and Campus Architect) are receptive
to PRP’s participation.

• PRP would welcome receipt of the minutes of the UTLF planning meetings.
• PRP is currently working with the Chair of the Senate (Sang-Hee Lee) to find a faculty member to represent PRP in these meetings.

In summary, PRP supports the Lot 19 location for the UTLF building and provides recommendations to ensure engagement of faculty in the UTLF planning process.
PLANNING & BUDGET

November 4, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Peter Atkinson, Chair
       Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: [Campus Review] Consultation: Site Analysis - Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Facility (UTLF)

Planning & Budget reviewed the ULTF proposal at their October 25, 2022 meeting and approved the proposed location of the UTLF building in parking lot 19 noting the size of the site and its proximity to relevant buildings of the colleges and schools along with the large campus theater and the HUB. The committee requested that consideration be given to a parking garage located beneath the building (noting that UCOP typically does not supply these funds as part of building projects) and that naming rights for both rooms within the building and the entire building itself be pursued as soon as feasible.
November 7, 2022

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: John Kim, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: [Campus Review] Consultation: Site Analysis - Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Facility (UTLF)

The CHASS Executive Committee (EC) met on October 27, 2022, to discuss the UTLF Building Proposal submitted by Planning, Design and Construction.

The EC strongly opposed the use of Lot 19 for the UTLF unless the severe problems of sewage odor on this site extending to the adjacent INTN and INTS Buildings are resolved. This problem sewage odor is due to the City of Riverside’s sewage main that runs through this area of campus. A map of this sewage main can be found here on the City of Riverside’s website.

Faculty, staff, and students have complained for years about this sewage odor in this area of campus, since at least the construction of the INTN and INTS Buildings. EC members whose offices are in INTN and INTS, or who teach in those buildings, noted that the sewage stench continues to be so strong as to cause severe headaches and nausea to the point of nearly vomiting. This situation is such an environmental hazard that the UTLF Building Proposal should not proceed until it is permanently resolved.

The question was also raised about how the classroom space in the UTLF Building will be allocated among the three colleges – CHASS, CNAS and BCOE – sharing this building. What will the mechanism be for deciding this allocation?
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
UTLF Site Analysis

INTRODUCTION

Planning, Design and Construction first began to examine the need for a classroom and class lab and/or studio building in 2019 due to the significant instructional seat shortage on campus, now over 4,718 seats\(^1\), and based on consistent reporting by the colleges (BCOE, CHASS, CNAS) that current space is inadequate both in quantity and quality,

The formal programming process was launched in January 2021. Early in this effort, Lot 19 emerged as a potential site because of its central adjacency to the users UTLF is proposed to serve and its presumed ease of constructability. Additionally, the site would achieve important LRDP goals related to densification of East Campus, as well as enhancing the campus’ visibility along University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive.

Based on these qualities, the PDC completed an analysis of Lot 19, as summarized below.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Programmatic Compatibility

The fundamental assumption upon which this site analysis is based is that the primary users of the proposed UTLF building will be Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE), College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS), and College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS) faculty. These colleges make up the vast majority of undergraduate enrollment at UCR, while also requiring a variety of specialized teaching spaces such as laboratories and studios. They presently deal with both space quantity and quality constraints that prevent them from meeting existing demand for lab courses; anticipated enrollment growth over the LRDP planning horizon (2035) will further intensify the strain. Their combined needs make a strong case for constructing a facility that will provide specialized spaces to meet pedagogical need and allow for enrollment growth in the three most populated colleges on campus.

In addition to its proximity to general-assignment classroom space in University Lecture Hall (UNLH) and Student Success Center (SSC), the Lot 19 site proposed for UTLF affords the following programmatic adjacencies for the colleges:

BCOE:
- Near Materials Science Engineering (MSE) building, which is used for undergraduate instruction and features several class labs

\(^1\) UCOP 2018 Analysis
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- Less than 5 min walk from the college’s home base in Bourns Hall.

CNAS

- Approximately 7-10 minute walk from existing class laboratory facilities in Physics, Pierce Hall / Science Lab 1, and Spieth / Life Sciences, making travel between building during class changes feasible

CHASS:

- Immediately adjacent to CHASS Interdisciplinary North & South, and Athletics & Dance, which are used for undergraduate instruction and feature class labs / studios
- Within a five-minute walk to other CHASS facilities with class lab and studio space, such as Arts and Watkins Hall

Constructability

The proposed site is currently used as Lot 19. Construction of the UTLF building would displace approximately 185 red permit spaces. However, Transportation and Parking Services has indicated that overall staff and faculty parking space utilization is significantly lower than pre-pandemic levels, which results in excess capacity. Further analysis is needed to ensure that displacing these spaces will not create undue parking challenges, but at this time PDC believes there is sufficient capacity such that users can easily be relocated to other lots.

A civil survey of the site was completed in 2017 confirming that the site is relatively flat (approximately 1% average slope East-West, and 1.7% North-South). This may afford some savings in site preparation costs. Additionally, the site has nearby access to all major utilities – electrical, domestic and chilled water, stormwater, and data/telecommunications. Capacity will be confirmed following site approval.

Environmental

This is a pre-disturbed infill site. PDC does not foresee any environmental concerns or limitations.

Planning & Design Considerations

The Lot 19 site is within the University Avenue Gateway land use designation of the 2021 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which emphasizes buildings in the 4-5 story range that engage the public and showcase campus priorities. Consequently, UTLF is considered a compatible use.

The site’s location near the intersection of University Ave and Canyon Crest Drive affords significant visibility and opportunity to create a clear “arrival” to this side of campus, as well as enhance the
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campus’ connection to the rest of the City—a goal of the LRDP.

Operational Considerations

The site is well served by parking nearby lots 22 and 1, which are both within a 5-minute walk. Disabled parking stalls are provided in both of these lots, however, the path of travel will need to be surveyed for compliance if it is determined that these parking stalls are to serve the site. Access to public transit is also conveniently located within a 5 minute walk—either at Bannockburn Village or on University / West Campus Drive intersection.

The site is served by existing emergency vehicle/service vehicle drive aisles accessed from North Campus Drive. How to balance service and delivery vehicle access with the future increased pedestrian circulation through these aisles as students travel to/from UTLF will warrant particular consideration during design.

Future Transit Center

Developing a bus transit center that would extend University Ave into campus and facilitate rider drop-off/pickup has long been a campus goal, although at this time it is unclear when funding for the project may become available. In anticipation of this project and in keeping with the vision for University Ave and Canyon Crest Drive, a landmark building of significant height and square footage, as well as suitable program is most appropriate for the Lot 19 site. Following site analysis, PDC concludes that UTLF presents the right opportunity to construct a building that will eventually become a highly visible gateway to the campus at the terminus of the anticipated transit center.

OTHER SITES CONSIDERED

PDC also examined the development potential of Olmsted Lawn and the undeveloped area immediately west of MRB. Although both sites can accommodate the assumed building footprint and offer relative ease of constructability, neither offer the same level of programmatic suitability as Lot 19. While Olmsted Lawn is within a 2.5 minute walk of existing CHASS and CNAS Labs, it is outside the 5 minute walking radius of most existing BCOE facilities. The vacant site east of MRB1 encounters similar trade-offs; it is close to existing BCOE facilities but further from CHASS facilities.

FINDINGS

This early analysis indicates that Lot 19 is a suitable site for the proposed UTLF building, with particular significance given to programmatic compatibility and design opportunities to advance the LRDP goals of placemaking, visibility/presence and connectivity.