University of California, Riverside East Campus Entrance Area Study



THOMAS HACKER ARCHITECTS INC.

WALKER•MACV



University of California, Riverside East Campus Entrance Area Study

January, 2004

Prepared for the University of Riverside, California Academic Planning and Budget Capital and Physical Planning

Walker Macy

Landscape Architects and Planners 111 SW Oak Street, Suite 200 Portland, Oregon 97204 www.walkermacy.com

Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc.

733 SW Oak Street, Suite 100 Portland, Oregon 97205 www.thomashacker.com

UCR Project Management Team

Nita Bullock, Project Manager & Campus Physical Planner, Capital and Physical Planning Tim Ralston, Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Capital and Physical Planning Tricia Thrasher, Principal Environmental Project Manager, Office of Design and Construction

East Entrance Area Study Planning Committee

Richard Block, Chair, Academic Senate Physical Resources Planning Committee
Liam Corley, President, Graduate Student Association
Kyle Hoffman, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Alumni and Constituent Relations
Gavriel Kullman, Vice President of Campus Internal Affairs, Associated Students of UCR
Robert Nava, Interim Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Patricia O'Brien, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences
Andy Plumley, Director of Housing
Dennis Rice, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering
Nadine Sayegh, President, Associated Students of UCR
Jim Sandoval, Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
Satish Tripathi, Dean, Bourns College of Engineering

Consultant Team

Walker Macy (Portland, Oregon)
Doug Macy, Principal
Melinda Graham, Project Manager
Ken Pirie
Lisa Town
Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc. (Portland, Oregon)
Thomas Hacker, Principal
Will Dann, Principal

Contents

Section 1: Executive Summary

	Study Overview	.1
	Plan Concept	.2
S	ection 2: Introduction	
		_

East Campus Entrance Area Study	. 5
Process	. 6
Planning Efforts	. 7

Section 3: Existing Conditions

Site and Program Review	
Physical Site	
Access and Circulation	
Utilities	
Open Space Framework	
Planning Context	

Section 4: Program Analysis

Program	Analy	/\$15		
Program	Assu	mptions		
Section	5:	Area	Plan	

Key Determinants	
Area Plan Concept	
A Walk Through the Future	
Area Plan Districts	
Connectivity	
Campus Approach	

Section 6: Phasing

Phase I	
Phase II	
Phase III	
Future Growth	

Appendix A	
Meeting Minutes5	3
Appendix B	
Detailed Program Assumptions7	9
Appendix C	
Costs	7
Appendix D	
University Avenue Fly By9	
Canyon Crest Drive Fly By9	
North Campus Drive Fly By9	5
Carillon Mall Fly By9	7

Section One: Executive Summary



Study Overview

The University of California, Riverside is projecting unprecedented growth in student enrollment in the next decade. To assure that there will be an adequate land base to support that growth, the campus is in the process of updating the 1990 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), which has served to guide campus growth effectively to date, but does not anticipate the increases in enrollment that UCR now foresees.

An important component of the LRDP update will be the future development of the formal entrance to the East Campus, which is located in the area of the intersection of University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive. The draft 2003 LRDP identifies this largely undeveloped area of land as the potential site for several public oriented uses such as a Performing Arts Center, an Alumni and Visitor's Center, a Museum and Art Gallery and parking structures, to serve these public functions and campus commuters.

Since the current Athletic Fields located in the study area are not a "highest and best use" of land so close to the landconstrained core campus, this area has been included within the 'Academic Core' for the LRDP update. This dictates that numerous future academic buildings will need to be located here as well.

With direction from the draft 2003 LRDP, the East Campus Entrance Area Study (ECEAS) was launched by UCR staff in Spring of 2003. The study's intent was to create a development plan and funding strategy for the campus entry which articulates a series of goals found in the LRDP draft.

The overarching purpose of the Area Study is to provide a flexible long-range planning tool that updates previous master planning efforts, incorporates current planning guidelines, and reflects stakeholder and community concerns.

The following are some of the key Project Needs established at the outset of the project to highlight important elements for consideration in creating a new East Campus Entrance Area:

- Identify sites for known as well as projected uses to be studied to ensure appropriate placement;
- Determine how the campus circulation system would access and service the facilities;
- Retain views of the Box Springs Mountains wherever appropriate;
- Ensure that the entry to the campus conveys a unique sense of place for the campus.

The East Campus Entrance Area Study (ECEAS) included a public involvement process to ensure that the concerns and insights of community organizations, leaders, neighbors, city staff, and transportation agencies were integrated with campus objectives. A series of stakeholder interviews and a public open-house were conducted to solicit campus and community feedback.

A clear, hierarchical review process was utilized throughout the East Campus Entrance Area Study process. This process was guided by a core Project Management Team (PMT), consisting of key UCR staff from Capital and Physical Planning and the Office of Design and Construction.

Executive Vice Chancellor David Warren appointed an East Campus Entrance Area Study Planning Committee made up of stakeholders in this important area of the campus:

- Patricia O'Brien (Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences)
- Satish Tripathi (Dean of the Bourns College of Engineering)

- Robert Nava (Interim Vice Chancellor, University Advancement)
- Andy Plumley (Director of Housing Services)
- Richard Block (Chair of the Academic Senate Physical Resources Committee)
- Representatives from Associated Students of UCR and the Graduate Students Association.

This Committee was charged with an active advisory role, providing the consultant team and the PMT with critical feedback and guidance throughout the planning process. With the addition of Jim Sandoval (Vice Chancellor, Sudent Affairs), Kyle Hoffman (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Alumni and Constituent Relations) and Dennis Rice (Assistant Dean, Bourns College of Engineering) the committee worked with the Project Management Team and the consultants to develop the East Campus Entrance Area Study and the future development scheme for the area.



Executive Summary

Plan Concept

As the alternatives were generated and reviewed by the Planning Committee, they were then presented to the UCR Design Review Board (DRB) and at a series of Capital Programs Advisory Committee (CPAC) meetings. These meetings served to obtain authoritative approval for the direction of the Study, and to request major decisions from campus leadership.

The following page illustrates the final concept that was approved as the preferred East Campus Entrance Area Plan. The Plan reinforces a clear campus identity and creates positive connections to the city through an enhanced campus approach sequence. An array of arts-related venues welcome visitors, creating a place at the heart of the plan that fosters campuscommunity interaction.

Long viewed as the "front door" for visitors to UCR, the campus approach traveling east along University Avenue is enhanced via the ECEAS plan through the placement of signage, entry monuments, street furnishings and plantings, creating a sense of continuity and highlighting decision-making points. A roundabout at the east end of University Avenue serves as a ceremonial terminus for the approach, providing a visual focal point before the road swings north, continuing as Canyon Crest Drive. The ECEAS repeats these street improvements along Canyon Crest Drive ensuring the same level of wayfinding clarity, continuity and sense of place.

At the heart of the ECEAS, an Arts Plaza serves as a 'welcome mat' for the university and capitalizes on the adjacent art venues to create a space that emphasizes campus-community interaction. In its position at a crossroads on campus, the generous plaza accommodates the overspill of visitors attending evening performances, large-scale campus community gatherings, and small outdoor study groups, as well as the buzzing movement of daily academic life. Looking east over the Arts Plaza toward the Box Springs Mountains, visitors see glimpses of the powerful arroyo system that drains the range beyond. The ECEAS respects this strong natural feature by creating an open space framework to organize future development and protect the drainage pattern, starting at The Glade area east of Aberdeen Drive, through the Athletic Fields, under Canyon Crest Drive and terminating in the Gage Basin. As the existing arroyo emerges west of Canyon Crest Drive, buildings are located along its perimeter, protecting the integrity of the naturalized channel while capitalizing on its unique visual character as a southern Californian riparian system.

The East Campus Entrance Area Study captures the current values of the campus community in its articulation of identity, promotion of campus-community relationships, and emphasis on environmental respect and stewardship. The ECEAS respects the unique natural characteristics found within this area of the campus, while simultaneously creating a series of development sites necessary to support a sense of campus pride and civic vitality for UC Riverside.



Executive Summary



University of California Riverside

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Executive Summary



Section Two: Introduction



East Campus Entrance Area Study

Building upon the extensive planning work to date, the East Campus Entrance Area Study refines planning efforts related to the University of California Riverside (UCR) campus entrance, focusing primarily on the intersection of University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive and immediately surrounding areas (*Figure 2.1*). This area, mostly undeveloped for the almost fifty year history of UCR's general campus, has been identified by the draft 2003 UCR Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) as the formal entrance to the campus.

The draft LRDP anticipates 25,000 students in the year 2015 and the need for an increased density on the highlydeveloped East Campus (588.5 acres east of I-215/SR-60) and the development of housing and professional level academic uses on the mainly undeveloped West Campus (523.6 acres west of I-215/SR-60). In addition to the increase in student enrollment and the need to increase building density, the ECEAS was further prompted by the desire to strengthen connections between the UCR campus and the City of Riverside, both through the enhancement of physical connections, and through the introduction of a diversity of community interface programs at the East Campus's "front door". The overarching purpose of the Area Study is to provide a flexible long-range planning tool that updates previous master planning efforts, incorporates current planning guidelines, and reflects stakeholder and community concerns.

The following are Project Goals established at the outset of the project to highlight important elements for consideration in creating a new East Campus Entrance Area:

- Develop a unique "sense of place" for the East Campus Entrance Area
- Clarify circulation and signage
- Emphasize the University-Community interface

- Place public-oriented facilities at the campus "Front Door"
- Emphasize the East-West Campus connection
- Support redevelopment of University Avenue as a "Main Street" with mixed-use and an active pedestrian environment
- Enhance open space opportunities within the East Campus Entrance Area: malls, courtyards, plazas, gathering spaces

In developing the goals for the East Campus Entrance Area Study, UCR also identified the following programs assumed to be accommodated within the study area:

- Alumni and Visitors Center
- Campus Museum and Art Gallery
- Recital Hall (350-400 seats)
- Performing Arts Center (1,000 plus seats, changed to 2,000 during the course of the study)

- Parking Structures (2)
- Student Academic Support Services Building (SASS)
- Bourns College of Engineering Expansion (BCOE)
- College of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences Instruction and Research Facility (CHASS I&R)
- CHASS I&R Expansion Opportunities
- Materials Science and Engineering Building (MS&E-relocated during course of this study)

The following significant existing elements within the area were also taken into consideration:

- Carillon Mall
- Arts Mall
- Physical Education Building
- Watkins House
- Bannockburn Student Housing
- Arts Building



Figure 2.1: East Campus Aerial Photo and project boundaries.

Process

In keeping with the planning objective of reinforcing the campus-community interface, the East Campus Entrance Area Study (ECEAS) began with a campus and community involvement process to ensure that the concerns and insights of community organizations, leaders, neighbors, city staff, and transportation agencies were integrated with campus objectives. A series of stakeholder interviews and a public open-house were conducted to solicit campus and community feedback.

This feedback was then introduced, along with the initial Area Study goals, as a starting point for a series of interactive committee meetings. A clear, hierarchical review process was utilized throughout the East Campus Entrance Area Study process. This process was guided by a core Project Management Team (PMT), consisting of key UCR staff from Capital and Physical Planning and the Office of Design and Construction. Regular phone conferences were conducted between the consultant team and the PMT at critical points throughout the process to ensure continuity.

A project committee was established to guide the development of the Area Study. This East Campus Entrance Area Study Planning Committee was comprised of UCR faculty, staff and students and sought to incorporate stakeholders of proposed facilities within the study area as well as a diversity of additional campus voices in the process. This Committee was charged with an active advisory role, providing the consultant team and the PMT with critical feedback and guidance throughout the planning process.

As the alternatives were generated and reviewed by the Planning Committee, they were then presented to the UCR Design Review Board (DRB). The DRB's mission is to provide professional advice to consultant teams and planning/building committees, from respected peers in the field of architecture, landscape architecture and planning, and to ensure that such advice contributes to the development of a cohesive vision for UCR. The DRB met twice to review the ECEAS and provided critical input into design direction (see Appendix A for a complete listing of project Meeting Minutes).

The final level of review from UCR leadership came from a series of three Capital Programs Advisory Committee (CPAC) meetings. These meetings served to obtain authoritative approval for the direction of the Study, and to request major decisions from campus leadership.

This iterative process, in which Committee recommendations were reviewed by the DRB, with feedback then forwarded to CPAC for final review, ensured a process of inclusion and accountability throughout the planning process. This interactive process resulted in numerous unique and invaluable insights that critically shaped the final East Campus Entrance plan concept.



Planning Efforts

One of ten campuses in the renowned University of California system, this rapidly growing campus takes much of its character from the rugged beauty that surrounds it and from the city and people that shaped it. Situated 60 miles east of Los Angeles, the University of California, Riverside lies in the heart of the semi-arid "Inland Empire" region of southern California.

Campus Growth

"Because of its impending growth and the resources associated with that growth, UCR is in a unique position to make dramatic changes during the first decade of the 21st century, changes that can propel it to a position of leadership among American research universities".

(Vision 2010 Planning Outcomes)

Within its 1,112 acre campus, the University of California Riverside currently educates approximately 17,000 (Fall 2003) undergraduate and graduate students. With recent annual enrollment increases as high as 9% (Fall 2001), UCR ranks as one of the fastest growing campuses in the nation. Corresponding increases in faculty positions (up 11% from 2000-2001) and total campus assignable square footage (up 7.5% from 2000-2001) are further evidence of an exuberant campus growth cycle. With an estimated enrollment of 25,000 students by 2015, the University is faced with the need to expand the academic facilities, housing, athletic fields, and infrastructure systems that support this enrollment growth. Not only must continued development provide adequate facilities to accommodate this growth, it must also direct expansion in an orderly manner that continues to enhance and reflect the University's mission.

University Mission

As home to both nationally and internationally respected scientists and scholars, the University of California, Riverside continues to pursue a superior level of academic excellence across all disciplines. It ranks with the top schools in the nation with its record for educating undergraduate students who may then obtain doctorate degrees, while its student population represents a diversity unheard of in most higher education arenas.

As the campus continues to grow, planning efforts must respect the Mission Statement established by the campus community:

UCR is a research university committed to the creation and transmission of knowledge at the highest level, and to the translation of that knowledge for the public good. Our comprehensive programs and services, excellent faculty and staff, and vibrant and attractive physical environment are designed to:

- Provide a high-quality learning environment for undergraduate and graduate students
- Advance human knowledge and accomplishment through research and scholarship
- Enhance the public good through community service and initiatives
- Seek preeminence among U.S. research universities, recognizing UCR's quality in every area.

(from the UCR website)

In the late 1990s, UCR undertook an extensive visioning process that further engaged all of the University's internal and external constituents in discussions about UCR's future possibilities. This document, entitled Vision 2010, articulates the following overarching vision:

UCR is recognized as a world leader in the fusion of teaching and research excellence in a multicultural environment.

The Vision 2010 process also articulated the need for the physical facilities of the campus to support and nurture full participation of faculty, students and staff in the intellectual life of the campus. In this context, a Student Environmental Master Plan (SEMP) Committee was established to identify the highest priority program and facilities needs within the following related areas and to recommend project development strategies and priorities that are consistent with these identified needs.

- 1) Learning Environments
- 2) Student Services
- 3) Housing
- 4) Student Life

The work of this committee further highlighted the need for the continued coordination of physical planning efforts as the University of California, Riverside seeks to fulfill its mature vision.

Given the accelerated growth of both academic programs and the physical environment required to support them, it is imperative that UCR continues to focus on consciously and proactively guiding the University's continued development.



Planning Efforts

In addition to the Vision 2010 planning exercise and the Student Environment Master Plan, a series of other planning efforts have taken place over the years and form the foundation for current plans guiding campus development.

Long Range Development Plan

UCR completed a Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) in 1990. This plan provided an overall strategy for the future development of facilities, roads, open space and infrastructure on the UCR campus. Since then, UCR has embarked on a decade of 6 percent annual growth which will result in an anticipated environment of 21,050 students by the year 2010 and the potential for 25,000 students by 2015. This new growth is expected to increase UCR student enrollment by 38 percent in the coming decade. The campus is updating the 1990 LRDP and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the guiding documents for the physical growth of the campus, to accommodate these rapid changes.

The draft 2003 LRDP Land Use Map (*Figure 2.2*) anticipates 25,000 students by 2015, but will guide campus development into the future. The new LRDP also establishes planning principles and an overall land use plan for the UCR campus. One key strategy of the LRDP is the consolidation of campus uses to ease campus accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians. The planning process has involved the campus community, city and county leadership and members of the larger Riverside community. The accompanying EIR will be a detailed discussion of the potential environmental effects of implementing the planned campus expansion. Since the projected growth on campus exceeds the buildable land to the east of I-215/SR-60, the updated LRDP proposes a significant campus expansion into the agricultural research fields on the West Campus.

DRAFT



Figure 2.2: Proposed Long Range Development Plan update.

8

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Planning Efforts

West Campus Area Plan (2003)

Predicated by the explosive student enrollment growth and increasing scarcity of buildable land, this document "...presents plans and guidelines for the long-term, orderly development of the western portion [West Campus] of the UCR campus." Campus development has been steadily expanding across the I-215/SR-60 freeway, onto University land that has been operated for over 80 years as agricultural teaching and research fields. The West Campus Area Plan tested the capacity of the West Campus according to land use designations in the draft 2003 LRDP. The concept plan (*West Campus Area Plan, Figure 3.9*) and the Land Use Plan (*West Campus Area Plan, Figure 3.11*) were consulted to ensure compatibility between West and East Campus plans.

UCR Infrastructure Master Plan (1993) and East Campus Infrastructure DPP (2002)

These two plans were prepared to study the existing adequacy of infrastructure on the East Campus and to ensure that utility provision is maintained at a sufficient level to accommodate anticipated growth on campus. The following systems were addressed and mapped in the most recent plan: Chilled and Domestic Water, Steam, Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drainage, Electrical and Natural Gas. Campus growth was broken down into three time periods, 2002-2005, 2006-2010 and 2011-2015, and existing capacity was compared with anticipated new buildings and facilities to determine key infrastructure projects to meet future load conditions.

University Arroyo Flood Control and Enhancement Plan

Due to anticipated rapid growth at the UCR campus, and a clear lack of available buildable land near the east campus academic core, campus planners focused on an area of the University Arroyo designated by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps as lying within a 100-year floodplain. The University Arroyo (arroyo is a Spanish term meaning a watercourse or channel in an arid region) extends from the east side of the Campus, along the general alignment of the south side of Big Springs Road and North Campus Drive, through the Athletic Fields (partially contained within underground pipes,) and under Canyon Crest Drive to the Gage Basin. Waters collect in the Gage Basin and are released to flow under the freeway and eventually flow into the Santa Ana River west of the City of Riverside.

To provide additional areas for development a strategy was devised to reduce the land area contained within the defined 100-year floodplain. An initial version of this plan served as an early concept for the development of the northern edge of the core UCR campus. The current \$5 million project is in the design stage and consists of open channels, detention basins and underground facilities that are contemplated to include a combination of habitat restoration, naturalistic plantings and ornamental landscape along the arroyo. This essential concept has been integrated into the East Campus Entrance Area Study.

Parking Structure at Lot 24 (Esquisse)

A unique, intensive workshop explored potential design options for a multi-level parking structure along Canyon Crest Drive, on the site of Parking Lot 24. The sketches included in the workshop summary document suggested options for including Student Academic Support Services (SASS) in this structure's south end, as well as ways to minimize the building's bulk and activate the street frontage with ground floor retail uses and glass stair towers.

Alumni & Visitor's Center Planning Efforts

Planning efforts for the creation of an Alumni and Visitors Center have explored a number of program alternatives and development scenarios intended to meet the University's varied needs within anticipated funding parameters. Suggested program elements have included meeting space, dining facilities, a formal boardroom, library, conferencing facilities and administrative offices. Based on these program assumptions, and taking into account current funding and schedule parameters, the ECEAS consultant team was asked to review alternative sites within the study area that would enhance access and visibility, while promoting the Center's role in welcoming alumni, students and visitors to the campus.



Planning Efforts

CHASS Instruction & Research DPP

The College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) currently enrolls more than half of all undergraduate students and a third of all graduate students at UCR. In response to anticipated campus and program growth, the University completed a Detailed Project Program (DPP) in 2003 to guide the proposed development of a new CHASS Instruction and Research Facility. The DPP identified a preferred site for the facility adjacent to the intersection of the Carillon Mall and the Fine Arts Mall. Subsequent concern was expressed regarding the impact of the proposed facility on the prominent green space adjacent to the Carillon Mall and the ECEAS consultant team was asked to do a detailed study of alternative sites. Through an extensive and interactive process, campus leadership approved an alternative site north of the original location, situated along the Arts Mall. Original program elements have been maintained and design work for the building is now underway.

Materials Science and Engineering (MS&E) DPP

On behalf of the Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS) a detailed document was prepared in 2002 for a new Instruction and Research (I&R) building on the east end of the Athletic Fields. There were a number of concept elements in this DPP that conflicted with the emerging East Campus Entrance Area Study, such as the service access shown cutting down the steep slope on the north side of the Athletic Fields, and the visual and physical barrier that the MS&E building implied to a central open space framework reflecting the historic arroyo drainage, which was the preferred direction given by the DRB and CPAC. The project has been slightly revised for this study, with the original program elements maintained, siting alternatives explored, and the final location of the MS&E IR Building reconfigured (see Section IV).



Section Three: Existing Conditions



Site and Program Review

Setting

UC Riverside exists in a physical landscape rich in cultural heritage and natural beauty. Situated on an alluvial plain at the foot of the Box Springs Mountains, at the eastern edge of the City of Riverside, the campus enjoys spectacular views of nearby mountain ranges including the San Gabriel Mountains to the northwest and the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and the Box Springs Mountains to the east. Natural features such as the Box Springs Mountains and the University Arroyo continue to influence the character of the campus, as does the diverse cultural heritage of the area.

Regional History

Long before Euro-American settlement, indigenous peoples of the Cahuilla, Luiseño and Serrano tribes likely settled in the Riverside area. Hunting small game, they made straw baskets from wild grasses, constructed clay containers and gathered acorns, seeds, wild berries, and roots for food. They were divided into small groups in the foothills, mountains, and desert lands east of the Sierra divide. The Cahuilla population may have numbered as many as 10,000 in the 17th century, with about 5,000 remaining by the late 18th century.

Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries and settlers arrived in "Alta California" in the late 1700s and large land grants were awarded to Spanish "Californio" families who pursued sheep and cattle ranching. Mission San Gabriel was established in 1771, and supported the large 'Jurupa' ranchería, part of which is now Riverside. American settlement in the area intensified after the Mexican-American War and the Gold Rush.

The City of Riverside was founded in 1870, and following the introduction of navel orange trees imported from Brazil in 1873, it rapidly became a center for citrus cultivation. Soon the Riverside area was home to over half of all citrus trees in California, as well as to the University of California Citrus

Experiment Station, founded in 1907. The station was moved to 370 acres at the current UCR campus in 1917.

By 1954, a liberal arts college with 130 students was established on the site, and by 1959 it had grown to become a general campus of the University of California, offering a broad range of graduate and professional studies. Rapid growth in the 1950s and 1960s resulted in the construction of many of the modernist buildings found on campus today. Completion of the first Long Range Development Plan in 1964, for a planned enrollment of 10,000 students, left the study area for the East Campus Entrance Area Study as untouched citrus fields and athletic fields. As the original campus landscape developed, it became an unprecedented showcase for a variety of architectural responses to local climatic conditions, with large shaded pedestrian malls, open arcades and loggias connecting buildings and classroom entrances directly open to the campus or outdoor halls.

Current Academic Programs and Facilities

UC Riverside began as the University of California's first and only liberal arts college. Today, the Campus is widely recognized as one of the world's leading research institutions in the areas of subtropical horticulture and semi-arid agriculture, and offers graduate and professional studies in addition to its continuing undergraduate liberal arts programs.

UCR currently has three colleges, two graduate schools and one division that serve its undergraduate and graduate populations:

- College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS)
- College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS)
- The Marian and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE)
- The Graduate School of Education (GSOE)

- The A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management (AGSM)
- Division of Biomedical Sciences

Additional campus resources include the extensive University Library system, the California Museum of Photography in downtown Riverside, the Sweeney Art Gallery, the Botanic Gardens, Cooperative Extension, University Extension, and a comprehensive range of student services and organizations. The University also supports intramural and recreational programs, as well as 14 NCAA sports, and currently houses approximately 4,000 students in campus housing.



Physical Site

Climate

The City of Riverside is located in the semi-arid Inland Empire, and its Mediterranean climate is influenced more by the desert climates to the east than by the Pacific's onshore breezes, making the area extremely favorable for agriculture and horticulture. Riverside's average annual rainfall is 10 inches per year. Predominant winds come from the northwest with occasional Santa Ana winds flowing from the north and east, bringing hot and dry conditions in fall and winter. Summer breezes sometimes arrive from the west. The annual average temperature is almost 79 Fahrenheit. Riverside's seasonal average temperature ranges from 94F in August, to 82F in October, to 68F in February and 75F in April. Temperatures can get over 100F in late summer and early fall. Occasionally there have been atypical episodes of freezing temperatures in winter.

Topography

The UC Riverside campus lies at the foot of the Box Springs Mountains, on a gently-sloping terrace bisected by a system of drainages or arroyos. The study area appears to be flat, but there is actually a substantial drop in elevation from east to west (*Figure 3.1*). The central area features a large expanse of lawn used for athletic fields, in a basin which sits atop fill that flattened out a drainageway in the 1950s, interrupting the natural flow of intermittent storm water from east to west. The walls of the basin rise almost 20 feet in the NE corner, 16 feet in the SE corner, and decline in height towards the basin's edge at Canyon Crest Drive, where the natural drainageway re-emerges at the Gage Basin. Underground pipes carry stormwater through the Athletic Fields to the Gage Basin.

The study area slopes gently up to the south towards the Carillon Mall, but this is more imperceptible due to retaining walls and structures at the Student Commons and Physical Education Building.



12

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Physical Site

Geotechnical

The City of Riverside is surrounded by three major earthquake faults, the San Andreas, San Jacinto and Elsinore faults. The San Andreas Fault at one point is 14 miles from the UCR Campus, running through the San Bernardino Mountains, capable of producing an 8.3-magnitude earthquake. Closer to the campus, the San Jacinto Fault runs northwesterly through the Box Springs Mountain range, within 6 miles of campus, and is capable of a 7.0 temblor. While the campus is not directly bisected by any active faults, the proximity of these faults could cause considerable damage. Although the threat of liquefaction is minimal within the filled "arroyo" basin, new structures will probably have to excavate fill soils and re-compact soils for foundations and adhere to the Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 standards.

The Santa Ana River which flows to the west of downtown Riverside was once named "El rio de los templores", which means "the river of earthquakes." This name is thanks to the explorers Gaspar de Portola and Father Crespi in 1769, who when passing through this area, experienced a good sized earthquake that threw much of the river's water out of its banks. The name was changed later to encourage settlement of the city.

The geology of the UCR East Campus is simple. Fluvial erosion and deposition has been the major geomorphologic process. Over centuries, the granitic Box Springs Mountains have shed alluvial fans of sedimentary gravel and sand onto the terraces below. Most of the East Campus is old alluvial fan deposits. The channel of the Arroyo drainage through the study area is comprised of younger finer sands. Soils outside the arroyo drainage are well-drained, granular, silty sands. The fill soils within the Athletic Fields basin have slightly more clay content.

University Arroyo

The University Arroyo is a drainage system for a 1,500-acre watershed on the Box Springs Mountains. Runoff from these mountains is often rapid after storms, and as such, there are portions of the University Arroyo that lie within the 100year flood plain as defined by FEMA. After filtering through Islander Park at the base of the mountains, the Arroyo cuts through a residential neighborhood and flows over Watkins Drive before entering the UCR campus via Big Springs Road. Including all tributaries, the total length of the Arroyo through campus is over 2 miles. The University Arroyo Restoration/ Storm Drain/Flood Control Project (February 1995) defined seven 'reaches' of the Arroyo through Campus. (Figure 3.4) The East Campus Entrance Area includes two of those reaches. The University Terrace Reach runs from The Glade east of Aberdeen Drive, through the Athletic Fields (Figure 3.2) in a closed 39" culvert. An additional 72" pipe carries stormwater from Valencia Hill Drive across the Athletic Fields. The Basin Reach is the natural area from Canyon Crest Drive west to the Gage Canal (Figure 3.3) also known as the Gage Basin.

Water from the arroyo system then flows into a culvert under the Gage Canal and eventually empties into the Santa Ana River which flows to the Pacific Ocean. The Arroyo Restoration Plan has not been implemented to date, but a recently-completed study, the University Arroyo Flood Control and Enhancement Plan 'Alternative G', examined the conveyance of the arroyo culvert under the University Terrace Reach. This plan considers the addition of a box culvert or pipe which will increase the flow carrying capacity beyond that of the existing two pipes (39" and 72") in order to adequately convey stormwater and avoid flooding. The alignment of this new box culvert presents constraints on the location of buildings on the south side of the Athletic Fields. Alternative G will determine future building setbacks from the alignment. The storm drain improvements are currently in design and scheduled for completion in summer 2005, providing additional "buildable" lands in the Athletic Fields as identified in the 1990 and draft 2003 LRDPs.



Figure 3.2: View Northeast across athletic fields. Underground culverts of 39" and 72" run east-west the length of these fields, beyond the chainlink fence shown here.



Figure 3.3: Vegetation in the Basin Reach of the University Arroyo.

Physical Site



Figure 3.4: Reaches of the University Arroyo

Vegetation

Natural vegetation in this area before European settlement consisted of Coastal Sage Scrub species such as Sagebrush, Buckwheat and Cheatgrass. There are remnants of the original riparian woodland vegetation of the University Arroyo through the western edge of the study area, although this is degraded by invasive species. Navel Orange trees were imported to the area in the late 1800s, and Riverside's ideal growing conditions coupled with new irrigation projects such as the Gage Canal led to the area's growth and prosperity as the agricultural center of what would later be known as the 'Inland Empire.' The University began as a Citrus Experiment Station amid huge expanses of orange groves, remnants of which are still visible on the West Campus. Landscape plantings from the 1950s and 1960s, commonly of sycamores, pines and eucalyptuses, have matured with full canopies providing shade to campus open spaces.



Access and Circulation

Entry

There are a limited number of ways to enter the East Campus of UCR, for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and other vehicles. This is due mainly to the topographic barrier of the Box Springs Mountains to the east, and the physical and visual barrier of the I-215/SR-60 Freeway to the west. Most visitors arrive on campus from the principal entry on the west along University Avenue, and from Exits #32 and #32B on south and northbound I-215/SR-60. A lack of directional signage and a vacant streetscape offer limited clues to assist visitors in finding their specific objective. Many drivers continue through the "elbow" of University Avenue, turning left onto Canyon Crest, and exiting the University without penetrating the campus proper and finding their destination, while others reverse direction in the midst of oncoming traffic. Pedestrian access along this route provides challenges of its own, with narrow sidewalks, limited street crossings and no amenities connecting the East and West campuses. The need to cross the off-ramp intersections of I-215/SR-60 presents additional safety concerns and the narrow underpass restricts potential pedestrian movement along the north side of University Avenue.

In October 2002, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) began implementing operational and safety improvements for the "60/91/215" interchange a mile north of the campus. The accelerated regional growth over the past two decades has resulted in increased commuter and interregional traffic, making improvements necessary to relieve congestion and improve mobility. This \$312 million project is scheduled for completion in 2006 and will include partial redesign of the University Avenue off-ramps. It is anticipated that the alignment of the intersection of this off-ramp with University Avenue can be designed to improve pedestrian comfort, and enhance the sense of arrival at UCR.

Transit

UCR Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) operates a free campus shuttle service for the campus community. During academic sessions, the Highlander Hauler (*Figure 3.5*). operates two routes, with the Blue Line servicing the area south of the campus and the Gold Line providing service to the north. The Hauler provides transportation between main campus and University Village, University Extension, the Canyon Crest Towne Centre and the numerous apartment complexes surrounding UCR. The Hauler operates on a reduced schedule during summer sessions.

TAPs also offers the Point-to-Point evening shuttle service during the regular academic sessions. This service is provided free to UCR faculty, staff and students.

Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) provides bus service to western Riverside County and offers the campu community several route options. The UCR Route 1 stop is located at Big Springs and Watkins, providing transportation to the Downtown Riverside Metrolink Station. The UCR stop for Route 16 is located in Parking Lot 30; the Downtown Riverside Metrolink Station is included on the service route. Route 14 stops within walking distance of the UCR campus, at Rustin Avenue and Linden Street. These RTA lines service Riverside neighboring cities.

Parking

The UCR Transportation & Parking Services department operates a website (www.parking.ucr.edu) that details parking regulations for students, staff and visitors. Currently, there are two large surface parking lots in the East Campus Entrance Area, Lot 24 and Lot 1 (*Figure 3.6*) with capacity for 352 cars and 349 cars, respectively. It is anticipated that both of these lots will eventually become Parking Structures as campus growth proceeds.

The surface parking Lot #19 to the north of the Physical Education Building will be altered due to construction of the CHASS (I&R) Building, and will be used as a staging area for the CHASS (I&R) as well as the Commons expansion project. Residents and visitors to Bannockburn Village use parking lots to the north and south of the complex, and these lots are slated for reconfiguration as part of the proposed redevelopment of Bannockburn Village. Finally, there is a linear, informal parking lot stretching west of Watkins House, and a linear lot running south into the Athletic Complex from Linden Avenue. There is some on-street parking near campus, but not on University Avenue or Canyon Crest Drive in the area close to campus. However, there are impromptu pick-up and drop-off zones at various places, including the 'elbow' at Canyon Crest Drive and University Avenue.



Figure 3.5: UCR Transportation System

Access and Circulation

Service

The UCR East Campus academic core is served by a discontinuous perimeter road, Campus Drive, which currently provides for local vehicular travel around most of the East Campus. Service roads branch from this perimeter into the heart of campus. The perimeter road becomes North Campus Drive at Aberdeen Drive, ends near the NW corner of the Surge Building and becomes a service-only road as it angles south and east into the rear of the Commons. At this point, the service road crosses the Commons Mall and accesses the Pierce Hall loading dock. Service access is also found at a number of locations along Canyon Crest Drive. Maintenance vehicles access the west end of the University Arroyo and the Gage Canal from Watkins House Drive. The only significant loading docks for large trucks currently in the Study Area are the angled one at the rear of the Arts Building, and the docks for Physical Education, Commons, Bookstore and Pierce Hall. (*Figure 3.6*)

Emergency

With a daily population of about 23,000 students, faculty, staff, and visitors, UCR is comparable to a small city, and as such, experiences periodic emergencies. The campus Police Department is located at 3500 Canyon Crest Drive, to the north of Parking Lot 24, in the East Campus study area. Any police, fire, or medical emergency on campus can be reported using a variety of methods, including campus Emergency Call Boxes (ECBs), campus emergency phones, or by walkin reporting to the Police Department. Emergency access to the East Campus is primarily along University Avenue and the Campus Loop Road, but if this is congested, emergency vehicles may use Blaine Avenue or Linden Avenue, and access the campus core via Canyon Crest Drive or North Campus Drive. Landscaped malls on campus are wide and open enough to be used by emergency vehicles if necessary.



Figure 3.6: Vehicular and service circulation

16

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Access and Circulation

Pedestrian Access

The East Campus academic core is pedestrian-oriented, with formal malls and informal pathways and courtyards (*Figure 3.11*). The draft 2003 LRDP aims to make the core East Campus an automobile-free zone. Although the 1990 and draft 2003 LRDP describe a pedestrian campus, there are deficiencies and/or gaps in the sidewalk system in the East Campus Entrance Area. Most glaringly, University Avenue has only a 6'-wide sidewalk from the I-215/SR-60 overpass to West Campus Drive, and walkers often have to queue behind slower walkers or pass on the planting strip or lawn of the City water reservoir (*Figure 3.7*). The north side of University Avenue only has a short stretch of sidewalk from the corner of Canyon Crest Drive to the crosswalk at West Campus Drive (*Figure 3.8*).

The sidewalk along the west side of Canyon Crest Drive is currently adjacent to the paved right of way, and weaves to avoid a large tree (*Figure 3.9*). Pedestrians coming from the north must cross at the signalized intersection at Bannockburn Village in order to access the East Campus. They can cross at West Campus Drive, but this is an indirect route. Pedestrians usually jaywalk between crosswalks, waiting in the turn lanes on Canyon Crest Drive and University Avenue. There is a crosswalk at the signalized entry to Bannockburn Village off Canyon Crest Drive, and cyclists heading south will often cross at this point and ride south on the wrong side of the road to get into campus, because the elbow at University Avenue is so unsafe (*Figure 3.10*). Adding medians to these turn lanes, would help to make the pedestrian and bicycling environment safer.

Bicycles are sporatically accommodated on roadways and on pedestrian ways. There are painted bicycle lanes on University Avenue, Canyon Crest Drive and Aberdeen Drive but not on the campus loop road. The University currently runs an Alternative Transportation program, offering incentives for cyclists and walkers such as showers and lockers in the Physical Education Building.



Figure 3.9: Narrow sidewalk along west edge of Canyon Crest Drive



Figure 3.8: There are no sidewalks on the north side of University Avenue.



Figure 3.10: Cars turning West from Canyon Crest Drive onto University Avenue often impinge on bicycle lanes.



Figure 3.7: Narrow sidewalk on south side of University Avenue



18

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Utilities

The UCR Campus has over 50 buildings with more than 3 million gross square feet overall, with an additional 8 million square feet projected. This requires significant expansion of utility infrastructure. A Detailed Project Program (DPP) was prepared for the East Campus infrastructure in June 2002, detailing existing utility lines, and projected requirements to accommodate growth up to 25,000 students. There is a large utility tunnel running under the Carillon Mall, serving the Arts Building, Physical Education and Commons with chilled water, steam, electricity and gas. This will continue to serve new buildings located in the vicinity of Carillon Mall. Utilities not in the tunnel such as potable water, sewer and telecommunication run underground along road rights of way such as University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive, and along open spaces and pedestrian malls such as the Arts Mall and North Campus Drive. As such, they should not pose major constraints to the location of major future buildings in the Study Area. (Please refer to the aforementioned DPP and the 2003 LRDP update for detailed information on campus infrastructure.)

There are two major infrastructural facilities along University Avenue that constrain the future mixed-use development that this plan proposes. Next to the I-215/SR-60 freeway, the small "Telephone Building" on the south side of University Avenue houses the hub for all campus telecommunications. There are no plans to relocate or renovate this building. To the east of this building, there is a buried City of Riverside water reservoir (*Figure 3.12*). Built in 1936 to serve the original agricultural station, this 5-million gallon concrete tank was cleaned in 2002 and is in excellent condition and continues to be more than adequate for the Campus water supply. There is an associated pump station, with valves and meters at the edge of the existing tennis courts at the east end of the 'elbow' at University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive. This pump station will be adjacent to the NW corner of the new CHASS (I&R) Building. Discussions with city staff from the Public Utilities Department identified that a pump station to the west of I-215/SR-60 lifts water up to this reservoir from the City supply. The reservoir does not need to be at this precise location, but it cannot go much higher than 1077' above sea level (it currently sits at 1037'), due to constraints on the aforementioned pump station's existing pumps located near the intersection of University and Chicago Avenues which were renovated in 1999. If relocated, the reservoir could be downsized to 4 million gallons if necessary, which would require a tank of approximately 150' in diameter. If the reservoir is to be relocated to provide a site for a mixed-use building, it will cost roughly \$4-5 million dollars, must meet the above conditions, and be within close proximity to the existing site. It could be located entirely underground, under the proposed Central Plaza, for example, at the end of University Avenue.

Another challenge to East Campus development is the system of storm drain culverts associated with the University Arroyo, running east-west under Aberdeen Drive along the south edge of the Athletic Fields and across Canyon Crest Drive. These pipes (39" and 72" diameter), with the proposed addition of a box culvert, may be consolidated into a new configuration to handle Arroyo flooding, but will still require a 30'-40' setback for new building construction, although plazas and open spaces may be located above the facilities. The new Arroyo storm drain design will determine the required building setback from the underground pipes.

The southwest corner of West Campus Drive and University Avenue belongs to the Church of Latter-Day Saints (*Figure 3.13*). Although not under UCR jurisdiction, the site could be coordinated with campus mixed-use development to activate University Avenue between the "elbow" and the freeway. This would being people and activity to a current open space area that can be intimidating to pedestrians, especially after dark and on weekends.



Figure 3.12: Eastern edge of reservoir from Parking Lot 1



Figure 3.13: Eastern facade of the Church of Latter Day Saints

Open Space Framework

Natural Features

The University Arroyo system runs generally east to west from the Box Springs Mountains, presenting the main natural feature on the UCR campus (other than the southeastern hillsides.) Remnant pockets of a riparian system exist along this arroyo. The original native sage-scrub landscape has only survived on campus in the foothills of the Box Springs Mountains to the south and east. In addition to the Arroyo and the southeastern hills, the maturing landscape on campus provides a level of natural bird habitat within the campus openspace.

Viewsheds

The most dramatic views in the study area are revealed as one travels east on University Avenue from I-215/SR-60 and approaches the left-hand turn onto Canyon Crest Drive. The Box Springs Mountains rise up suddenly from behind the campus tree canopy, forming a rugged visual boundary to the eastern horizon of campus. This view of the Box Springs is consistent throughout campus, but is particularly prominent from the basin of the Athletic Fields (*Figures 3.15 & 3.16*).The Mountains are still viewed as one continues north on Canyon Crest Drive.

Traveling south on Canyon Crest, the Box Springs are a consistent feature, but two prominent campus landmarks, the Carillon Tower (*Page 38, Figure 5.12*) and the Humanities and Social Sciences Building (*Figure 3.14*) also add visual interest. Within the grassy, landscaped malls of the UCR campus, linear views to buildings are framed by mature trees. Clear winter skies allow long-range views of distant mountains such as the northern San Bernardino Mountains and the northwestern San Gabriel Mountains as well as local hills such as Mt. Rubidoux in downtown Riverside and the Box Springs Mountains.

The I-215/SR-60 freeway presents a visual and noise barrier and blocks views along University Avenue from the developing mixed-use district on the West Campus, although the underpass murals and large identity sign (*Page 34, Figure 5.2*) help to ease the visual impact.



Figure 3.14: The Humanities and Social Sciences Building as seen from Canyon Crest Drive looking south down the Arts Mall



Figure 3.15: Box Springs Mountains as seen from the basin of the Athletic Fields

There are a number of shaded planted courtyards throughout

the core campus, providing relief from summer heat. Wide

gatherings or outdoor classes. The existing Athletic Fields in

the Study Area are a large expanse of open playing field, with

little relief or shade. New campus development has tended to

replace parking lots, grass lawns and ornamental plantings with

xeriscaping and drought-tolerant species, however the existing Malls are an important element of the LRDP (*Figure 3.18*), and

will be maintained in close to their current turfed state. New

Malls such as the Recreation Center Mall may be combined with Arroyo restoration in a more naturalized landscape style.

grassy pedestrian malls are often used for impromptu

Gathering Spaces

Figure 3.16: The Box Springs Mountains as seen looking down North Campus Drive

East Campus Entrance Area Study



University of California Riverside

East Campus Entrance Area Study



East Campus Entrance Area Study

Planning Context

LRDP Considerations

UCR has experienced several years of 6 percent estimated annual growth and anticipates a total of 21,050 students by the year 2010 and the potential for 25,000 students by 2015. This new growth is expected to increase UCR student enrollment by 38 percent in the coming decade. The campus is updating the 1990 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and an accompanying Environmental Impact Report, the two guiding documents for the physical growth of the campus.

The 1990 LRDP planned for growth up to 18,050 by the year 2005. This plan identified "Designated Open Space" roughly along the route of the University Arroyo, which was the impetus for the large open space 'arroyo' area which forms the core of this East Campus Area Study. The 1990 LRDP also "zoned" the land along the north side of University Avenue for graduate school uses, and proposed that the "elbow" at the corner of University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive be designated a significant space with accompanying traffic circle to distinguish this formal entry to campus. The College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences and Student Academic Services were to have a prominent place at the East Campus Entrance. While these priorities are being reviewed for the LRDP update, there are still strong reasons for these earlier LRDP choices, and they will be retained in some form.

The draft 2003 LRDP anticipates 25,000 students by 2015. The planning process has involved the campus community, city and county leadership and members of the larger Riverside community. The LRDP is a general physical 'blueprint' or guide for the future development of facilities, roads, open space and infrastructure and a land use map. The accompanying EIR is a detailed discussion of the potential environmental effects of implementing the planned campus development.

UCR Cooperation with City of Riverside

Although the University is exempt from local planning and zoning jurisdiction, the campus nevertheless considers local input on all major projects. UCR has been cultivating a collaborative relationship with City of Riverside municipal planning and redevelopment staff to ensure that the campus land uses are compatible with City planning and land uses. Currently, the UCR campus is entirely within the City's "O" Zone, or "Official", which is one of the most permissive zones in the City, allowing "Official and public uses of property and related activities...". Although no city review is required, UCR continues to make an effort to review plans of improvements to campus property with the City.

General Plan Update

The City of Riverside has just begun updating its General Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. The process, which was initiated in April of 2003, is anticipated to take approximately 18 months. As part of this process, a Community Visioning project was conducted to gather public input, and resulted in 5 Strategic Goals for the City of Riverside, all of which affect UCR in some form:

Goal One: Preserve and improve our quality of life (making Riverside a "dynamic arts and cultural center)

Goal Two: Reduce transportation congestion and improve traffic flow

Goal Three: Address Riverside's social concerns with community involvement

Goal Four: Beautify the City (with particular emphasis on 'entryways')

Goal Five: Increase investment in youth and children

The eastern portion of University Avenue corridor is part of the University Community Plan area which contains all of UCR and is bounded on the north and east by the City limits, on the south by Central Avenue and on the west by Ottawa and Kansas Avenues. This area connects UCR with a mixture of residential housing types from hillside housing to apartments and Box Springs Mountain Regional Park.

Over the years, a number of plans and studies have been undertaken directly affecting the University Area. The chronology of evolution in these studies underscores the great importance which has been attached to the role of University Avenue and UCR within the overall urban fabric of Riverside. The various efforts include the following efforts.

University Community Plan

This plan, first adopted in 1960 as a subcomponent of the City's General Plan in anticipation of the annexation of 3500 acres to Riverside, including the UCR campus, focused land use and related issues on the unique character of the University environment. This plan is being updated simultaneous to the draft 2003 LRDP.

Eastside Community Plan

Prepared in 1974, and a functional companion to the University Community Plan, the Eastside Community Plan narrows the focus of the General Plan to the unique needs of this long established and historic residential community bordering the north and south sides of University Avenue. The plan's boundaries underscore the importance of viewing revitalization of University Avenue in the context of its synergistic role with the adjoining, long-established Eastside community.

Planning Context

University Avenue Strategic Development Plan (1990)

Commissioned by the City's Redevelopment Agency, the strategic plan's purpose was to outline an overall vision for University Avenue and prepare a strategic plan of action to guide the Agency in its revitalization efforts. The plan established key parameters for development along University Avenue allowing flexibility for the Agency to respond to changing market, economic, institutional, and other conditions.

University Avenue Streetscape Concept (1991)

Recognizing the need for physical improvement to the appearance and vitality of University Avenue, the Streetscape Concept defines a program for capturing the majesty of previous tree planting efforts while enhancing the Avenue's appearance recognizing contemporary economic goals. The concept is intended to be the means by which civic, business and property interests can work together for the physical renovation of the Avenue.

University Avenue "University Village Center" Specific Plan (1993)

This plan set up Development Standards and Design Guidelines for redevelopment along University Avenue. These regulations will apply to campus-related development on the western edge of campus.

University Community Plan Update

The City of Riverside is preparing an update to the University Community Plan, which will be incorporated into the new General Plan. This Community Plan includes studies of housing opportunities, transportation and retail, as well as student/community conflicts through single-family home conversions to multi-family student housing with its attendant parking issues. It is being updated in parallel to the draft 2003 LRDP.

Environmental Considerations

The University of California system is committed to the practice of sustainable design in campus expansion and redevelopment. Buildings are by far the largest users of energy, through construction and daily use. The California State Title 24 Energy Code is also one of the strictest in the United States, so new buildings at UC Riverside should incorporate green design to an unprecedented degree, and will be "among the most explicit demonstrations of the campus' ethos and vision."

The LRDP process includes the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, as mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the University of California CEQA Guidelines. This is a detailed examination of all environmental impacts of campus growth over the projected lifespan of the LRDP, as well as a proposal for mitigation of such impacts. The University anticipates that this EIR will revise the EIR prepared for the 1990 LRDP. It will include in-depth analysis for those areas not considered as such in the 1990 plan (West Campus) and update those areas (East Campus) where the existing context may have changed since 1990. According to UCR documents, the LRDP Update and subsequently the EIR will:

- support the University's academic goals recently updated during a Vision 2010 planning exercise;
- enhance the design of the campus; and
- contribute to its sense of place.



Section Four: Program Analysis



Program Analysis

Initial Program Assumptions

In developing the goals for the East Campus Entrance Area Study, UC Riverside identified the following programs to be accommodated within the study area:

- Alumni and Visitors Center
- Campus Museum and Art Gallery
- Recital Hall (350-400 seats)
- Performing Arts Center (1,000 plus seats, changed to 2,000 during the course of the study)
- Parking Structures (2)
- Student Academic Support Services Building (SASS)
- Bourns College of Engineering Expansion (BCOE)
- College of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences Instruction and Research Facility (CHASS I&R)
- CHASS I&R Expansion Opportunities
- Materials Science and Engineering Building (MS&E-relocated during the course of this study)

Beyond accommodating these specific programs, it was a primary goal of the study to identify additional future buildings sites that would ensure that the campus developed at an appropriate density given the long-term need for growth of the campus and the desire to maintain and enhance elements unique to the character of the campus.

Programming Process

The process of understanding the future needs and potential uses for new buildings within the study area included the review of previous plans and documents; the use of questionnaires and personal interviews with individual users; extensive follow-up discussions via phone and e-mail with users and the project planning team; review at committee meetings and multiple reviews by all parties of the draft program. These discussions considered the size of the existing programs and the projected growth with an understanding of the potential schedule for the project. In addition, spaces required with general adjacency and access requirements, and other special characteristics of each building were considered.

Program Adjacency

Within the context of the overall site plan, which governed general building locations and density, individual program assumptions were sited following a program adjacency determination process. The criteria for these program locations included the following:

- Need and desire for public access
- Proximity to related programs
- Required footprint size, based on the need for ground floor access to specific elements of the program
- Total capacity of the proposed site, assuming a maximum four-story structure
- Need for future expansion
- Service access requirements
- Phasing that presumed buildings would be added in a way that would incrementally expand the East Campus academic core to the north

The criteria for each program came out of the programming process described above. Specific locations were then reviewed with individual users, the Project Planning Committee, the Design Review Board (DRB) and the Capital Programs Advisory Committee (CPAC).

Some programs, particularly those which have a defined schedule, were the subject of detailed study. For these programs multiple sites were considered, with alternative diagrams and a considered list of positive and negative attributes of each option. Final decisions were made at CPAC based on recommendations by the Project Planning Committee and the Design Review Board.





Program Assumptions

A summary of the proposed building programs, including program assumptions, adjacency criteria proposed, and approximate schedule, foot print size, net program area, gross building area, "order of magnitude" construction cost and total project cost is shown in the Table 4.1. A general description of the final program and building locations is below (*see Appendix B for additional program details and assumptions*):

Project	Duringt	Due anno Alexandria de	Adia and Daminum da	Oshadula	Footprint Size (Sq. Ft.)	Net Area	Gross Area	0	Total Project Cost	Comments
Number	Project	Program Assumptions	Adjacency Requirements	Schedule	Size (Sq. Fl.)	(Sq. Ft.)	(Sq. Ft.)	Const. Cost	Cost	Comments
		Interdisciplinary academic program offices,		00.05	10.000	04.007	100.017	00014	00.014	
1	CHASS I & R	classrooms	Near other CHASS facilities	03-05	10,000	64,397	102,217	\$23M	\$34M	DPP, dated 1/30/03. * Based on early design by PCF
	Material Science and	Classrooms, Offices, Research Labs and	East end of existing athletic							
2	Engineering	Clean Room	field,	03-06	36,226	76,940	134,000	42.5M	\$51.7M	DPP, draft dated 4/16/03
		Administrative space, meeting rooms, executive dining, library, boardroom,								
3	Alumni and Visitors Center	banquet hall	Near campus "front door"	03-07	19,663	21,960	31,403	\$7.8M	\$9.4M	Could be combined with the SASS Building.
• •		Same as above except without Banquet		00 01	10,000	21,000	01,100	¢1.0m	<i>40.111</i>	
3 Alt		Hall and University Club	Near campus "front door"	03-07	7,279		12,870	\$3.2M	\$3.8M	Phase one of above project
• /				00 01	1,210		12,010	\$0.2	\$0.0m	
		Financial Aid, Registrar, Student Business,								
	Student Academic Support	Admissions, Outreach VC for Enrollment	Near Commons, and campus							
4	Services	Services, International Student Services	front door	03-07	26,294	39,800	61,200	\$14.8M	\$19.38M	Could be combined with Alumni and Visitors Center
		2000 seat Hall for Theater, Performance,								
5	Performing Arts Center	Orchestra	Near campus "front door"	?	61,763	76,140	123,347	\$67.8M	\$81.4M	Would require a donor gift
5 Alt		1200 seat Performance Hall	Near campus "front door"	?	51,103	31,545	94,235	\$51.8M	\$62.2M	Would require a donor gift
			Near Arts Building, and							
6	Recital Hall	350 seats	campus "front door"	07-09	22,761	15,550	25,191	\$10M	\$12M	Could be combined with Museum
		Sweeney Art Gallery(s) for temporary	-							
7	Campus Museum/Art Gallery	exhibits plus pernamnant collection	Near campus "front door"	05-07	15,076	11,335	15,076	\$4M	\$5M	Could be combined with Recital Hall
		Bioengineering and Material Science	Near other engineering							
8	Engineering III	Departments	facilities	?	34,048	65,165	113,492	\$36M	\$43.2M	Assume Footprint 30% Gross Floor Area (GFA)
		Undergraduate Engineering Instruction/	Near other engineering							
9	Engineering IV	Computer Science and Engineering	facilities	?	33,956	64,990	113,188	\$35.9M	\$43M	Assume Footprint 30% GFA
		Campus Health, Counseling Center,								Consider part of mixed-use location, or "retail" space in Parking
10	VCSA Growth	Student Special Services	Could be off campus	?	NA	21,860	33,664	\$8.9M	10.7M	Structure Lot 24
				2	10.040	00 700	44.450	¢40.014	¢40.4M	Depletered of energy in Useders design Actives Fracticity 200/ OF A
11	CHASS Expansion	Additional exansion of CHASS 1 & R	Other CHASS Facilities	?	12,346	26,722	41,152	\$10.9M	\$13.11/1	Replacement of space in Hinderacker. Assume Footprint 30% GFA
12	Art Building Expansion	Digital Studios Faculty Offices, Teaching Labs and Performance Space	South of existing Art Building	2	20.500	36.900	61.500	\$5.4M	\$6.5M	Sized according to the site available.
12			South of existing Art Building	1	20,300	30,900	01,500	φ3.+IVI	φ0.0W	
		Student Housing for Upper-class and								
		Graduate Students; 500 beds, offices, retail, 250 residence parking spaces, 40	Redevelopment of the							
13	Bannockburn	retail, 250 residence parking spaces, 40 retail parking spaces.	existing site	2010	*		220,000	\$38.8M	\$50 5M	* Based on Strategic Plan for Housing, dated 1/31/03
		1 01		2010			220,000	φ00.0ivi	ψ50.5Μ	.
		1,250 parking Spaces (at four floors). Potential for 280 spaces for each additional								Revised program based on shorter footprint. Original program called for 1400 spaces. See attachment for options of an additional floor to
14	Parking Structure (Lot 24)	floor.	Existing site	05-07	99.000	NA	423.000	\$21.2M	\$25 4M	achieve original program goal.
	. . , ,	1,200 parking spaces	Existing Site	2	00,000	10.	420,000	Ψ= 1.211	Ψ20.ΤΙΝΙ	Location & size based on DRAFT 2003 LRDP update
10	Parking Structure (Lot 1)	1,200 parking spaces	LAISUNG SILE	ť						-
										Suggested that Watkins House be demolished to make way for SASS or the Alumni and Visitors Center. Deed restrictions on property
16	Watkins House	Program to be determined					14,000			resolved - must remain for students/University use.
	Tatiano nouse	. regian to be determined					14,000			

Table 4.1: Program Summary

East Campus Entrance Area Study



CHASS I&R

- MS&E Offices/Labs 2A 2B
 - MS&E Classrooms
- Alumni & Visitor Center (A&VC) 3A
- 3B A&VC Expansion
- SASS 4 5

1

6

- Performing Arts Center
- Recital Hall
- Campus Museum/Art Gallery
- Engineering III 8 9
- Engineering IV 10
 - VCSA Growth Location Options
- CHASS I&R or SASS Expansion 11
- Arts Expansion 12
- Bannockburn 13 14
- Parking Garage (Lot 24) 15
 - Parking Garage (Lot 1)
- 17 Academic/Mixed Use (4) 18
 - Academic (2)

Figure 4.1: East Campus Entrance Area Plan Concept

Program Assumptions

Proposed Facilities:

CHASS Instruction & Research (I&R) Building

The Detailed Project Program (DPP) for the CHASS I&R was completed prior to the beginning of this study. However, at the onset of this work concern was expressed about the proposed location of the building, a prominent green space at the intersection of the Carillon Mall and the Fine Arts Mall. The ECEAS consultant team was asked to do a detailed study of alternative sites. Five alternative sites were reviewed relative to criteria based on planning considerations, program relationships, program fit and site configurations, environmental considerations and relative infrastructure cost. (*See Appendix A, Meeting Minutes, April 15, 2003*)

The selected site was north of the original site, parallel to the Arts Mall on the site of the existing tennis courts. This site has the following attributes:

- Preserves the existing open space at the intersection of the Carillon Mall and Arts Mall
- Complies with the draft 2003 Long Range Development Plan
- Creates a positive relationship opposite the Arts Building
- Within a 5 minute walk of the Carillon Tower (the heart of campus) and other CHASS facilities
- Has good service access
- Allows for future expansions
- Has a great views of the Arts Mall and to the Box Springs Mountains from the upper floors

Material Science and Engineering (MS&E)

The DPP for the MS&E was completed concurrent with the beginning of this study. The site proposed for the building was at the east end of the Athletic Fields, parallel to Aberdeen Drive. As the East Campus Entrance Area Study evolved, a central organizational concept was developed with a continuous open space, reflecting the historic arroyo, connecting The Glade to the east (across Aberdeen) to the Gage Basin west of Canyon Crest Drive. The proposed location for the MS&E Building effectively blocked the open space at Aberdeen. The Project Planning Committee asked the design team to review alternative sites for the MS&E Building.

The design team considered two options for the location of the MS&E: on the north side of the proposed "arroyo" open space, parallel to a proposed east/west access drive; and on the south side of the proposed "arroyo" open space, parallel to North Campus Drive. (*See Appendix A, Meeting Minutes, September 23, 2003*)

The conclusion of CPAC, based on recommendations of the design team, Project Planning Committee, and Design Review Board was that the MS&E should be located on the south side of the proposed central openspace, parallel to North Campus Drive for the following reasons:

- Allows for the east end of the "arroyo" to be open to Aberdeen and The Glade beyond
- Adjacent to existing classroom and lab facilities
- Provides for service to the lowest level relatively close to grade (without extensive ramps and retaining walls)
- Maximizes density within the Athletic Fields
- Provides for an incremental expansion of the campus, moving north, that facilitates the phasing of site improvements for future facilities on the Athletic Fields

In approving the location of the MS&E it was recommended that the East Campus Entrance Area Study include a requirement that the service yard and loading dock on the west end of the building be incorporated in the building structure, and/or completely screened from view on the west and north with limited exposure on the south.

Alumni and Visitors Center, Student Academic Support Services Building (SASS)

Both the Alumni and Visitors Center and the SASS require easy access by the public because they both will serve as a first stop for visitors to the campus. Early studies suggested that the two programs could be co-located, and the existing site of the Watkins House was suggested. Upon further investigation it was apparent that this was not feasible because the sources of funds, private for the Alumni and Visitor's Center, and public for the SASS could not be co-mingled in a shared structure. In addition, the SASS is slated to begin the DPP process this fall, while the Alumni and Visitors Center is awaiting secure funding. The Watkins House site is not large enough to accommodate two independent structures.

The design team was asked to review several alternative sites for both programs. The conclusions of that study were that the Alumni and Visitors Center should be at the Watkins House site, and the SASS should be located adjacent to the Carillon Mall, next to Costo Hall. These locations have the following advantages:


Program Assumptions

Alumni and Visitors Center at Watkins House Site

- Convenient public access
- Convenient to parking at Lot 24
- Takes advantage of the adjacent University Arroyo for views and outdoor programs
- Sufficient room for expansion

The major issue with this location is the potential need to demolish the existing Watkins House, relocate the existing programs it houses, and satisfy specific deed restrictions on the property. The Project Management Team concluded that these issues were surmountable.

SASS on Carillon Mall adjacent to Costo Hall

- On the Carillon Mall, providing excellent orientation for prospective students
- Adjacent to student activities and organizations in both Costo Hall and the Student Commons (Existing and Proposed Expansion)
- Visible from the campus entrance from parking at Lot 1
- Sufficient room for expansion
- Takes advantage of adjacent green space shared with the CHASS (I&R) Building

The major issue in the design of the SASS in this location will be providing adequate service access from the existing loading dock north of Costo Hall, or the future development of a shared service access point for the SASS, Costo Hall, and the Commons.

Future Development:

Given the prolonged timeframe for construction of the remaining program elements, these projects do not have a brief summary of the programs. Considerations in their site selections are as follows:

Performing Arts Center:

The initial program assumption for the Performing Arts Center was for a hall with a capacity of 1,200 seats. CPAC directed that this be increased to 2,000 seats in keeping with the vision that this will become a regional cultural venue accommodating traveling shows as well as campus events. The detailed program was developed with the assistance of Auerbach Pollack Friedander based on similar facilities. It was essential that the site be located at the campus "front door." The specific site, adjacent to Canyon Crest Drive was selected to define the northern edge of an Arts Plaza, terminating University Avenue, while allowing for a diagonal connection to the proposed "arroyo" open space to the east. The selected site is also convenient to the parking structure proposed for Lot 24 and allows for a direct connection between the two structures, such as a second-floor walkway, if so desired.

Recital Hall and Campus Art Museum/Gallery:

The need for a campus Recital Hall was anticipated initially in the planning for the Arts Building which was completed in 2001. At that time it was anticipated to be located immediately south of the Arts Building. This assumption was revisited in the Area Study, because that site would be more conducive for other needed expansion of arts facilities, and the Recital Hall was seen as a complement to the Performing Arts Center, sharing the proposed Arts Plaza. The program was developed with the assistance of theater consultant Auerbach Pollack Friedlander, based on similar facilities.

The Museum/Art Gallery is intended to replace the Sweeney Art Gallery currently located in the Watkins House. The Museum component has been a part of a long-term plan for the campus as reflected in the 5-year Non-State Capital Program. The East Campus Entrance Area Study proposes that the Recital Hall and the Art Museum/Gallery be located in a shared structure located on the Arts Plaza and at the terminus of University Avenue. These programs are complementary to the Performing Arts Center and appropriate to present a welcoming face of the University to the public. Smaller facilities at the terminus of University Avenue also assure that views of the Box Springs Mountains will be preserved at that point.

Engineering III & IV

The east end of the "arroyo" open space is intended as expansion space for the science and engineering programs. Engineering III is proposed for further development of the Bioengineering and Material Science Departments. Engineering IV is proposed for Undergraduate Engineering Instruction and Computer Science. The sites proposed for these two buildings are on the north side of the "arroyo" opposite the MS&E Building.

Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Growth

These programs were considered in the initial planning for the Student Academic Support Services program, and include Campus Health, Counseling Center and Student Special Services. The conclusion was that the first two functions could be better served off-campus to give them an independent identity from the institution. The proposal is that they should be located within the mixed-use structures proposed for University Avenue, within the ground floor "retail" space in the parking structure proposed for Lot 24, or incorporated into the redevelopment of Bannockburn Housing.

Program Analysis

Program Assumptions

CHASS Expansion

The program needs for CHASS expansion are not known at this time. The area assumption is based on the existing size of Hinderacker Hall, with the assumption that CHASS will expand into Hinderacker's released space after the completion of SASS. Additional CHASS expansion could take place at the site of the existing Physical Education Building. It is understood that the Physical Education Building would no longer be utilized as it was intended as the athletic and recreation facilities have been or will be appropriately relocated further from the center of the campus. The site of the existing building could be developed in the future for academic uses at a higher density than the current facility.

Arts Building Expansion

The Arts Department anticipates the need for additional Digital Studios, Teaching Labs, Performance Spaces and Faculty Offices. The logical site for these elements is immediately adjacent to the south of the existing Arts Building. The size of this additional building is determined by the site available, assuming a height of four stories.

Bannockburn Housing

The program for the Bannockburn Housing (*Figure 4.2*), 500 beds for upper-class and Graduate Students, offices, retail and parking was based on the Strategic Plan for Housing, dated January 2003. The assumptions underlying this plan were not re-examined, however it was confirmed that they were generally valid.

Parking Structure, Lot 24

Previous plans for the campus had anticipated a parking structure on Lot 24; however there was great concern about the visual impact of the structure on Canyon Crest Drive. The East Campus Entrance Area Study proposes that the length of the structure be reduced relative to the previous schemes. If the four story height is retained this will reduce the number of spaces to approximately 1,280 cars, from the earlier program of 1,400. An additional floor would add approximately 280 spaces. In addition, the following design guidelines should be addressed as a part of the final structure design:

- The structure should include ground floor retail space for a minimum of half the length of the structure.
- The parking structure's entrance at the southern end should be from the service drive developed at the existing traffic light at the southern end of Bannockburn.
- The massing should be broken up above the ground plane and particularly at the roof. The massing should be varied to emphasize vertical segmentation of the structure into separate parts and minimize the continuous horizontal nature of the building.
- A pedestrian bridge from the second floor of the parking structure, crossing the service drive, may provide a ceremonial connection from the parking to the Performing Arts Center and Arts Plaza beyond.



Figure 4.2: Existing Bannockburn

- The parking structure should be sheathed in materials that provide a variety of textures, degrees of transparency and colors.
- The interior design of the garage should be considered and enhanced through the use of materials, natural and electric light and an emphasis on views.

Parking Structure, Lot 1

The East Campus Entrance Area Study retains the recommendation of constructing a parking Structure on Lot 1, based on earlier planning efforts. The site location and the opportunity for the structure to block the noise of the adjacent freeway make this an attractive site (*Figure 4.3*). Access points may be established off of West Campus Drive and via a new entrance running west of the Church of Latter Day Saints facility along an available public easement. The trapezoidal geometry of this site makes it more expensive to develop than Lot 24, therefore it is likely to be developed further in the future, or possibly combined with other uses.



Figure 4.3: Looking West across Parking Lot 1

Section Five: Area Plan



Key Determinants

The East Campus Entrance Area Plan builds on the extensive visioning and planning efforts already embraced by UCR, and seeks to support the University's guiding principles through the continuing development of the built environment. In keeping with this effort, the Area Plan reflects the following key pursuits at UCR:

Improving the University/Town Connection

As the UCR campus develops, a key focus will be the University's evolving relationship with the surrounding community including its public entities, private businesses and residential neighborhoods. It will become increasingly important to establish both clear campus boundaries and a strong sense of University identity, while at the same time reaching out to build connections with the surrounding community and the downtown area. Planning efforts must recognize that these "University/Town" relationships offer a variety of opportunities for creating shared resources, facilities and programs. Continuing development scenarios need to explore both buildings and outdoor gathering spaces designed to capitalize on these opportunities. In addition, special attention to issues of access and connection, both physical and perceived, will be required.



Environmental Stewardship

The University has committed to an ongoing responsibility to lead the way as a regional model for environmental stewardship, through the preservation, enhancement and restoration of the natural environment. Continued planning efforts must not only recognize existing environmental patterns, but also enhance and capitalize on these elements as unique campus assets. Preservation of viewsheds, protection of drainage patterns, and enhancement of native plant communities can all contribute to the creation of a truly unique campus identity for both the Entrance Area and the larger University campus.



World Leadership in Selected Areas

The 2010 Vision for UCR identified world leadership in selected fields of study/research, including Materials Science, Nanotechnology, and Genomics, as a critical focus in the continuing development of the University. In order to meet this goal, campus planning must ensure an adequate land base for the development of cutting edge teaching and research facilities. In addition, plans must establish strong building adjacencies that enhance interaction and collaboration between the students, faculty and staff engaged within these programs.

Support of the Draft 2003 LRDP Strategies

Continued planning efforts must also respond to the draft 2003 LRDP as the primary long-range planning document for the University of California, Riverside. Efforts must support stated LRDP strategies including those related to projected campus growth, transportation, openspace requirements and land use development. As articulated in the LRDP, plans must recognize the need to efficiently utilize the campus land base, ensuring that available land will be capable of supporting continued growth for many years to come. Higher density development is critical in implementing the LRDP circulation and parking strategies, as it supports a pedestrian oriented campus, and encourages the campus community to use alternative transportation or to park in perimeter parking structures and walk to their destination. In addition, planning efforts must respond to the long-term goal of generating activity along University Avenue, promoting a lively streetscape capable of strengthening the pedestrian connection between East and West Campus, and between UCR and the City of Riverside.

University of California Riverside

Area Plan Concept

Guided by the University's key pursuits, the East Campus Entrance Area Study (ECEAS) reinforces a clear campus identity and creates positive connections to the city through an enhanced campus approach sequence. Parking structures located at the campus perimeter provide convenient access to the campus core while promoting a pedestrian environment. An array of arts-related venues welcome visitors, creating a place at the heart of the study area that fosters campuscommunity interaction. The ECEAS further reinforces the key visions of the University by respecting the unique natural characteristics found within this area of the campus, while simultaneously creating a series of development sites necessary to provide a sense of campus pride and civic vitality to UC, Riverside.

Long viewed as the "front door" for visitors to UCR, the campus approach from downtown Riverside traveling east along University Avenue is enhanced in the ECEAS through the placement of signage, entry monuments, street furnishings and plantings. These improvements not only clarify wayfinding, but also contribute to a sense of entry into the unique place that is the UCR campus. The repetition and patterning of street tree planting and architectural elements creates a sense of continuity and highlights decision-making points as visitors move from Iowa Avenue along University Avenue toward the campus core. A roundabout at the east end of University Avenue serves as a ceremonial terminus for the approach, providing a visual focal point before the road swings north, continuing as Canyon Crest Drive. The ECEAS repeats these street improvements along Canyon Crest Drive, providing visitors entering from Blaine Avenue and traveling south along Canyon Crest Drive with the same level of wayfinding clarity, continuity and sense of place.

The enhanced campus approach brings students, faculty, staff, and visitors alike to the central plaza surrounded by an array of arts-based venues. Placed at the heart of the ECEAS, this central Arts Plaza serves as a welcome mat for the university and capitalizes on the adjacent art venues and programs to create a space that emphasizes campus-community interaction. In its position at a crossroads on campus, the generous plaza accommodates the overspill of visitors attending evening performances, large-scale campus community gatherings, and small outdoor study groups, as well as the buzzing movement of daily student life.

Looking east over the Arts Plaza toward the Box Springs Mountains, visitors see glimpses of the powerful arroyo system that drains the range beyond. Towering vegetation marks the arroyo as it tracks down the mountains toward the UCR campus at Valencia Hill Drive, where the University Arroyo first manifests itself as an above-ground directed channel with native vegetation. The ECEAS respects this strong natural feature by creating an open space framework to organize future development and protect the drainage pattern. The ECEAS echoes this natural feature in both the placement of buildings and the emphasis on a naturalized planting scheme reflective of the original wild character of the arroyo. As the existing arroyo emerges west of Canyon Crest Drive, buildings are located along its perimeter, protecting the integrity of the naturalized channel while capitalizing on its unique visual character as a southern Californian riparian system.

The East Campus Entrance Area Study serves as a benchmark in time. The plan captures the current values of the campus community in its articulation of identity, promotion of campuscommunity interaction, and emphasis on environmental respect and stewardship. Just as the plan reflects the vision of the current community, it must also serve as a long-range planning tool and as such, it will be required to accommodate future changes both internally and in relation to surrounding conditions. With this in mind, the Area Plan provides a flexible hierarchy of spaces and building massing capable of adjusting to future programmatic changes and a strong open space framework to guide future campus growth as it occurs.





University of California Riverside

A Walk Through the Future

Two students finish their cappuccinos at the Arroyo Café, checking their watches to see how much time they have to get across East Campus to their class at the Materials Science and Engineering Building. The two met an hour earlier to discuss their upcoming term paper. Javier had walked across the footbridge from his apartment at Bannockburn Village, stopping briefly to check on the progress of the new Alumni and Visitors' Center. The Center had outgrown their space in the old Watkins House and a new wing was being built, funded by an alumnus who had studied biotechnology. As Javier ambled through the treetops of the wild arroyo, he had spotted a ruby-crowned kinglet stopping by to rest in the lush trees on its migratory path southwards.

Javier's friend, Lavinia had come along University Avenue, under I-215, from her apartment near The Grove on West Campus. She normally liked to wander through the gardens along the old Gage Canal on her way to class, but she was running late this morning so she had hopped on the Highlander Hauler. The brightly painted trolley bus dropped her off in front of the apartment building recently completed by a local church, which housed students and church elders above a ground-floor chapel and bookstore.

Lavinia and Javier like to meet at the Arroyo Café because it's convenient for them both, and the rear terrace looks out onto a quiet creek weaving through a jumble of trees and shrubs, alive with birdsong. As they cross the tree-lined University Avenue after their coffee, the two stroll along wide sidewalks in front of the Arts Building, and continue towards the Arts Plaza beyond. Cars circle slowly through the Roundabout, heading towards the Parking Structure on Canyon Crest Drive. Campus gardeners carefully replant the seasonal floral display in the middle of the roundabout and adjust the sculptural installation created by UCR Fine Arts students to mark the school's 75th anniversary as a University.

As they hurry across the Arts Plaza, they bump into their friend Susan, who is rushing from dance practice in the Recital Hall to her Native American studies seminar in the nearby CHASS Instruction and Research Building. Exchanging a quick hug, they make plans to meet for lunch in the Commons – Lavinia has an appointment with an advisor next door in the SASS building at 1:30 to discuss her graduate school plans, so that suits her just fine. Javier might head to the Phys. Ed. Building to work out after lunch. Passing in front of the soaring glass lobby of the C'ordova Museum and Recital Hall, Javier and Lavinia stop suddenly, as they spot the huge orange crane in front of the Performing Arts Center. Beneath it is suspended a large banner, proclaiming the upcoming shows by the Chinese National Opera, which, observes Javier, is a huge coup for UCR – this is their only show in California and they chose Riverside for the world class quality of the Watkins Concert Hall, with its soaring fly-loft and ease of access for delivery of the innumerable sets and instruments associated with such a large traveling production.

Hearing the Carillon Tower chime the hour, Javier and Lavinia dart down the stairway into Arroyo Gardens, the wide green space framed by the Performing Arts Center and Engineering complex. This is their favorite space to gather with friends for picnics or impromptu football games, or simply to study between classes under large trees. Some drama students practice a swordfight on the Arts Lawn, watched by others on the pedestrian bridge above that leads to the tennis courts and Student Athletic Center. This bridge is a popular shortcut onto campus for commuter students using the parking structure at Lot 24.

Cutting across the Arroyo Gardens at a jog, Javier and Lavinia sprint up the stairs to the MS & Building, dashing into the Auditorium just in time to get two seats together, as the lights dim, and the professor begins to speak.



Area Plan Districts

The East Campus Entrance Area Plan can be considered as four distinct yet interwoven districts, each with its own unique attributes and requirements, building on the key concepts articulated in previous sections of this document. For purposes of the study, these areas will be referred to as the:

- University Arroyo District,
- Arts Plaza District,
- East University Arroyo District and
- Carillon Mall District

As a long-range planning document, the Area Plan seeks to illustrate the character of each district and provide generalized guidelines to assist in directing continued growth.

While the unique characteristics of each district generate a set of specific guiding principles, the Area Plan process also identified several guidelines applicable to the development of the entire area at-large:

- Infill new facilities to work as a whole while preserving the individual building/user needs such as adjacencies, circulation and service
- Promote development scenarios that represent the most efficient use over time of the UCR land-base
- Integrate proposed open space and public plazas seamlessly with existing and proposed facilities



Figure 5.2: Murals and the I-215/SR-60 underpass

University Arroyo District

Extending from Iowa Avenue to the roundabout junction at Canyon Crest Drive, the University Arroyo District embraces both sides of University Avenue in a vibrant and dynamic mixed-use pattern. Boasting an active streetscape, this District could combine conferencing facilities at the University's Extension Center with the continued infill of mixed-use development between Iowa Avenue, I-215/SR-60 and the roundabout. Colorful banners, University District signage and an enhanced streetscape lead to the landmark murals at the I-215/SR-60 underpass (*Figure 5.2*).



Figure 5.3: University Village - looking North from University Ave. to UNEX



Figure 5.4: University Village - looking East towards UCR from UNEX Driveway

Passing by the murals, visitors are greeted by formal monument signage denoting the arrival to the main UC Riverside campus. Mixed-use development south of University Avenue replaces the elevated reservoir site and could incorporate the existing Church of Latter Day Saints facility (*Figure 5.8 and 5.9*), creating a contiguous and dynamic pedestrian experience linking West and East Campuses. This development could accommodate a variety of uses including restaurants, retail, commercial, and housing components geared to serve both the resident student population and visitors taking advantage of the Continuing Education conference facilities or attracted by performances in the nearby Arts complex.



Figure 5.5: Looking East down University Ave towards the UCR entrance sign



Figure 5.6: UCR entrance sign on University Ave.

Area Plan Districts

Enhanced pedestrian crossings slow traffic and facilitate access to additional mixed-use along the northern edge of University Avenue (*Figure 5.7*). Here the buildings take advantage of both the active streetscape of University Avenue to the south and the green respite of the arroyo to the north. Outdoor terraces and decks take advantage of unique views into the arroyo basin while a pedestrian bridge moves students through the canopy toward new student housing to the north. Situated along Canyon Crest Drive, the Alumni Visitors Center also capitalizes on the unique nature of the arroyo, benefiting from easy access and proximity to the perceived campus "front door."

The following guidelines are suggested for development within the University Arroyo District:

- Use the formal entry of the campus as a gateway to the campus core
- Retain the roundabout as the "front door", terminating the campus approach and calming traffic
- Develop primary campus approach enhancements beginning at Iowa and University to the west

- Develop secondary campus approach enhancements beginning at Blaine and Canyon Crest to the north
- Establish mixed-use development both north and south of University Avenue to create a University District supporting an active vibrant streetscape
- Develop a dynamic mix of uses including academic, restaurant, retail, commercial and housing to attract both student and community populations
- Consider utilizing a variety of parking strategies including on-street, underground and/or structured parking at Lot 1 to meet the parking requirements of the mixed-use area
- Pursue relocation of the City water reservoir south of University Avenue to enliven the streetscape
- Encourage integration of the existing Church of Latter Day Saints (LDS) facility south of University Avenue within a new mixed-use complex
- Provide views of the Box Springs Mountains from University Avenue
- Develop facilities along the University Arroyo to capitalize on the unique character and views of the arroyo

- Enhance interaction with, and appreciation of, the University Arroyo through the use of canopy bridges, overlook terraces, and preservation of filtered views
- Ensure that development adjacent to the University Arroyo does not impact the overall flood capacity of the Gage Basin
- Control invasive species and enhance native vegetation to strengthen the quality of habitat and the natural aesthetic character of the University Arroyo and Gage Basin



Figure 5.8: Looking Northeast towards University Ave, from reservoir



Figure 5.9: Looking East towards the Arts Building and the LDS facility



University of California Riverside

36

Area Plan Districts

Arts Plaza District

Serving as the heart of the East Campus Entrance Area Plan, the Arts Plaza District (*Figure 5.10*) pulls together a collection of campus programs that bring with them a heightened level of public interface: the Performing Arts Center, Recital Hall and Campus Museum/Art Gallery. Located at the University's "front door", these programs fronting their associated plaza are designed to welcome visitors and activate one of the least developed, yet most visually important, areas on campus.

Each of the buildings within this district is sited with careful consideration for facilitating access, maintaining critical view corridors and activating the adjacent central plaza. Located along the eastern edge of the plaza, the Recital Hall and Museum/Art Gallery share an open glass lobby that, in the evening hours, serves as a "lantern" element at the terminus of University Avenue. The Performing Arts Center is located north of the plaza to take advantage of immediately adjacent parking, while also providing a drop-off zone along Canyon Crest Drive. A transparent lobby at this building allows visitors to view the arroyo reflected to both the east and the west.

At the heart of these programs is the Arts Plaza, a flexible multi-use space large enough to accommodate large-scale gatherings while also providing secondary spaces that respond specifically to the adjacent building programs. As the design of the plaza evolves, attention should be paid to providing a hierarchy of diverse spaces. Lush plantings and canopy trees may be utilized to soften the edges of buildings fronting the plaza, providing shaded gathering spaces to support informal outdoor lectures and study groups. Raised planters, seatwalls, or benches may be incorporated to allow visitors moving to and from performances to pause and mingle, while an open central plaza of specialty paving or open lawn could provide a central congregating space for students and visitors alike. Fronting the Arts Plaza is the ceremonial roundabout. In addition to providing a ceremonial terminus for the enhanced campus approach, the roundabout also serves to slow traffic through the Arts Plaza District and allows visitors that have missed their desired venue to correct their route as they entered the campus proper. Given the roundabout's position adjacent to the Arts Plaza, it retains the potential to become a convenient campus identifier and memorable UCR landmark.



Figure 5.10: Arts Plaza District

The following guidelines are suggested for development within the Arts Plaza District:

- Maintain views toward the Box Springs Mountains and the University Arroyo through careful consideration of building placement, building height and plaza vegetation
- Utilize plaza vegetation to reference the connection of the East Campus and University Arroyo features
- Retain adequate open space within the plaza to accommodate large scale public and University gatherings
- Locate buildings to ensure a clear flow of space and views from the University Arroyo, through the Arts Plaza, and south along the Arts Mall
- Create a hierarchy of spaces to accommodate activities such as informal classroom gatherings adjacent to the CHASS I&R facility
- Align buildings to maintain a clear extension of the Arts Mall north along the east side of Canyon Crest Drive
- Provide logical campus vehicular drop-off points for visitors as well as for campus and public transit on University Avenue, if possible, and Canyon Crest Drive

Area Plan Districts

East University Arroyo District

Located on the current UCR Athletic Fields, the East University Arroyo District (*Figure 5.11*) draws strongly from its adjacency to both the naturalized arroyo form east of Aberdeen Drive and the science facilities located to the south.

Within this district, views both east and west reveal the canopy of the arroyo system as it flows down from the Box Springs Mountains to the Gage Basin. While implementation of the University Arroyo Infrastructure Project will remove this area from the 100 year floodplain, and protect development from the flood hazards of the arroyo, the East University Arroyo District will respond to and reflect this powerful natural system in the placement of buildings, treatment of grades, and use of a more naturalized planting scheme inspired by the natural arroyo's character.

This district will retain a "basin" quality, reflecting the historic drainage of the arroyo. Buildings will be located on the north and south edges of the basin, preserving an open flow of space and visual connection with the arroyo to the east and west. These buildings will have both a public face activating a pedestrian streetscape on North Campus Drive and the additional new northern access drive, and a private face fronting on the central open space.

The creation of a new Engineering/Science Quad within the East University Arroyo District reflects the University's commitment to growth within these disciplines. Proximity to the existing facilities at Bourns Engineering, the Surge Building and the University Lecture Hall, south of North Campus Drive, will promote pedestrian activity and provide numerous opportunities for enhanced collaboration.

Pedestrian bridges spanning the open space will continue to strengthen north-south pedestrian connections with the Recreation Mall and the Commons Mall and to ultimately accommodate an increased flow of students from housing to the north and northeast. A network of pathways will provide access to a hierarchy of gathering spaces within the central open space basin, including an open green suitable for outdoor performances and celebrations.

Forming the northern edge of the East University Arroyo District, a new combinded pedestrian/service corridor, North Arroyo Drive, will provide front door access to the buildings along the district's northern edge. This pedestrian oriented corridor will facilitate the movement of students from housing east of Aberdeen Drive to services along Canyon Crest, as well as providing easy access from the parking structure at Lot 24 into the academic buildings in the East University



Figure 5.11: East University Arroyo District

Arroyo District. This drive will also provide direct contiguous service access between Canyon Crest and Aberdeen Drive. In addition to pedestrians, bicycles, and service, this access drive will enhance emergency access throughout the East University Arroyo District.

The following criteria for development should be maintained within the East University Arroyo District:

- Provide views of the arroyo from Canyon Crest Drive looking east through to The Glade
- Position buildings to allow central open space to expand and constrict, but never be blocked from east to west
- A minimum distance of 100 feet between building faces fronting the central open space is to be maintained, with buildings along North Campus Drive positioned as far south as allowed by utility constraints, and those along North Arroyo Drive positioned as far North as allowed by the alignment of the pedestrian/ service corridor
- Allow for a naturalized expression of the University Arroyo to be reflected in the development of the Athletic Fields
- Design the University Arroyo to allow for innovative treatment strategies for local building runoff
- Develop "North Arroyo Drive" a continuous service/ pedestrian and bicycle drive along northern edge, for service access and building entry
- Offset buildings from North Campus Drive to accommodate existing utilities
- Develop diversity and hierarchy of spaces to ensure that students, staff, and visitors can access and use central open space.
- Provide screening of MS&E loading dock

Area Plan Districts

Carillon Mall District

Shaping the southern most extent of the East Campus Entrance Area Plan is the placement of the Student Academic Support Services (SASS) Building and Arts growth programs along the existing Carillon Mall (Figure 5.12). Drawing on strong program adjacencies, the placement of these two buildings also works to strengthen and clarify the northern edge of the formal Carillon Mall, the main campus green space.

Immediately south of the existing Arts Building, a location for academic Arts growth has been reserved. This site provides opportunities to spatially clarify both the Carillon and Arts Malls, enhance student activity and complement programming and activities currently found within the Arts Building.

Located immediately adjacent to Costo Hall, the SASS Building benefits from adjacencies to the student activity found at the Commons as well as student organizations located within Costo Hall. Visitors to the SASS Building will find convenient

access from Parking Lot 1, including an enhanced pedestrian walkway and clear sitelines leading from the drop-off area at West Campus Drive, east to the SASS Building and the Commons beyond. Student tours beginning at the SASS Building will also be able to take advantage of nearby facilities such as the Commons, Bookstore, and University Lecture Hall.

The following guidelines are suggested for development within the Carillon Mall District:

- Position Arts Expansion to maintain clear site lines from Lot 1 to the SASS Building, Costo Hall and Student Commons area
- Develop a shared service access point for the SASS Building, Costo Hall, and Student Commons sites
- Develop the SASS Building to strengthen the Carillon Mall and address Costo Hall
- Enhance pedestrian walkways leading from the SASS • Building west to parking at Lot 1 to accommodate pedestrian traffic at peak hours and provide a secondary small vehicle service route during off hours.



Figure 5.13: Open space in Carillon Mall





Figure 5.14: Carillon Tower

Connectivity

Key to the success of the East Campus Entrance Area Study are the circulation systems, both vehicular and non-vehicular, that provide access to each of the districts and weave them together into one clear and cohesive entity.

Vehicular

University Avenue remains the primary public entry to the East Campus, with Canyon Crest Drive serving as a secondary entry. As recommended in the draft 2003 LRDP, parking is held outside of the campus core and supported within parking structures to maximize the efficient use of the UCR land-base. Prominent directional signage along University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive directs visitors to new parking structures at Lots 1 and 24.

Both parking structures include dual access points to minimize congestion particularly as related to campus events. A visitors' information kiosk greets visitors entering the Lot 1 structure, while a vehicular drop-off zone near Lot 24 offers additional access opportunities and facilitates the continued flow of traffic. Development of the parking structure at Lot 24 includes lush streetscape planting, a carefully modulated building facade and the inclusion of retail venues to mitigate impacts on the pedestrian environment along Canyon Crest Avenue. In addition, a fire access road is retained along the structure's east face to ensure adequate emergency access routing.

The Area Plan provides a comprehensive service and emergency access system (*Figure 5.16*). A shared pedestrian/ service road links Canyon Crest and Aberdeen Drive, allowing for primary service access to the East University Arroyo District from Canyon Crest Avenue. This routing ensures adequate service and emergency access to the East University Arroyo District and allows for convenient semi-trailer access to the Performing Arts back-of-house docks. Facilities to the south, including the MS&E building, Recital Hall/Museum, CHASS I&R facility, and the SASS Building, gain service access from the existing North Campus Drive route and rely on the creation of shared loading docks to ensure the efficient use of the campus core land-base.

The Area Plan also provides for continuation of mass transit services, public and university, with primary routes traversing University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive. A pull out at the Performing Art Building on Canyon Crest may serve as a primary access point for these services. As the campus continues to evolve increased service will be required to facilitate universal access to the campus and to help alleviate parking needs created by single occupant auto usage. The Multi-Modal Transportation Management Strategy, initiated in 2003, considers an integrated network of both vehicular and non-vehicular circulation opportunities throughout the campus which will in turn benefit the East Campus Entrance Area Study.

Non-vehicular

To promote a pedestrian oriented campus, UCR must facilitate the movement of students, staff, visitors, goods and services onto the campus from surrounding communities, as well as ensure safe and convenient routes within the campus core. The Area Plan includes pedestrian enhancements targeted at linking the East and West Campuses, attracting visitors from the University Village area and encouraging the flow of students from housing on the west into the campus core (Figure 5.15). These improvements include widened sidewalks, street trees and signalized pedestrian crossings along University Avenue. The introduction of mixed use within this University District further animates the streetscape, creating an enjoyable and dynamic pedestrian experience as visitors move toward the campus core, eliminating a large expanse of mostly vacant land between the freeway and the Arts Mall, which can be intimidating, especially at night.

Along Canyon Crest Drive, street utilities are consolidated, walks widened and street trees added to create a safe and pleasant pedestrian experience. In addition, the plan recognizes established pedestrian routes from student housing to the north, and positions bridges and walkways to facilitate this increased movement into campus.

As student populations increase so will the number of bicycles entering the campus core. The Area Plan accommodates bicycle routing on the primary perimeter roads, retaining bike lanes on University Avenue, Canyon Crest Drive, and Aberdeen Drive. Within the campus proper, shared pedestrian/bicycle walks provide connections both north-south and east-west. The width of these shared walks should be at least twelve feet to ensure safety and be accompanied by bike-only ramps to avoid hazardous conflicts at stairways.



Figure 5.15: Students in the I-215/SR 60 underpass walking towards UCR

East Campus Entrance Area Study



University of California Riverside

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Campus Approach

The East Campus Entrance Area Study examines the potential land uses and transportation options for a key piece of UCR. Critical to the successful accommodation of future growth on the East Campus, will be the improvement of University Avenue, from Iowa Avenue to the "elbow" with Canyon Crest Drive, and the upgrading of Canyon Crest Drive northwards to Blaine Avenue.

The University Avenue axis will continue to serve as the primary "gateway" to UCR, as the simplest route to campus from downtown Riverside and from the I-215/SR-60 freeway, and also as the easiest and most direct link from UCR's burgeoning West Campus to the core East Campus. Canyon Crest Drive will continue to serve as a favored route from student housing in neighborhoods north of campus, and may become a more heavily-used automobile route to future facilities on the East Campus such as a parking structure on Lot 24, and a Performing Arts Center.

With the above functions, and with campus enrollment growth, University Avenue along with Canyon Crest Drive will become increasingly busy corridors to campus and will see increasing development and redevelopment along their frontages. Currently, however, these corridors suffer from substandard pedestrian amenities, irregular street tree plantings, unnecessary roadway width and uncoordinated development.

To address these conditions, and to consider the importance of these corridors in establishing UCR's identity, a strategy for the creation of a distinct campus approach was created. This strategy focused on physical improvements to the 'streetscape' of these two corridors, suggesting enhancements such as signage, public art, sidewalk widths and materials, street trees and lighting and pedestrian crosswalks. (Figure 5.17)



University Avenue Sequence

Downtown to Iowa Basic Directional UCR Signage University District Identity Redevelopment and Infill to create continuous street frontage Safe Crosswalks Landscaped Median Street Trees 30' O.C.

lowa to Freeway

Begin District Signage University Village Entry Monument Freeway Monuments Mixed Use frontage both sides, new UCR extension Special Event Banners on light standards Enhanced Streetscape on all 4 corners Safer Crosswalks with pavers District Lighting Slow Automobile Speeds Enhanced Bus & Shuttle Stops with benches, shelters

Freeway to Plaza

District Signage + On-campus Wayfinding Special Event Banners on light standards Wide Sidewalks both sides of Avenue Enhance pedestrian freeway undercrossing Mixed Use Frontage both sides On-street parking when possible Multiple, safe Crosswalks--pedestrian priority Slow automobile speeds Paving stone intersections District Lighting

Canvon Crest Drive

Basic Directional UCR Signage Widened Sidewalks Beginning of District Lighting Maintain existing Street Trees 30' O.C.

District Signage + On-campus wayfinding Special Event Banners on light standards Multiple Safe Crosswalks Slow automobiles, pedestrian priority Double row "allee" of Street Trees 30' O.C. along eastern edge of Canyon Crest Drop-off area for Performing Arts Center

Roundabout & Arts Plaza

Coordinated landscape design with new buildings Special Event Banners on light standards Minimize regulatory signage at roundabout Underground utilities Wide Sidewalks both sides of Avenue Multiple, safe Crosswalks and pedestrian priority Consider special Paving for roundabout No automobile drop-offs = safety & aesthetics



Figure 5.17: Future Plan Connectivity

42

Campus Approach

The two key corridors of Canyon Crest Drive and University Avenue have the potential for three conditions upon the full build-out of the ECEAS:

- Residential Campus Street Edge
- Urban Campus Street Edge
- Main Campus Streetscape

It is important to note that streetscape improvements will be easiest where UCR owns land on either side of the Right-Of-Way. Elsewhere, City-UCR coordination will be required. The ROW throughout campus for these two streets is owned and maintained by the City of Riverside.

Residential Campus Street Edge

This condition is proposed for the length of Canyon Crest Drive from the Arts Mall north to Blaine Avenue. (*Figures* 5.18 through 5.21 show the existing conditions for this corridor. *Figures* 5.22 and 5.23 show a typical streetscape replacement for Canyon Crest Drive) There are, however, three distinct stretches of Canyon Crest Drive, which should be considered for subtly different streetscape treatments:

Blaine to Linden

This stretch of Canyon Crest Drive should be upgraded to include:

- Basic Directional UCR Signage
- Widened Sidewalks (6-8')
- Safe Crosswalks
- District Lighting
- Traffic calming techniques such as curb bulbouts.
- Street Trees every 30'

Linden to Arts Plaza

This stretch of Canyon Crest Drive should be upgraded to include:

- District Signage and on-campus wayfinding
- Clear wayfinding for bicycles travelling south on Canyon Crest Drive to the Main Campus.
- District Lighting
- Special Event Banners on light standards
- Wide Sidewalks (8'-10')
- Multiple 'Raised' Crosswalks (creating "bumps" for cars)
- Slow automobiles with pedestrian priority
- No service/delivery trucks in the Athletic Fields area
- Double row "allee" of Street Trees every 30' along eastern edge of Canyon Crest
- Drop-off/Turn-out area

Roundabout & Arts Plaza

This stretch of Canyon Crest Drive should be upgraded to include:

- Recognition of the "A-Ha Moment" (the moment of "realizing" you have arrived at the UCR campus proper)
- Public Art
- A landscaped traffic circle, or roundabout
- Coordinated landscape design with new buildings
- District Lighting
- Special Event Banners on light standards
- Minimal regulatory signage at roundabout to city standards
- Wide Sidewalks (8'-12') on both sides of street
- Multiple, safe Crosswalks and pedestrian priority
- Potential special paving for roundabout
- No automobile drop-offs to prioritize safety & aesthetics



Figure 5.18: Existing Canyon Crest Drive looking North



Figure 5.19: Existing Canyon Crest Drive looking south

Campus Approach



Figure 5.20: Existing Canyon Crest Drive



Fig. 5.22 Proposed Canyon Crest Drive at Bannockburn Village







Figure 5.23: Proposed Canyon Crest Drive at Bannockburn Village Plan Diagram

Campus Approach

Urban Campus Street Edge

This condition is proposed for the length of University Avenue from downtown Riverside to Iowa Avenue and then at a more intensified level, from Iowa to the I-215/SR-60 freeway. Recognizing that University Avenue is one of the primary routes to the UCR campus from downtown, several city and neighborhood planning documents have already addressed the need to enhance this corridor with basic streetscape treatments and signage:

Downtown to Iowa

This stretch of University Avenue should be upgraded to include:

- Basic Directional UCR Signage
- University Avenue District Identity
- Redevelopment and Infill to create a continuous street frontage
- Safe Crosswalks
- Landscaped Median
- Street Trees every 30'

Iowa to Freeway

This portion of University Avenue traverses a rapidlychanging edge to the UCR campus. The University has partnered with the City of Riverside and private developers to create an innovative mixed-use retail, residential and office complex called University Village, and the streetscape has been correspondingly upgraded with impressive street trees, wide sidewalks, a landscaped median, and speciallypaved crosswalks. As the West Campus develops, this section will become even more vital to the establishment of the University's identity, so there are further upgrades that could occur to make this even more distinct. This stretch of University Avenue should be upgraded to include:

- District Signage
- A University Village Entry Monument
- Freeway Offramp Monuments
- Mixed Use 'infill' buildings
- New UCR facilities located close to street frontage with pedestrian orientation (Ex. UNEX, Human Resources, Conference Center, etc.)
- Special Event Banners on light standards (Figure 5.24)
- Safer Crosswalks, raised or textured with pavers (creating a "bump" for cars, *see Figures 5.25 and 5.26*)
- District Lighting expanded to all adjacent streets
- Traffic calming and curb bulb-outs (Figure 5.27)
- Enhanced Bus & Shuttle Stops with benches, shelters, digital arrival time displays



Figure 5.24: Example of Special Event Banners



Figure 5.25: Example of a Raised Crosswalk



Figure 5.26: Example of a Textured Crosswalk



Figure 5.27: Example of a Curb Bulb-Out

Campus Approach

Main Campus Streetscape

This condition is proposed for the length of University Avenue from the 1-215/SR-60 freeway to the roundabout at the Arts Plaza where the Avenue meets Canyon Crest Drive. After the urban bustle of University Avenue west of the freeway, this stretch will assume an appearance that is much more closely integrated with the core campus landscape. Where there are currently vacant lots, and a lack of pedestrian amenities or a roadway that is wider than necessary (Figures 5.28 through 5.32), infill mixed-use development, wide sidewalks and enhanced landscaping will transform this into a true gateway to campus. Along with clear, concise signage that is integrated with a larger campus signage system, this stretch of University Avenue will act as the final welcome to UCR, embracing visitors arriving by foot, bike, auto or bus and moving them efficiently on to their final campus destination (Figures 5.33 and 5.34).



Figure 5.28: Existing University Avenue east of I-215/SR-60 looking west

Freeway to Plaza

This stretch of University Avenue should be upgraded to include:

- District Signage and On-campus Wayfinding
- Special Event Banners on light standards
- Wide Sidewalks (10'-16') on both sides of University Avenue
- Enhanced pedestrian freeway undercrossing (widen undercrossing). Murals replaced after freeway reconstruction
- Mixed-Use frontage both sides, with buildings close to the street, parking behind or underneath and pedestrianscaled shop fronts. Academic uses, student dwelling units or UCR offices atop retail will ensure that the streetscape has active uses and "eyes-on-the-street" throughout the day
- Multiple, safe Crosswalks with priority for pedestrians
- Traffic calming
- Special paving at intersections, potential logo pattern imprinted on intersection
- District Lighting
- Enhanced landscaping, with street trees in wells within sidewalks, and a planted, raised median separating traffic lanes and replacing the current "turn-lane-to nowhere".



Figure 5.29: Existing University Avenue east of I-215/SR-60 looking east



Figure 5.30: Existing University Avenue east of I-215/SR-60 looking southeast

Campus Approach







Figure 5.31: Existing University Avenue east of I-215/SR-60





Section Six: Phasing



Phasing

As a long-range planning tool, the East Campus Entrance Area Study is designed to accommodate a number of phased development scenarios. While select elements of growth are projected for completion in the near future, many of the components of the Area Plan may not be realized for many years to come. With this in mind, the Area Plan is flexibly configured to accommodate a number of possible growth scenarios over time including anticipated improvements to I-215/SR-60, continued growth in student housing both north and west of the study area, the possible relocation of the City reservoir south of University Avenue, and the potential integration of the Church of Latter Day Saints facility within continued campus growth.

Despite these many fluid variables, from a master-planning standpoint there are certain development scenarios that appear most appropriate and probable at this time, taking into account the current focus of funding and planning efforts.

Phase I

The CHASS Instruction and Research facility represents Phase I development of the East Campus Entrance Area Study (*Figure 6.1*). This building will take the place of existing tennis courts along the Arts Mall, strengthening and activating the Mall's east edge. Considerations during the development of this phase include special attention to the articulation of the building's north facade to ensure a strong and interactive relationship with the future Arts Plaza. In addition, the design of service functions within the building should address the future development of a shared service drive from the east. Walkways and openspace related to the new CHASS Instruction and Research facility should be developed in a manner that will reinforce the long-term planning vision for this area.



Phasing

Phase II

Phase II of the Area Study is the construction of the MS&E Building, marking the first building in the development of the future East University Arroyo District (Figure 5.16). Located in the southeast corner of the current Athletic Fields, this building will reinforce pedestrian activity along North Campus Drive and set the tone for site development as growth within this district continues. Considerations during development of this phase include careful screening of the MS&E service area from both North Campus Drive and Canyon Crest Drive and from a future north-south pedestrian bridge that will cross the central open space basin to the west. Building siting will need to consider both the existing utilities running parallel to University Drive and the need to hold the building to the south in order to maintain a clear flow of open space through the central basin as the East University Arroyo District develops. Facilities must maintain a required setback from the underground storm drains on the south.



Phase III

The completion of the SASS Building at the Carillon Mall and the Alumni and Visitors Center along Canyon Crest Drive represents Phase III of the ECEAS (Figure 6.3). With the introduction of the SASS Building at the open space currently adjacent to Costo Hall, the north edge of the Carillon Mall is strengthened and activated. Primary considerations in the development of the SASS Building include: reinforcing connections with the complimentary uses found at both Costo Hall and the Student Commons; enhancing and capitalizing on adjacent greenspaces; and development of an efficient shared service access point for the SASS Building, Costo Hall, and the future Academic Building (Figure 5.14: Future Plan Connectivity). The development of the SASS Building should anticipate coordination with the existing Physical Education Building, while not precluding the development of a future Academic Building in its place.

Completion of the Alumni and Visitors Center at the site currently occupied by the Watkins House will create a truly unique venue within the context of the University Arroyo. Development at this site will eliminate the current service drive at Watkins, coordinating a single entry to parking and the Alumni and Visitors Center from the existing signal on Canyon Crest Drive. Careful siting of the new center will reduce possible impacts on the University Arroyo drainage system while ensuring that the building takes advantage of the unique natural setting. Additional considerations include relocation of the programs currently housed in the Watkins House and satisfying specific deed restrictions that may remain on the property.



Phasing

Future Growth

All remaining buildings and sitework are currently considered under future growth as the projected pattern of acquisition, funding, and development is unclear at this time (Figure 6.5). As the East Campus Entrance Area Plan is achieved over time, major considerations for the University will include road improvements in conjunction with the City along University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive, as well as those roads supporting chiefly the University's infrastructure such as the "North Arroyo Drive", the service and pedestrian/bicycle route connecting Canyon Crest Drive and Aberdeen Drive. In addition, the few remaining non-University-owned properties East of the freeway, including the City water reservoir site and the Latter Day Saints property, will play a pivotal role in shaping future development scenarios. The progressive adaptation of these land uses will be critical in securing the land use necessary for completion of the Area Plan vision.



Appendices



Meeting Minutes

DATE: April 1, 2003

RE: Committee Meeting #1 – Kick-off

ATTENDEES: Juanita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Richard Block, Academic Senate (Chair of Physical Resource Committee) Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Andy Plumley, Director of Housing Dennis Rice, Assistant Dean of Engineering

> Gavriel Kullman, ASUCR representative Nadine Sayegh, ASUCR President Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction Tim Ralston, ABP-Capital and Physical Planning

Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Ken Pirie, Walker Macy Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects

ITEMS

1.1 Nita Bullock began the meeting with a review of the selection process and the introduction of the Walker Macy/Thomas Hacker team. She provided a brief review of the project scope, goals, and the campus planning background (2010 Vision, 1990 LRDP, LRDP update 2003) that has laid the groundwork for the East Campus Entrance Area Study.

1.2 The Walker Macy/Thomas Hacker team led formal introductions, with committee members encouraged to share early impressions of their arrival on campus as well as special interests/concerns as related to the study area. General thoughts, initial impressions of the campus entry experience and ongoing observations included:

• The need to formalize the public entrance, enhance wayfinding, and emphasize Hinderaker as the starting point for new students and other campus visitors. (At least in the near future. The new student services academic facility may take over that function in the future.)

• The desire to clarify the entry sequence and subsequent arrival to campus. Numerous stories were recounted of first time arrivals traveling up University Avenue, where they found no clear way to enter the University, and turned back or exited the campus via Canyon Crest.

• A lack of formal campus boundaries and entry markers was noted. Images of a series of kiosk style entrances, such as those found at the UC Santa Barbara campus, were favorably noted as contributing to a strong overall sense of campus. • The committee expressed a sense that the process of clarifying the East Campus Entrance would serve as a character defining moment for the campus.

1.3 Doug Macy provided the committee with an overview of the team's preliminary thoughts with regard to the entry sequence, arrival zone, and the distribution of associated future development. Conceptual site analysis diagrams, initially presented in the project interview, where used to note project scope, primary site characteristics, and to stimulate the discussion of possible opportunities and challenges found within the East Entrance study area. Preliminary concepts represented in the diagrams included:

• Development of University Village as a primary activity generator in the connection of East and West Campus, and ultimately the city

• Potential for unique sequence of spaces progressing from University Village, through the underpass, past initial campus markers, to the first decision-making point (turn to visitor parking), and ultimately arriving at the elbow of University Avenue and Canyon Crest.

• Implications of ring road, peripheral parking and the location of the visitors lot as related to the entrance sequence.

 Environmental characteristics such as sun angles, Santa Ana and prevailing winds, the Arroyo, and noise impacts from the adjacent freeway

Primary landscape features including the Carillon and Arts Malls

Committee members responded to the site diagrams, relating special interests and concerns.

Richard Block expressed interest in the future of the Watkins House as the associated area develops. The group discussed the need to study the current programming of Watkins, as well as the implications of remodeling or relocating the associated chapel. Nita Bullock offered to follow up with counsel regarding these implications. Doug Macy noted the need to carefully review the future of Bannockburn in order to develop a plan that has creates a positive relationship between it and the Watkins House. The committee went on to identify the property currently owned by the Church of Latter Day Saints as worth special consideration as the streetscape along University Avenue is developed.

1.5 Kyle Hoffman expressed surprise at the idea of combining commercial uses with academic character in the entry sequence along University Avenue. Numerous development strategies for University Avenue were discussed, including its development as a grand boulevard or, in contrast, establishing a grid along University Avenue by punctuating the street with a series of crossings. The importance of exploring multiple ideas at the phase, without selecting a final option, was emphasized as a way to explore the committee's values, perceptions, and goals for the entrance area.

1.6 Kyle Hoffman noted that in bringing visitors from the Alumni Offices on West Campus down University Avenue, the murals at the underpass were always appreciated, but only <u>after</u> the artwork was specifically pointed out by a campus guide. The desire to develop the entire entry sequence in such a way that visitors say "ah ha" on their own was expressed.

1.7 Richard Block emphasized the impact of noise from the freeway on adjacent properties, noting that noise related complaints are currently received from the Arts Building. This will need to be carefully considered in siting buildings and determining their associated programs. Additional freeway impacts were discussed including the desire to explore a possible pedestrian connection through the underpass on the north side of University Avenue. Nita Bullock noted that the LRDP update also calls for decreased lane widths of the off and on University. Kyle Hoffman pointed out that there is difficulty crossing the ramps even where pedestrian signals are provided. The possible reconfiguration of the off-ramp east of the bridge to modify the free right merge to a complete stop was suggested. Walker Macy will work with Cal Trans and the City to explore possibilities for pedestrian related enhancements.

1.8 Richard Block pointed out the importance of University as a vehicular connection as well given the increasing housing options for University students west of the freeway. He also posed Linden as an alternative route to downtown. Nita Bullock added MLK as an excellent alternative for quickly moving between the campus and the city, but reinforced the long-term plan for the University that emphasizes masstransit and non-vehicular circulation to encourage leaving cars at the edge of the campus.

1.9 The committee noted that moving classroom space west of the freeway, for example the joint lecture/cinema space, creates difficulties for students attempting to make the 10 minute shift between classes. Courses offered in the cinema space typically run on an altered schedule to accommodate the need for extra time. Pedestrian travel time will need to be taken into consideration as the expansion of uses along University-is considered.

2.0 Anticipated development was reviewed by the committee with the following plans noted:

• Long-term development of west athletic fields (on East Campus) as future housing and academic space is built

Meeting Minutes

 Addition of 400 parking spaces to be leased at University Village in Fall 2004

Reconstruction of Bannockburn approximately 2007

 Addition of Material Science Building at east end of Athletic Fields

2.1 The arroyo was discussed in relation to the development of the Material Science and Engineering Building. Current plans include a 7' box culvert for bringing the arroyo past the intramural fields and future development in this zone. The committee expressed interest in developing future openspaces in this area in a way that makes reference to the character of the natural arroyo.

2.2 Dennis Rice posed the question of what actually constitutes the "entrance" to campus. He related that visitors primary concern is generally in locating a place to park. The question of secondary entrances was explored with Linden noted. This prompted a conversation of a ceremonial place of arrival versus functional arrival sequences that may vary from first time visitors to campus staff and faculty on a typical working day route.

2.3 Kyle Hoffman reviewed the history of the Alumni Center proposal. He reviewed how the original scope and budget first increased to include extensive meeting space, dining (Faculty Club), boardroom, library, administrative space, and conferencing facilities before then contracting significantly due to budget constraints and a shift in administrative goals. A small area in the student union is currently the only conferencing facility on campus. (There is conference space at University Extension and in the Pentland Hills. Pentland is used for summer conferences only.) He noted that previous suggestions of attempting an expandable or phased building concept had been rejected.

Kyle expressed a desire for the Alumni Center to play a significant role in welcoming students to campus. Thus, the building program would not be suited to being "buried" behind other uses. Suggestions of pairing the Alumni Center with other programs were discussed. The art gallery, recital hall, and/or museum were suggested as possible adjacencies, creating a complex suited around an open courtyard. Kyle emphasized the importance of the Alumni Center not being paired with another endeavor that brings with it a "20 year" time-line as this would delay the development of the Alumni Center even further. Important elements of the \$4.5 million currently raised are time contingent.

2.4 The committee discussed the Art Gallery program, noting that current facilities located in the Watkins House are not adequate to accommodate some traveling programs. Tim Ralston emphasized that the

proposed 10,000 SF is driven more by the funding target than by an actual tested museum program. Reprogramming or adding onto the Watkins House, perhaps merging programs, was considered a viable option.

2.5 The Recital Hall was noted as being part of the original Arts Building project but was ultimately value-engineered out. The area south of the Arts Building was originally designated to house the Recital Hall.

2.6 Nita Bullock noted that with the proposed addition of a new parking structure at lot #24, visitors will actually be directed there and then brought down Canyon Crest to the campus core. The timing of this shift is critical in developing an appropriate long-term wayfinding and arrival plan. Tim Ralston noted that an additional support building (Surge II) is being considered at the south end of the proposed parking structure to heighten evening activity levels along Canyon Crest.

2.7 With regard to the current site selection for the CHASS building, Gavriel Kullman expressed concern with the loss of openspace in the campus core. In addressing the desire for the CHASS to be adjacent to the Student Union, he noted that students currently walk from the student union throughout the campus to reach classes. Nita Bullock noted additional criteria that are being taken into account in the siting of the CHASS including the size of the building, topography, and other program adjacencies such as adjacencies of academic programs to their corresponding student organizations in Costco Hall.

2.8 Kyle Hoffman emphasized the need for future development immediately adjacent to the proposed arrival circle to have a strong public presence. His review of early design concepts for the Alumni Center (which located the building on the circle) illustrated to him the potential for this area to be the center of a strong public connection between the campus and the Riverside community.

2.9 Doug Macy thanked the committee for their participation and valuable input. He noted that the Walker Macy/THA team would proceed in gathering addition background information, developing a comprehensive site analysis, and examining the proposed building programs in depth. The next meeting date and time will be confirmed through Nita Bullock.

DATE: April 15, 2003

RE: CHASS CPAC Meeting - Site Alternatives Review

ATTENDEES: France Córdova, Chancellor Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor Patricia O'Brien, Dean of CHASS Chuck Rowley, Computing & Communications Tim Ralston, Capital and Physical Planning Juanita Bullock, Physical Planning **Dennis Rice**, Engineering Robert Nava, University Advancement Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction Ed Chang, Ethnic Studies Ted Chiu, Design and Construction Tony Cook, Capital and Physical Planning Sandi Evelyn-Veere, CHASS Andy Pumley, Housing Sharon Salinger, College of Humanities, Arts Social Sciences Satish Tripathi, Bourns College of Engineering

> Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Thomas Hacker, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc. Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc.

ITEMS

1.1 Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar opened the presentation with an introduction of the East Campus Entrance Area Study. She emphasized the study's need to develop a plan that creates a "front door" for the campus and highlights the connection between the University and Riverside communities. Vice Chancellor Bolar noted that the team had been asked to review the siting of the CHASS Instruction and Research (I&R) building within the context of the greater East Campus Entrance Area Study, taking into account the continued long-term develop of this area, its nature as a ceremonial campus entrance, and the importance of the area as a public interface zone. Nita Bullock then introduced the Walker Macy / Thomas Hacker Architects team.

1.2 Doug Macy (Walker Macy) began the presentation with a review of the project scope, using an aerial photograph to outline the area under consideration. He reviewed the three primary goals of the study: to develop



Figure A.1: April 15, CHASS Keyplans

University of California Riverside

Meeting Minutes

University Avenue as a City-Campus connection, to create a ceremonial arrival at the elbow of University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive, and to develop a long-term plan for the placement of numerous proposed facilities within the Entrance Area zone.

Project goals were reviewed (see Goals on page 4), as were proposed program elements. It was noted that the CHASS I&R facility and associated expansion opportunities represent only a fraction of the ultimate program to be accommodated within the entrance area.

A site analysis diagram was presented, emphasizing the 200' wide Carillon Mall and 100' wide Arts and University Malls as designated in the 1990 and draft 2003 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). Current visitor flow from parking lot #2 and future visitor entry from the parking structure proposed at lot #24 were also noted as important considerations in evaluating long-term development strategies.

Will Dann (Thomas Hacker Architects) then led a discussion of significant existing and future program adjacencies as related to the proposed CHASS I&R_facility. Maintaining close proximity to the Humanities was noted as the primary consideration by CHASS administration, faculty and staff, with adjacency to the Arts as a secondary goal. Both Hinderaker and the Physical Education Building were noted as having moderate current and/or future significance with regard to program adjacency needs.

Five sites were selected (*Figure A.1*) for comparison against the original, or "base condition", siting of the CHASS. Site selection was based on the ability to accommodate the required square footage, to meet program adjacency needs, and on general proximity to the academic core. Each of the five sites was assessed in a matrix format using the following planning criteria: planning considerations, program relationships, program fit/site configuration, environmental conditions and infrastructure relative costs.

Will Dann reviewed the original siting for the CHASS I&R, establishing it as the base condition against which the five alternatives would be reviewed (see Matrix on page 25). Each of the five alternative sites was presented, utilizing a key map, matrix evaluation and 3D fly-by to facilitate discussion. (Note: the base condition or site had a positive rating for all the categories, the alternatives rated lower overall than the baseline.) General discussion and comments were fielded throughout the evaluations as follows:

1.3 Chancellor Córdova noted that in reviewing Site #3, the design team should remember that there will ultimately be new buildings across the pedestrian walkway (University Mall) requiring the future extension of utilities even if this site was not chosen for the CHASS I&R facility. Will Dann clarified that the budget developed under the original siting for CHASS

I&R included utility costs to that location. A revised site, such as #3, would require additional impacts to the budget at this time to further extend the utility system. Thus, it becomes a question of what the CHASS I&R budget can currently accommodate for utility expansion without forfeiting program.

1.4 Dean O'Brien noted that Site #3 is removed programmatically from the Humanities. She reviewed the history of persuading faculty to leave their primary department locations to teach within the CHASS I&R, noting that this is a condition unique to the CHASS as it seeks to combine a number of divergent studies under one roof.

1.5 Doug Macy noted that Site #4 is best suited for a building with a high public presence given the site's proximity to the proposed parking garage at lot #24 and to the ceremonial campus entry. Vice Chancellor Bolar expressed that Site #4 has always been envisioned as the Performing Arts complex or a similar public oriented building.

1.6 Noise from the adjacent freeway was noted as a critical negative component for Site #5.

1.7 Several members of the group expressed that Sites #2, 3 and 4 were all best suited for buildings with a more "public" face than that dictated by the CHASS program.

1.8 Chancellor Córdova posed the question of possible development around Site #1 if selected for the CHASS; could additional buildings be accommodated adjacent to the CHASS in the future? Will Dann noted that by sliding the building footprint slightly to the south, an additional building could be accommodated adjacent to the terminus of University Avenue. Doug Macy supported this move, noting that shifting to the south would register the CHASS more strongly with the Arts Mall, furthering defining and strengthening this axis.

1.9 It was noted that while Site #1 would block views from the Arts Building to the mountains, views toward the Arts Building and Mall from the CHASS I&R at Site #1 could be very positive.

2.0 The question was posed if Site #1 was moved south, would it compromise what could be built at the base condition site in the future; would it necessitate a reduction in square footage (sf)-available on the base condition site? Will Dann estimated a reduction from 100,000 sf gross to 80-90,000 sf gross. Doug Macy stated that careful work with the selected CHASS I&R architect would be necessary to ensure that the potential for a quality relationship with a future building at the base condition site was retained.

2.1 The group expressed concern that if a certain level of density in the Arts/Entrance area was required to meet future program needs, that

a building would likely go onto the base site and if so, there was concern regarding what the building would be. The CHASS I&R facility was viewed as appropriate in this site as a signature academic building relative to the academic campus core.

Chancellor Córdova responded that base condition site will not be built on.

Will Dann noted that the proposed recital hall is most likely to be inserted in the open space immediately south of Arts. This was the original intent before the recital hall program was deleted due to budget constrains. He noted that the entire entrance area will be under intense pressure for longterm development. Thomas Hacker concurred, noting that to achieve the proposed academic density, it is likely that the base site will remain under consideration for future expansion.

2.2 Mike Webster pointed out the need to consider the future of the Physical Education Building and any potential for redevelopment. He recognized the need for athletic facilities, but noted that this location becomes an issue when looking at accommodating all of the academic needs within the core. Thomas Hacker requested input on the estimated life span of the building – the group concurred that the building remained in good condition so reuse rather than demolition at this time is a viable option as well as demolition and reuse of the site sometime in the future.

2.3 Dean O'Brien recounted the decision-making process during the CHASS I&R DPP, acknowledging to the three faculty members present that the proximity of the base condition site to the academic core (Humanities in particular) was a deciding factor in the final consensus. She noted that of the five new alternatives, Site #1 would be the next choice.

2.4 Vice Chancellor Bolar noted that freeway noise, poor site configuration, and distance from the campus core make Site #5 a non-starter.

2.5 Chancellor Córdova questioned the Arts Building footprint as exceedingly large for the number of people it accommodates. She queried whether the openspace was utilized or not? The group noted that the openspace is used as outdoor classroom space and performance space. Tim Ralston also added that the upper floors of the building are very dense.

2.6 Dean O'Brien expressed concern with Site #1's ability to provide a monastic experience desired to complement the program of both the Center for Ideas and Society and the ceremonial arbor that will have very private functions. Doug Macy acknowledged this challenge, noting possible difficulties accommodating service without negatively impacting the privacy of these programmatic needs. He supported the need to continue interfacing with the CHASS I&R architects as the chosen alternative siting is explored.

2.7 Dan Johnson requested a ¹/₂ day workshop meeting with

Meeting Minutes

the CHASS I&R architects in the coming weeks to identify possible opportunities and challenges.

2.8 Thomas Hacker noted the importance of considering a breadth of site development alternatives for this signature academic building to ensure the most comprehensive discussion and ultimate decision-making process. He described an additional site alternative previously developed by the team but not presented in the matrix. This alternative would slide the Site #1 footprint further south, into the western portion of the base condition site. This alignment would preserve a future building site adjacent to the terminus of University Avenue for a more predominantly public building, it would continue to strengthen the Arts Mall, and would create a sheltered openspace between the CHASS, Phys Ed and Costo Hall.

2.9 Chancellor Córdova expressed the desire of students to retain this openspace as an area of repose. She noted that the Carillon Mall is more open and utilized for public events. She relayed that students had expressed a desire to preserve the open space north of the Carillon Mall, with the possible addition of a fountain to create a place for students to congregate. Chancellor Córdova noted that she had committed to retaining this open space in its entirety and that it would not be open for consideration as a building site.

3.0 Dean O'Brien noted that Site #3 is too removed from the necessary program adjacencies. Vice Chancellor Bolar summarized that it appeared Site #1 was the only viable alternative.

3.1 The group posed the question of utilities located at the northwest corner of Site #1; if building is moved south does this solve the problem? Doug Macy clarified that moving the footprint south of the pump station would alleviate the significant cost of relocating these facilities, but they remain a challenging issue located at such close proximity to the building entry.

3.2 A discussion of the "front door" for Site #1 followed with the team noting that while this face will have an important public function, the "door" at the buildings south end will actually received the majority of student traffic. Doug Macy noted that this will present the need to reevaluate pedestrian movement across the green space from the CHASS to the Carillon Mall.

3.3 Dean O'Brien expressed concern that the need for additional dollars for utilities would weaken the overall CHASS I&R program.

3.4 Chancellor Córdova also requested that views from the Arts Building to the mountains (particularly from the dance studios) be considered and preserved in developing the architecture of the CHASS I&R on Site #1.

DATE: June 13, 2003

RE: Committee Meeting #2 – Analysis and Planning Concepts

ATTENDEES: Juanita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Richard Block, Academic Senate (Chair of Physical Resource Committee) Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Andy Plumley, Director of Housing Dennis Rice, Assistant Dean of Engineering Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction Tim Ralston, ABP-Capital and Physical Planning Patricia O'Brien, Dean of CHASS

> Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Ken Pirie, Walker Macy Thomas Hacker, Thomas Hacker Architects Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects

ITEMS

1.1 Nita Bullock began the meeting with a brief introduction, thanking the committee members for making time in their schedules to attend. After a brief review of project goals, Melinda Graham with Walker Macy reviewed the overall project schedule and process:

Round 1: May	Introduction and Background
Round 2: June	Stakeholders interviews, Analysis, Concepts
Round 3: July Round 4: September	Planning alternatives, Public Open House Refined Plan

1.2 The team then presented Site Analysis drawings for feedback and correction by the committee. These diagrams included:

- Pedestrian circulation
- Vehicular circulation
- Views
- Buildable areas

The committee expressed a desire to see a diagram relating current and future activity generators as related to pedestrian circulation. The addition of shuttle routes, accessible parking and adjustments to existing service were also noted.

1.3 Will Dann of Thomas Hacker Architects then led a discussion of program needs. Nita discussed the need to reserve space for expansion of the Engineering facilities, as there is nowhere else on campus capable of

accommodating these expanding programs. It was noted that the Performing Arts, Recital Hall and Museum components of the program offered the opportunity for sharing resources and relating strongly to each other across a shared space; potential for "synergy." The desire to retain some surge space within this zone that might provide for small retail such as a coffee shop was also noted. The group also discussed that the Watkins House is not conducive to reuse by these programs due to its condition and the configuration of the building. The need for a CHASS expansion site as well as for an expansion of arts (in addition to Recital Hall) was also noted.

1.4 Doug Macy and Thomas Hacker then presented the planning concepts generated by the team. They made special note of the fact that these concepts were intended to be idea generators not refined plans and that components from all plans could be mixed and matched.

Base Planning Scheme:

The base scheme (*Figure A.2*) suggests mixed use on the south side of University Avenue creating an active streetscape connection to the city, a representative "arroyo" landscape moving through the center of the Athletic Field area as an extension of the University Arroyo and Botanical Gardens, and positions the Performing Arts Center on a ceremonial roundabout and entry plaza terminating University Avenue.

Alternative #1:

This alternative (*Figure A.3*) creates courtyard style building complexes, each with a unique personality. The buildings are pulled to the north to allow for and open greenspace to follow North Campus Drive. The Performing Arts Center is positioned near parking and the Museum terminates University Avenue.

Alternative #2

The second alternative (*Figure A.4*) maintains a strong diagonal view across the plaza into an "arroyo" landscape that weaves between building complexes. This scheme represents a more dispersed "arts complex" idea.

1.5 The committee offered the following comments and direction for the planning concepts presented:

Meeting Minutes

Base Planning Scheme

- This scheme seems to leave a lot of land open; review densities across all schemes
- With more open space remaining open, we may be able build higher (hold below 6 stories)
- Provide for ADA access; create bridge system across "arroyo"
 Would this concept accept the natural flow of the arroyo rather than having to pipe it; no--due to flooding implications, need to be flexible in use of landscape, unpredictable nature of arroyo floods. This area could however be used for localized stormwater strategies. Explore multiple uses for this openpace including outdoor teaching, outdoor performance space as well as for stormwater.
- Care should be taken that the Alumni and Visitor Center not encroach on Bannockburn.

Alternative #1

- Explore more realistic footprints for the buildings
- Compare the size and character of the open space with the Arts Mall and Carillon Mall; make it more of a natural space; less domesticated landscape than the core campus malls
- Potential to fill athletic fields? No, due to cost
- This scheme creates 5 very good building sites, including the potential for an "arts complex"
- Explore service access to buildings; are the services entrances on the same side as the formal entrances to these buildings?
- Explore the "arroyo" concept as a gesture only, not as carrying floodwaters; need to pipe to allow for flexibility in building within basin; also need to resolve floodplain issue prior to construction of the MS&E Building which is moving ahead.

Alternative #2

- Lose sense of Arts Complex and the "arroyo" concept is not as strong as the base scheme either.
- The Performing Arts at the terminus provides a great presence for the entry, but may provide issues with providing adequate service.
- This location for the Performing Arts may also create conflicts with the flow of pedestrian from the Commons north. Explore Museum/Alumni combination here with a terrace at the east side.
- Consider Performing Arts near parking but do not completely block "arroyo" concept.



Figure A.2: June 13, Base Plannig Scheme

58

Meeting Minutes

Mixed Use at University Avenue (Figure A.5)

- Would need to consider parking; structured or below grade?
- Develop buildings as only 2 to 3 stories, stepped back from street.
- Include new crosswalks; consider replacing traffic signal at the Arts Building
- Consider incorporating LDS in ground floor of Mixed Use; LDS could be the developers
- Consider expansion of Univ. Extension facilities contact for information

• Is it appropriate to have a commercial corridor east of the freeway; does it demean the entry? Consider a scheme that retains the north side as green; restored arroyo with bridge to Bannockburn.

• Consider upscale restaurant/cafe near Performing Arts Center; on street parking on University Avenue was discussed with City, but there are concerns related to traffic flow and students using parking for classes.

Thomas Hacker summarized comments and direction from the 1.6 committee, noting an emphasis on developing the central openspace in this district as a more naturalized landscape. Nita Bullock reviewed the remaining schedule with the committee and thanked participants for their valuable feedback.







University of California Riverside
Meeting Minutes

DATE: July 2, 2003

RE: Committee Meeting #3 – Refined Alternatives

ATTENDEES: Juanita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Robert Nava, Advancement UCR Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Ameal Moore, Councilman Ward 2 Richard Block, Academic Senate (Chair of Physical Resource Committee) John Divola, Professor Dept. of Art Andy Plumley, Director of Housing Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction Dennis Rice, Assistant Dean of Engineering

> Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Ken Pirie, Walker Macy Thomas Hacker, Thomas Hacker Architects

ITEMS

1.1 Nita Bullock began the meeting with a brief summary of project goals to date. Doug Macy then recapped thinking to date reminding the group that this project must consider not just what is happening within its own boundaries, but must also take into account what is happening in the larger context of the University and the city. The team's focus was summarized as identifying a unique character for this area that ties it to the natural assets of the University, accounting for the placement of academic, arts-public and parking program elements, and connecting the area to the city and housing west of the interstate.

1.2 The earlier planning concepts were briefly reviewed, reiterating the committee's desire to emphasis development of an art's complex, retain reference to the arroyo within the openspace development and refine the buildings to more realistic footprints. New alternatives were then reviewed:

Alternative #1

62

This alternative (*Figure A.6*) presents a series of buildings oriented around a naturalized landscape. The CHASS I&R site is pulled back and space is reserved at the end of University Avenue for a signature building. A roundabout is incorporated to calm traffic, provide the opportunity for self-correction, and provide a sense of arrival at the end of University Avenue. The building is pulled back from the roundabout to retain views up to the Box Springs Mountains.

Alternative #2

This scheme (*Figure A.7*) retains the MS&E in the orientation proposed by the DPP for this building. The Performing Arts Building is located north of the arrival plaza and SASS is placed near housing across Canyon Crest Drive.

Alternative #3

Similar to Alternative 2, this scheme (*Figure A.8*) rotates the MS&E to create a stronger "arroyo" concept in the central openspace. The Performing Arts Center remains at the terminus of University Avenue.

Alternative #4

This scheme (*Figure A.9*) provides the largest plaza terminating University Avenue. The plaza is conceived as broken into a number of park-like settings providing a generous welcome to campus visitors. University Avenue is developed as a lively streetscape with mixed use brought up to the roundabout. This scheme emphasizes partnership with the City in connecting the east and west sides of the University.

1.3 The committee offered the following comments and direction for the planning concepts presented:

- A need to explore phasing was noted particularly with regard to siting those programs currently in the queue for development. Kyle noted that many of the schemes require relocation of the women's athletic fields and that this should be considered in further phasing discussions.
- Dennis emphasized the need for ground floor service for the MS&E; the team was directed to complete a more detailed study of how this might be accomplished in the alternatives.
- The committee discussed the perception of the freeway as a choke point, both physical and psychologically. The team discussed the attempt to capture the areas around University Avenue as an active campus area to reduce the perception of a "deadzone" near the freeway. John expressed concern that such development might slow traffic too much, noting a preference for retaining open greenspace here and emphasing that as a unique campus character. Tricia Thrasher also expressed a preference for retaining the area north of University Avenue as an open greenspace, reflecting the arroyo as the signature element of the campus.
 Thomas Hacker noted that with the reality of phasing, even if the mixed-use concept was adopted north of University Avenue, that this area would remain green for many years to come. The committee felt an emphasis on student uses was important in this area to prevent faceless commercial development.

1.4 Ken Pirie of Walker Macy reviewed current considerations related to improving the streetscape along University Avenue and Canyon Crest Drive. He noted the benefits of adding a planted median to soften the roadways where possible, the addition of signalized pedestrian crossings to provide access north of University, and the use of a modest ceremonial roundabout configuration to allow people to self-correct without encouraging large drop-off zones or traffic conflicts. This roundabout would also serve as a psychological "arrival" point terminating the campus approach along University Avenue or Canyon Crest, and create a destination place on the campus. The team expressed the need for thorough review by city and campus traffic engineers should this concept be adopted.

1.5 Thomas Hacker reviewed requested refinements including the need to study the size of the Performing Arts Center with adequate service, a detailed study of service alternatives for the MS&E, the desire to place the Alumni Visitor Center immediately adjacent to University Avenue/Canyon Crest, and the desire to retain a ceremonial plaza terminating University Avenue and organizing an Art's complex. Thom thanked all of the participants for their feedback and Nita Bullock confirmed the next meeting date and time.



University of California Riverside



64



University of California Riverside



66

Meeting Minutes

DATE: July 22, 2003

RE: CPAC Meeting #2

ATTENDEES: France Córdova, Chancellor Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor Patricia O'Brien, Dean of Humanities Richard Luben, Office of Research Bill Schmechel, Office of Research Dallas Rabenstein, Graduate Division Eileen O'Connell-Owens, Academic Plan'g & Budget Stephanie Wittenbach, University Libraries Robert Clare, Academic Senate Bob Heath, Office of Undergrad Education Chuck Rowley, Computing & Communications Tim Ralston, Capital and Physical Planning Dan Johnson, Design and Construction Richard Block, Academic Senate (Chair of Physical Resource Committee) Nita Bullock, Physical Planning **Dennis Rice**, Engineering Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Robert Nava, University Advancement Susan Allen-Ortega, Student Services Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction

> Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Thomas Hacker, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc. Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc.

ITEMS

1.1 Gretchen Bolar introduced the East Campus Entrance Area Study, noting that work presented would be CPAC's first view of a work in progress and that the purpose was to solicit diverse feedback from the group.

1.2 Nita Bullock began the formal presentation with a review of the project goals, including the program elements to be included in the study. Included in the list of new elements was a Performing Arts Center targeted to provide 1,000 seats. Chancelor Córdova directed the team to target a 2,000 seat facility as the University should look toward attracting regional performances of a larger scale.

1.3 Thomas Hacker highlighted the importance of working with a consultant to develop a business plan for such a facility to guarantee its long-term success. He then began a review of the work completed to date by the team.

1.4 Thomas Hacker reviewed key concepts guiding the work of the team, noting the power of the regional landscape and the unique quality of the architecture already present on the campus. Citing this study as a rare opportunity to strengthen the identity of the campus, he also noted that the inclusion of several programs with a strong public interface would continue to shape the relationship between the campus and the City of Riverside.

1.5 Four alternative schemes were then presented. In all four schemes, parking is located in structures at the perimeter, a ceremonial "roundabout" terminates University Avenue and the arroyo formation moving down into campus from the Box Spring Mountains is reflected in the development of the current athletic fields.

Alternative #1:

This scheme (*Figure A.10*)emphasised the importance of a large plaza terminating Unviversity Avenue with public interface buildings ringing the perimeter. Here the representation of the "arroyo" is the most broken by building placement within the athletic fields.

Alternative #2:

In this scheme (*Figure A.11*) the Performing Arts Center is positioned to take advantage of direct access to the parking structure at Lot 24. This alternative also preserves the DPP siting of the MS&E Building.

Alternative #3:

Here (*Figure A.12*) the Performing Arts Center is placed at the terminus of University Avenue. While this serves as a focal point for the campus approach down University, it also raises questions as to the ultimate size of the Performing Arts and the ability to site it within this location. In this scheme the "arroyo" moves smoothly through the athletic fields as a central organizing element, connecting the campus to the hills.

Alternative #4:

This scheme (*Figure A.13*) pulls the buildings back into the "arroyo" and shifts the Performing Arts to a site allowing for easy expansion.

1.6 The question of rotating the MS&E Building to a new site was raised, with Chancellor Córdova expressing an interest in keeping the central "arroyo" open to the hills beyond. Gretchen Bolar noted that it was a possibility, but that the team would need to look at cost and access implications and pose any fatal flaws. Dennis Rice also raised possible issues related to service access noting that service must enter at the ground floor as elevators created too much vibration for sensitive equipment. The group also discussed the possibility of utilizing this "arroyo" space for innovative stormwater strategies.

1.7 Dean O'Brien questioned the positioning of the Performing Arts in Scheme 4 as related to interupting the flow of the "arroyo" concept. Thom noted that the DRB had responded positively to this scheme as it keeps a diagonal view open across the plaza and into the arroyo. He also noted the potential for the naturalized planting scheme to be reflected in the plaza planting.

1.8 The location of the SASS was also discussed by the group with a focus on issues of funding, timing, and the need for access to a concentration of student activity. A similar discussion as related to the Alumni Visitors Center program followed. The team was directed to review a scheme which partners the SASS and Alumni. Also, an option that explored combining the Musuem and Recital Hall was put on the table.

1.9 The team then presented issues of wayfinding and ideas generated to date on clarify and strengthening the arrival sequence to campus. This work introduced mixed use on University to create a lively streetscape connecting the campus with downtown, as well as improved signage and pedestrian amenities.

DATE: July 22, 2003

RE: Summary of preliminary directives

This summary is based on CPAC committee feedback in response to the four planning alternatives presented July 22. The intent of this summary is to clarify feedback that will used to inform the team's continuing work as the alternatives are further explored and refined.

Preliminary Directives

1.0 Explore combining the SASS and Alumni programs in one building to meet shared needs for drop-off and short-term parking, recognize the public nature of both programs and accommodate similar funding and construction timelines. Review two positions for the combined building: the current site of the Watkins House, or integrated with the Parking Structure slated for Lot #24.

2.0 Explore pairing the Recital Hall and the Museum in one building.

3.0 Study the Performing Arts Center as a 2,000 seat facility suitable for accommodating regional art activities and campus-wide events.

4.0 Study preserving the "arroyo" concept with the east end remaining open to the arroyo coming down from the botanical garden.

5.0 Retain an open plaza at the terminus of University Avenue.

6.0 Preserve the diagonal view into the central "arroyo" greenspace.

7.0 Retain mixed use on both the north and south sides of University Avenue as a longterm planning option to activate the pedestrian environment and strengthen connections to West Campus and the City.



University of California Riverside



University of California Riverside





University of California Riverside

Meeting Minutes

DATE: July 8, 2003 Design Review Board #1 RE: ATTENDEES: Professor Richard Block, Phys. Resources Comm. Professor David Eastmond Cell Biology and Toxicology (CNAS) Professor John Ganim, English (CHASS) Professor Chinya Ravishankar Computer Science (BCOE) **AVC Daniel Johnson** Design and Construction (VC - Administration) AVC Timothy Ralston Capital and Physical Planning (VC - APB) Nita Bullock, Capital and Physical Planning Steven Ehrlich, FAIA, Steven Ehrlich Architects Kathy Garcia, ASLA, Wallace, Roberts, and Todd Charles "Duke" Oakley, Altoon-Porter Architects

> Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Ken Pirie, Walker Macy

ITEMS

1.0 Meeting Agenda. The July 8th meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) was to review early alternatives associated with the East Campus Entrance Area Study. The following agenda was reviewed prior to the presentation of the Study itself:

- 1.1 East Campus Entrance Area Study
- 1.1.1 Project Overview and Process (Walker-Macy)
- 1.1.2 Project Alternatives (Walker-Macy)
- 1.2 Discussion and Working Lunch (All)
- 1.3 Board Internal Discussion
- 1.3.1 Formulation of preliminary recommendations (DRB)
- 1.3.2 Review of preliminary recommendations (DRB+Walker-Macy)
- 1.3.3 Preview of upcoming projects (Johnson, Ralston)

2.0 Preliminary Observations and Recommendations. In response to the presentation of early alternatives associated with the East Campus Entrance Area Study, the Board offered the following observations/ preliminary recommendations for the Walker-Macy/UCR team to consider as the Study is developed further. These are summarized below:

2.1 The Board indicated a preference for the location of the Performing Arts Center footprint as indicated in Scheme Four.

2.2 The Board indicated a preference for the open space as diagrammed in Scheme Three, with the caveat that attention should be paid to the character of the landscape (manicured vs. "rustic") so as not to replicate the existing Carillon Mall.

2.3 The Board suggested that further development of the schemes reinforce the connection of the Carillon Mall with the open space the study area via a strong connection along the Arts Mall.

2.4 The Board urged the Walker-Macy/UCR team to pay particular attention to the character of the streetscape and pedestrian experience along University Avenue/Canyon Crest Drive.

2.5 The Board encouraged the Walker-Macy/UCR team to study the feasibility of relocating the traffic roundabout slightly North and West to diminish intrusion of this element into the open space and pedestrian sequence proposed for this section of the Study Area.

2.6 The Board discouraged placement of any structures on the north side of University Avenue between the 215/60 Freeway and Canyon Crest Drive. Rather, the Board encouraged Walker-May/UCR to allow for an expanded expression of a rustic landscape (vs. manicured turf) along this segment of the Study Area.

2.7 The Board suggested that the Walker-Macy/UCR team further explore the notion of openness and constriction of the arroyo as approaches to open space and circulation pathways. In particular, the Board suggested that the Study should explore further development of the Materials Science and Engineering Building footprint to allow for more opportunities for pedestrian access at the East end of the Recreation Fields.

2.8 The Board requested the Walker-Macy/UCR team take a preliminary look at the feasibility of switching the locations for the parking structure, and future redevelopment of Bannockburn.

3.0 Follow up and Next Steps.

The DRB will meet next on August 5th to review the West Campus Family Student Housing Project (pre-design concept), and early schematic concepts for the College of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) Instruction and Research Building.

3.2 An agenda and related review items for the August 5th meeting is attached.

Meeting Minutes

DATE: Sept 4, 2003

RE: Committee Meeting #4 – Preferred Plan

ATTENDEES: Nita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Andy Plumley, Director of Housing Dennis Rice, Assistant Dean of Engineering Jim Sandoval, VCSA Patricia O'Brien, CHASS Dan Rockholt, Capital Planning Dan Johnson, Design and Construction Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction

> Doug Macy, Walker Macy Melinda Graham, Walker Macy Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects

ITEMS

1.1 Nita Bullock began the meeting with a review of the planning process to date, noting that Committee Meeting #4 marked the final presentation of work as refined by continued feedback from the project committee, the DRB and by CPAC.

1.2 Melinda Graham reviewed the list of Guiding Principles that continues to inform the evolution of the Entrance Area plan. These principles represent goals and ideals put forth in existing UCR planning documents (such as the LRDP) as well as those articulated by the project committee, DRB and by CPAC throughout the planning process. The committee approved the principles with the following modifications and additions:

• Refine - "Retain the roundabout as the front door for a sense of arrival and traffic calming."

Patricia O'Brien and Dennis Rice expressed concern with the use of the term "arrival" in describing the roundabout, noting that this description is misleading. The team agreed to explore a more accurate descriptor for describing the approach to campus.

• Add – "Develop a plan which efficiently utilizes the campus land base while addressing individual building programs and adjacencies"

1.3 Patricia O'Brien also encouraged the team to continue conversations with Pei, Cobb, Freed as the design work for the CHASS continues, noting that concern had been raised with regards to potential noise impacts on the CHASS building from the roundabout.

1.4 Will Dann presented the latest building program matrix, reviewing

the stakeholder interview process that informed its development and noting that the matrix represented a "snapshot in time" by documenting the original assumptions made with regard to each program element. Nita Bullock requested that the Committee review the individual program elements and return any comments to her within the next week.

1.5 The group briefly discussed the parking structure at Lot #24. Modifications to the structure that have been introduced to reduce the impact of this large volume fronting Canyon Crest have resulted in a reduction from the 1,400 spaces depicted in the structure's original DPP. Will Dann relayed his previous conversations with Tim Ralston, in which Tim noted that the DPP number was too large in terms of the University's ability to find funding and directed the team to consider a target of approximately 900 spaces as a structure that could be financed internally by the campus and paid back through fees. Nita requested that the team identify within the final report the number of cars accommodated per floor in both the DPP and the revised plan.

1.6 Doug Macy began the presentation of the preferred plan (*Figure A.14*) with a summary of feedback previously received during the review of alternative plans by the project committee, the DRB and from CPAC. He noted that all three groups were highly supportive of the strong arroyo concept through the center of the intramural field area. While the DRB expressed some reservation regarding the viability of mixed use north of University Ave, Doug noted that the preferred plan retains this land use in response to directives stated in the LRDP.

1.7 Andy Plumley asked for clarification on parking to meet the needs of restaurants and shops to be located within the mixed use area north of University. Doug Macy stated that the plan relies on the student resident population for support, with additional visitors accommodated in the nearby University parking structure. Additional spaces are also incorporated within the mixed use development south of University. He also noted that additional strategies could be implemented, such as basement level parking at the mixed use development and/or on-street parking, to further accommodate parking needs. Doug proposed the strategy of putting out a request for development teams to study this element of the project and inform the University of what implementation strategies would make the most functional and economical sense. Nita requested that the team document these suggested strategies within the report.

1.8 Dan Johnson asked if the access noted to Lot 1 from University Avenue was a "pie in the sky" idea or truly feasible. Nita clarified that Kevin Mulligan, with the City Water Department, had confirmed that an existing easement could be utilized by the University for access to the future parking structure. 1.9 Nita confirmed with the team that the preferred scheme allowed for retention of the pool at Physical Education with the addition of the combined Recital/Museum building. Dan Johnson expressed the benefit of this siting for the Recital/Musuem as a way to disperse student flow headed north to the Commons building.

Kyle Hoffman requested clarification on how the combined 1.10 SASS/Alumni site would be utilized. Doug Macy noted that the illustrated footprint assumes that the two programs would potentially share a large number of facilities such as the lobby, reception, and office space requiring ground floor access. The importance of reviewing the two programs to confirm what elements might go up and/or be combined to achieve a smaller footprint on the site was discussed as the location is constricted by the adjacent arroyo, Canyon Crest and service drive. The need to also explore which program might dominate the streetfront and how the two programs might be phased was also highlighted. Nita noted that the SASS is stated funded and the Alumni is not, likely requiring the Alumni building to wait +/ - 5 years for construction of the SASS. However, given the current funding level for the Alumni, it is unknown at this time when (and if) that program would be prepared for design/construction in conjunction with the SASS and thus should not be considered a deal-breaker at this point. Nita asked the team to further explore the issues noted.

1.11 The committee briefly noted the need for the report to diagram the required fire lane from the Recreation Mall to the service road connecting Canyon Crest and Aberdeen.

1.12 Will Dann continued the presentation with a review of strategies that may be utilized to minimize the impact of the future Parking Structure at Lot #24. The current plan assumes the inclusion of approximately 12,000-15,000 sf of retail, use of an articulated facade and skyline, and generous street setback to minimize impacts of the building.

1.13 Doug Macy reviewed the phasing diagram and received confirmation from the project committee. Nita requested that the report address implications and impacts of each phase as it is developed.

1.14 The presentation concluded with a review of the Arrival Sequence Diagram which illustrates the use of street trees, street furnishings and signage to enhance and accentuate the varying zones visitors move through on their approach to campus. Nita requested that the report include images and/or cross-sections to further clarify the intent.

1.15 Doug Macy thanked the committee for their continuing participation and support. Nita Bullock noted that the next step in the process would be review by the DRB, followed the final presentation to CPAC and documentation of the work in the final East Entrance Area Study Report.



Meeting Minutes

DATE: September 23, 2003

RE: Design Review Board #2

ATTENDEES: Nita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Professor Richard Block, Academic Senate, **Chair of Physical Resources Committee** Professor David Eastmond Cell Biology and Toxicology (CNAS) Professor John Ganim, English (CHASS) Professor Chinya Ravishankar Computer Science (BCOE) AVC Daniel Johnson Design and Construction (VC - Administration) AVC Timothy Ralston Capital and Physical Planning (VC - APB) Steven Ehrlich, FAIA, Steven Ehrlich Architects Kathy Garcia, ASLA, Wallace, Roberts, and Todd Charles "Duke" Oakley, FAIA **Altoon-Porter Architects**

Doug Macy, Walker Macy Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects

ITEMS

1.0 Meeting Agenda. The September 23rd meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) was to review a) the preferred alternative for the East Campus Entrance Area Study; and, b) refined schematic design concepts associated with the CHASS Instruction and Research Facility. The following agenda was reviewed prior to the presentations:

1.1 East Campus Entrance Area Study -preferred alternative (Walker-Macy)

1.2 CHASS Instruction and Research Facility –revised schematic concept (Pei Cobb Freed)

1.3 Board Internal Discussion

1.4 Board Recommendations to Walker-Macy and Pei Cobb Freed

2.0 Preliminary Observations and Recommendations.

2.1 East Campus Entrance Area Study (preferred alternative) (*Figure A.14*). In response to the presentation of the preferred alternative for the East Campus Entrance Area Study, the Board offered the following

observations/recommendations for the Walker-Macy/UCR project team to consider as the plan is developed further. These are summarized below:

2.1.1 The board advised that the project team should eliminate the mixed use building indicated at the northwest corner of the Canyon Crest/University Avenue intersection to strengthen the visual and spatial connection of the segments of the Arroyo east and west of Canyon Crest Drive.

2.1.2 The presentation included "north" (*Figure A.15*) and "south" (*Figure A.15*) siting alternatives for the forthcoming Materials Science and Engineering Building to study access issues. The board indicated a preference for the south alternative for the following reasons: the service access could be sufficiently screened through further design studies, and this location offers stronger programmatic adjacencies with core campus Engineering and CNAS facilities (and avoiding "leapfrog" development patterns in the study area). The board cited the following shortcomings of the north alternative: requirement for a significant retaining wall to accommodate a grade change at this location, and discontinuous service drive condition eliminating service vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access along the northern edge of the site between Aberdeen Drive and Canyon Crest Drive.

2.1.3 The board also cited three instances where the Walker-Macy/UCR team needed to provide quantitative and qualitative development guidelines in the forthcoming printed report to underscore the integrity of the overall plan. These three instances include the following:

2.1.3.1 Arroyo. Visual and spatial connectivity and continuity of the Arroyo is one of the key concepts of the preferred alternative. The board urged the Walker-Macy/UCR team to define key physical characteristics of the Arroyo that need to be acknowledged/celebrated/preserved or enhanced as this portion of the campus is built-out (e.g. minimum width, softscape vs. hardscape, etc.).

2.1.3.2 Performing Arts Center. The board advised the Walker-Macy/ UCR team to develop guidelines to define key characteristics of the site for the proposed Performing Arts Center to underscore functional criteria such as service, pedestrian, public, and campus access.

2.1.3.3 Parking Garage. The board strongly cautioned the Walker-Macy/UCR team to identify design criteria sufficiently to mitigate the scale and proportion of the proposed parking garage on Lot 24 to enhance the pedestrian experience and surrounding campus development.

2.2 CHASS Instruction and Research Facility –refined schematic concept. The Board encouraged the Pei Cobb Freed/UCR project team to further develop the following aspects of the refined schematic concept:

2.2.1 Reduce the presence of the southwest corner of the building relative to the Arts and Carillon Malls

2.2.2 Respond to the Arts Building vis-à-vis plan and massing (vs. color and materials)

2.2.3 Refine the landscape plan (and associated graphics) to preserve visual connections through the building toward the Box Springs Mountains beyond; and

2.2.4 Revisit the geometry of the communicating stair at the juncture of the northern and central sections of the building to reinforce the overall concept of the design.

3.0 Follow up and Next Steps. A draft agenda for the October 7th DRB meeting is attached.

Beginning with the October 7th meeting, the Board requests that simple concept/study models be included as part of the overall presentation materials for review.

ЩШШ Ā P ŀ Service Access 20' High Retaining Wall Service Access 6.5 % slope down Service MS&E ABERDEEN DRIVE Labs & Offices ACADEMIC ENGINEERING Plaza MS&E Auditorium & Classes ARROYO ENGINEERING ge to Bldg 39" Storm 72" Storm NORTH CAMPUS DRIVE AAAA Figure A.15: September 23, Materials Science and Engineering North Site Study

Meeting Minutes

DATE: October 21, 2003

RE: CPAC Meeting #3

ATTENDEES: France Córdova, Chancellor William Jury, Executive Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor John Azzaretto, VC, Public Service/Int'l Programs Patricia O'Brien, Dean of Humanities Steven Angle, Dean, College of Nat'l & Ag Sciences Susan Sandoval, Student Affairs Bill Schmechel, Office of Research Dallas Rabenstein, Graduate Division Eileen O'Connell-Owens, Academic Plan'g & Budget Irwin Sherman, Chair, Academic Senate Robert Clare, Academic Senate Dan Johnson, Design and Construction Sandi Evelyn-Veere, CHASS Andy Pumley, Director, Housing Susan Marshburn, Housing Sharon Salinger, College of Humanities, Arts Social Sciences Satish Tripathi, Bourns College of Engineering Hank Rosenfeld, UCPD Ross Grayson, EH&S Earl LeVoss, Physical Plant Kyle Hoffman, Alumni and Constituent Relations Robert Nava, University Advancement Nita Bullock, Capital & Physical Planning Tricia Thrasher, Office of Design and Construction Darius Maroufkhani, ODC Ted Chiu, ODC Fernand McGinnis, ODC Bill Johnson, Capital & Physical Planning Kieron Brunelle, Capital & Physical Planning Atira Harris, ASUCR

> Philip Sun, Ratcliff Associates Mark Kiszouaic, Ratcliff Associates Ed Buch, Leo A. Daly Architects Ian Bader, Pei Cobb Freed & Partners Robin Taff, Pei Cobb Freed & Partners Thomas Hacker, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc. Will Dann, Thomas Hacker Architects, Inc.

ITEMS

2.

1. Introductory Remarks (Bolar)

East Campus Entrance Area Study - Preferred Plan (Bullock, Consultants -Walker Macy Landscape Architects/ Doug Macy and Thomas Hacker Architects/Will Dann)

> a. Doug Macy presented the final plan and Will Dann presented the final program elements.

b. Project was accepted by the committee.

CHASS Instructional and Research Facility – Schematic 3. Design (Johnson, Consultants - Pei Cobb Freed & Partners/Ian Bader)

> a. Anticipate the project will go the February 18th, 2004 Regents meeting with start of construction in 2004-5 and occupancy in 2006-7. This project has funding guaranteed through the most recent revenue bond.

b. Comment – Dean O'Brien – Stated that speaking for the college and programs, they are impressed by the ability of the consultant to address teaching spaces and the flexibility of the work spaces that have been created.

Question - The Arts Building has a glass façade on the c. east side which has commanding views to the east. Are those views preserved?

Answer - The flame trees will block views at ground level but substantial views will be sustained at upper levels. However, in place of distant views will be views into a very active space between the buildings of college life. The south side of the building will be inviting from the Carillon Mall to lead students into the building space with 18 inch walls with seats and circular planter.

d. Question – Will the ramada along the west façade be large enough to provide shade so that a reception could be held under it?

Answer - There is a space about 18 feet wide between the pillars and the wall. The space to the south near the screening room could accommodate a larger gathering.

4. Arroyo Student Housing - Detailed Project Program (Brunelle, Consultants - Ratcliff Associates/Philip Sun)

a. The campus anticipates taking the project to the January Regents meeting for occupancy in Fall of 2006.

b. Pent up demand for on campus housing should be sufficient to allow this to go forward regardless of anticipated slow down in growth in the next few years.

Questions - none c.

Meeting Minutes

DATE: October 7, 2003 Design Review Board #3 RE: ATTENDEES: Nita Bullock, Campus Physical Planner Professor David Eastmond Cell Biology and Toxicology (CNAS) Professor John Ganim, English (CHASS) Professor Chinya Ravishankar Computer Science (BCOE) AVC Daniel Johnson Design and Construction (VC - Administration) **AVC** Timothy Ralston Capital and Physical Planning (VC - APB) Steven Ehrlich, FAIA, Steven Ehrlich Architects Kathy Garcia, ASLA, Wallace, Roberts, and Todd Charles "Duke" Oakley, FAIA Altoon-Porter Architects

Doug Macy, Walker Macy Rebecca Binder, Binder & Associates Phillip Sun, Ratcliff Architects

1.0 Meeting Agenda. The October 7th meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) was to review a) West Campus Family Student Housing, Phase
1 - Detailed Project Program (DPP) findings, b) Arroyo Student Housing
- DPP findings, and c) the East Campus Entrance Area Study – revised preferred alternative. The following agenda was reviewed prior to the presentations:

1.1 West Campus Family Student Housing, Phase 1 (Rebecca Binder & Associates/Brunelle)

1.2 Arroyo Student Housing (Ratcliff/Brunelle)

1.3 East Campus Entrance Area Study –revised preferred alternative (Walker-Macy/Brunelle)

- 1.4 Board Internal discussion to develop recommendations
- 1.5 Board Recommendations to Walker-Macy, Rebecca Binder, and Ratcliff
- 2.0 Preliminary Observations and Recommendations.

2.1 West Campus Family Student Housing, Phase 1 (DPP findings). In response to the presentation of the DPP findings for this project, the board had the following observations for the Rebecca Binder and Associates/UCR team to consider as the DPP is finalized:

2.1.1 Concept Site Development. The document should indicate alternative site layouts considered, beyond the option specified assumed for developing the associated cost models. The observation was to avoid suggested design solutions at this phase of the projects overall development.

2.1.2 Cost Assumptions. The board encouraged the DPP team to

revisit some of cost assumptions in the DPP, relative other housing projects at UCR, and relative to other housing projects generally.

2.1.3 Environmental Sensitivity. The board encouraged the DPP team to revisit portions of the document related to sustainability/environmental sensitivity to make sure that statements about project intent are reflected in the document itself. During the discussion it was observed that these elements are in the DPP already, and the presentation itself may not have made the connection strongly enough to these issues.

2.2 Arroyo Student Housing (DPP findings). In response to the presentation of the DPP findings for this project, the Board had the following observations for the Ratcliff Associates/UCR team to consider as the DPP is finalized:

2.2.1 Concept Site Development. The document should indicate alternative site layouts considered, beyond the option assumed for developing the associated cost models. The observation was to avoid a developed design solution at this phase of the project's overall development. In addition, the Board observed that the communal space as represented in the presentation needed to be more strongly articulated in the DPP itself.

2.2.2 Cost Assumptions. The Board encouraged the DPP team to revisit some of cost assumptions in the DPP, relative other housing projects at UCR, and relative to other housing projects generally.

2.2.3 Environmental Sensitivity. The Board encouraged the DPP team to revisit portions of the document related to sustainability/environmental sensitivity to make sure that statements about project intent are reflected in the document itself. The context for these observations had to do with some of site constraints of this project, including one of the reaches of the Arroyo, and the relationship of the project to the adjacent residential neighborhood.

2.3 East Campus Entrance Area Study (revised preferred alternative). In response to the presentation of the revised alternatives for the East Campus Entrance Area Study, the Board offered the following observations/ recommendations for the Walker-Macy/UCR project team to consider. (Note: The Chancellor was present for this portion of the agenda –both the presentation and related discussion.)

2.3.1 The revised alternatives for the East Campus Entrance Area Study explored four options in order to accommodate the programs assumed for two projects within the study area: the Alumni and Visitors Center, and the Student Academic Support Services Building. The four alternatives presented and the board responses to each are summarized below.

2.3.2 Alternative #1. The presentation indicated footprints for both

the Alumni Visitors Center and SASSB on the site of the existing Watkins House. This option demonstrated that siting both buildings at this location exceeded the site capacity, intruding into the floodplain/Arroyo itself. In addition, this alternative would require the demolition of Watkins House. The Board's observation was that this option was not feasible and should not be further developed by the Walker-Macy/UCR team.

2.3.3 Alternative #2. This option sited the Alumni and Visitor Center immediately south of the Arts Building, and Placed the SASSB on the Watkins House site. The "Arts Growth" program element footprint was indicated due east of the Performing Arts Center footprint. The Board observed that the SASSB site was viable, but that the relocated Arts Growth element was not feasible from a programmatic standpoint –as the growth assumed was for the visual/studio arts vs. the performing arts. The Board's concluded that this alternative should not be pursued further by the Walker-Macy/UCR team.

2.3.4 Alternative #3. This option located the SASSB on the Watkins House site as in Alternative #2, but now indicated the Alumni and Visitors Center due east of the proposed Performing Arts Center. The board observed that while the site would offer favorable views, in all likelihood the building would be an isolated stand alone edifice in the landscape given the timeframe assumed for the balance of the buildings and site development in the study area. Given the timing issues, the Board advised the Walker-Macy/ UCR team that this options was probably not worth further investigation.

2.3.5 Alternative #4. This option located the SASSB footprint immediately south of the Physical Education Building and immediately west of Costo Hall. Programmatically this provided adjacencies with related student services, either existing (e.g. Costo Hall occupants) or anticipated vis-a-via the Commons Expansion project. At the same time siting the SASSB in this tight configuration with existing buildings left open space at the juncture of the Carillon Mall and the Arts Mall. This option slso located the Alumni and Visitor Center on the Watkins House site. While the graphic associated with this option assumed demolition of Watkins House, subsequent discussion regarding this option left open the possibility for the campus to retain Watkins House as part of an interim or longer term solution to accommodate the Alumni and Visitors Center. The board encouraged the Walker-Macy/UCR team to pursue this option further as part of the overall study.

2.3.6 Presentation/Report Suggestions. The Board requested that the Walker-Macy/UCR team indicate opportunities for bike paths/bike parking in future graphics and the forthcoming study. The Chancellor specifically requested that the Walker-Macy/UCR team indicate phasing for the study in future graphics and the forthcoming report.

Detailed Program Assumptions

In an effort to both guide the development of the East Campus Entrance Plan and to test master plan alternatives for program fit, the design team developed an overall program (*see page 2*).

The information was compiled through a review of previous reports and documents and interviews with faculty and staff. The sources of all information and assumptions are noted. The intent is to provide a consolidated summary for all current and relevant information about the projected programmatic needs and goals for the East Campus Entrance Area of the campus.

Some general assumptions are as follows:

- The schedule assumptions represents a best guess at this time, with the only dates certain for projects already in the DPP stage.
- The footprint size is the key factor in determining whether a site is appropriate for a particular program. While most buildings are assumed to be four stories, assumptions have been made that the ground floor may be larger than the upper floors because of the need for easy access to some program elements. (Example: SASS Building)
- The gross area assumes an efficiency factor which is noted.
- Construction cost is based on today's dollars and is intended only to give an "order of magnitude" for each program.
- The total project cost is based on an allowance for soft costs provided by the University.

The assumptions behind each program element are summarized in the following tables.

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Footprint	Comments
Classrooms						
Demonstration Classroom	300	7500	1	7500	7500	
Lecture Classroom	300	4800	1	4800		
Classroom	60	1800	2	3600		
Classroom	30	900	2	1800		
Classroom Support						
Prep./storage		135	2	270		
Auditorium Control		200	2	400		
Instructional Laboratory						
Special Class Lab		330	4	1320		
Instructional Lab. Prep		330	1	330		
Offices						
Faculty Offices		135	30	4050		
Staff Offices		120	3	360		
Open Offices/Work Area		90	4	360		
Conference Room		270	3	810		
Mail Room		1	135	135		
Storage		1	135	135		
Research						
Research Labs		330	86	28380		
Graduate Students/Post						
Doc		135	39	5265		
Shared Research Support						
Space						
Misc Support spaces		330	17	5610	3630	
Misc Support spaces		165	3	495		
Lounge		330	2	660		
Library/colloquium		330	3	990		
Clean Room						
Technical Labs		450	8	3600	3600	
Core/Nanotechnology	T					
Labs		330	6	1980	1980	
Clean Room Support						
Misc Support spaces		150	5	750	750	
Entry/Gowning		450	1	450	450	
Service Gallery		210	9	1890		
Clean Corridor		1000	1	1000		
Total Assignable Area				76,940		
Efficiency				1.74	1.74	
Gross Area				134,000	36,226	130,000 in 5-yr CIP
Square foot cost				\$317		\$305 in 5-yr CIP
Construction Cost				\$42,544,000		From DPP, \$39.6 in 5-y CIP
Soft Cost multiplier				1.22		
Project Cost				\$51,763,000	1	From 5-yr Capital Plan

Detailed Program Assumptions

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Footprint	Comments
Alumni Offices	?		?	2370		
Boardroom		1540		1540		
Private Dining		0		0		
Meeting Rooms		4300		4300		
Library/Living Room		1250		1250	1250	
Lobby/Reception		2500		2500	2500	
Café		0		0	0	
Kitchen-Full		0		0	0	
Kitchen-Catering		1000	1	1000	1000	
Banquet Hall	500	8000	1	8000	8000	300 seats minimum
University Club (office,						
gameroom, lounge)		1000		1000	1000	
Tour function		0		0	0	
A la Carte Dining		0		0	0	
Dining Services Offices		0		0	0	
Total Assignable						9000 sf in 5 yr NS Capital
Area				21960	13750	Plan
Efficiency				1.43	1.43	
Gross Area				31,403	19,663	
Square foot cost				\$250		allowance
Construction Cost				\$7,850,700		
Soft Cost multiplier				1.2		From UCR
Project Cost				\$9,420,840		\$3.5M in 5 yr NS Capital Plan
Notes: Program develor	oed in meeti	ing with Kyle	Hoffman	. , ,	3 This proc	gram represents a middle
						to serve as an Alumni and
isitors Center, although						
considered compatable,						
important to the project.	541 1101 000		5000000000	the bonton.	Saturon opt	

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Footprint	Comments
Alumni Offices	?		?	2370		
Boardroom		1540		1540		
Private Dining		400				
Meeting Rooms		4300		2540	2540	
Library/Living Room		1250		800	800	
Lobby/Reception		2500		1000	1000	
Café		0		0	0	
Kitchen-Full		0		0	0	
Kitchen-Catering		1000	1	750	750	
Banquet Hall			1	0		
University Club (office,						
gameroom, lounge)		1000		0	0	
Tour function		0		0	0	
A la Carte Dining		0		0	0	
Dining Services Offices		0		0	0	
Total Assignable		-				9000 sf in 5 yr NS Capital
Area				9000	5090	Plan
Efficiency				1.43	1.43	
Gross Area				12,870	7,279	
Square foot cost				\$250		allowance
Construction Cost				\$3,217,500		
Soft Cost multiplier				1.2		From UCR
· ·						\$3.5M in 5 yr NS Capital
Project Cost				\$3,861,000		Plan

Detailed Program Assumptions

University of California Riverside

	Current Space	Projected			
Space	(Fall 02)	Growth	Total	Footprint	Comments
Admissions	2,583	1,417	4,000	4,000	
AVC Enrollment					
Management	0	1,000	1,000		
Financial Aid Office	2,453	2,047	4,500	4,500	
International Services	610	3,390	4,000		
Registrar	2,424	1,576	4,000	4,000	
Relations w/ Schools	3,867	133	4,000		
Relations w/ Schools -					
Transfer	1,191	309	1500		
Relations w/Schools -					
Upward Bound	1,000	0	1000		
Student Business					
Services	1,326	674	2000	2000	
Student Business					
Services-Cashier	577	423	1000	1000	
Technology	580	1,020	1600	1600	
Career Services	2,852	5,448	8,300		
Unassigned			2,900		
Total Assignable Area			39,800	17,100	From 5-yr. Capital Plan
Efficiency			1.54	1.54	
Minimum Gross Area			61,200	26,294	Minimum Program
Square foot cost			\$242		Result of given numbers
Construction Cost			\$14,800,000		From 5-yr Capital Plan
Soft Cost multiplier			1.31		Result of given numbers
					From Capital Project Summa
Project Cost			\$19,380,000		dated 7/18/03
•		•		•	PP process beginning Dec. finding and proximity to Parkir

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Footprint	Comments
Stage		7,000	1	7000	7000	Stage, Shell Storage
						10000 orch, 6000 1s
Auditorium	2000	20,000	1	20000	10000	balc, 4000, 2nd balc
Front of House		.,				,,
Lobby		20,000	1	20000	10000	
Restrooms		3,900	1	3900	2000	
Concessions		270	1	270		
Concessions Storage		210	1	210		
Ticker/Box Office		355	1	355	355	
Coat Room, Ushers Room		320	1	320		
Café		280	1	280	280	
House Manager's Office		200	1	200		
Event Room/Donor Room		670	1	670		
Storage		310	1	310		
Custodial Closet		80	1	80		
Back of House						
Chorus Dressing Rooms		800	3	2,400		3 for 15 performers
Small Dressing Rooms		300	2	600		2 for 4 performers
Soloist Dressing Rooms		200	2	400		2 for 2 performers
Quick Change Rooms		100	2	200	200	
Green Room		880	1	880	880	
Stage Manager's Office		170	1	170	170	
Tech Directors Office		170	1	170	170	
Visiting Manager's Office		170	1	170		
Security Office		170	1	170	170	
Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room		170 120	1	170 120	120	
Wardrobe Room		400	1	400	120	
Orchestra Pit		1200	1	1200	1000	
Trap Room		1200	1	1200	1000	
Chair Wagon Storage		1420	1	1420		
Loading Dock/Receiving		1500	1	1500	1500	
Catering Kitchen		220	1	220	220	
Control Room		650	1	650		
Projection Room		200	1	200		
Follow-Spot Booth		230	1	230		
Electrical Shop		480	1	480		
Crew Room/Lounge		250	1	250		
Custodial Closet		65	1	65		
Instrument Storage		480	1	480	480	
Piano Storage		200	1	200	200	
Dance Storage		220	1	220		
Set and Crate Storage		980	1	980	980	
Chair and Table Storage		500	1	500	500	
Prop Storage		250	1	250		
Drape Storage		400	1	400		
Platform and Riser Stor.		850	1	850		
Oversized Corridor		1500	1	1500	1500	
Administration		3500	1	3500		
Total Assignable Area Efficiency				76140	38125	-
Gross Area				1.62	1.62	
Square foot cost				123,347	61,763	
				550		
Construction Cost Soft Cost multiplier				\$67,840,740		From LICD
				1.2		From UCR
Project Cost				\$81,408,888		

Comments: 2000 seat Performance Hall added per CPAC, July 22, 2003. Program developed by Adam Shallack of Auerbach, Pollack, Freidlander and THA, based on other similar facilities Service Criteria: Administrative parking for 50 cars, 1 bus, 2 limousines and engineering vehicles; Loading Dock 3 truck bays wide with 3' vertical ramp down to 65' of flat length adjacent to dock - must be to rear comer back or side of stage with straight path; Adjacent dumpster and recycling area; 80' semi truck radius. Possible pedestrian linkage to parking structure at 2nd floor level.

Detailed Program Assumptions

Space Capar Stage Auditorium 11 Front of House 11 Front of House 11 Restrooms 11 Concessions Storage 11 Concessions Storage 11 Ticket/Box Office 11 Concessions Storage 11 Ticket/Box Office 11 Cat Room, Ushers 11 Catsodial Closet 11 Back of House 11 Chorus Dressing Rooms 11 Storage 11 Chorus Dressing Rooms 11 Green Room 11 Green Room 11 Green Room 11 Green Room 11 Stage Manager's Office 11 Building Engineer 11 Copy/Storage Room 11 M	City Area 7,000 200 12,000 200 2,000 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7000 12000 2300 200 150 355 320 200 200 200 200 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880	400 400 400 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1700 1700 1700 1200	Comments
Auditorium 1: Front of House 1: Lobby Restrooms Concessions Storage 1: Ticket/Box Office Codat Room, Ushers Café 1 House Manager's Office 1: Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Stage Manager's Office 1: Visiting Manager's Office 1: Scurity Office 1: Stage Manager's Office 1:	200 12,000 12,000 2,300 200 200 200 200 200 200 200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	12000 12000 2300 200 150 355 320 200 200 600 310 80 	8000 6000 1500 200 200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Front of House Lobby Restrooms Concessions Storage Concessions Storage Concessions Storage Cicket/Box Office Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Solisit Dressing Rooms Solisit Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage </td <td>12,000 2,300 200 155 320 200 200 200 310 800 300 200 100 888 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1600</td> <td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>12000 2300 200 355 320 200 200 310 310 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 200 170 170 170 170 170 170</td> <td>6000 1500 355 200 400 200 880 170 170</td> <td></td>	12,000 2,300 200 155 320 200 200 200 310 800 300 200 100 888 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1600	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	12000 2300 200 355 320 200 200 310 310 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 200 170 170 170 170 170 170	6000 1500 355 200 400 200 880 170 170	
Lobby Restrooms Concessions Concessions Concessions Storage Ticket/Box Office Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage Darae St	2,300 200 155 335 200 200 200 310 300 200 100 100 100 177 177 177 177 1770 1770 1770 1202 1202	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2300 200 150 355 320 200 200 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 600 400 200 170 170 170 170	1500 355 200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Restrooms Concessions Storage Concessions Storage Ticket/Box Office Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Contol/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage	2,300 200 155 335 200 200 200 310 300 200 100 100 100 177 177 177 177 1770 1770 1770 1202 1202	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2300 200 150 355 320 200 200 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 600 400 200 170 170 170 170	1500 355 200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Concessions Concessions Storage Concessions Storage Ticket/Box Office Caaf Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Solisit Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Drape Storage Darae Storage <td>200 150 355 320 200 200 310 800 200 000 200 000 100 170 170 170 170 170 1</td> <td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>200 150 355 320 200 600 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170</td> <td>355 200 400 200 880 170 170 170</td> <td></td>	200 150 355 320 200 200 310 800 200 000 200 000 100 170 170 170 170 170 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	200 150 355 320 200 600 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170	355 200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Concessions Storage Ticket/Box Office Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Gater Room Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Darage Storage Drape Storage	150 355 322 200 200 310 800 200 200 200 200 200 100 886 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120 1200 120	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	150 355 320 200 200 600 310 80 600 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170	200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Ticket/Box Office Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Contol/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Drape Storage	355 320 200 200 310 310 300 200 100 100 100 177 177 177 177 177 177 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	355 320 200 200 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170	200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Coat Room, Ushers Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Prop Storage	320 200 200 310 800 200 200 200 200 100 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 1200 400 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	320 200 200 600 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170	200 400 200 880 170 170 170	
Café House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage Darae Storage Darae Storage Drape Storage Darae Storage	200 200 310 800 200 200 200 100 886 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	200 200 600 310 80 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170	400 200 880 170 170 170	
House Manager's Office Event Room/Donor Room Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Chair and Table Storage Drape Storage Darpe Storage Darpe Storage Dance Storage Darpe Storage	600 310 800 300 200 100 886 170 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	600 310 80 2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Magon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crustodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Prape Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Draker Storage Draker Storage Draker Storage <t< td=""><td>310 80 300 100 880 177 170 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 17</td><td>1 1 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>310 80 2,400 600 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120</td><td>200 880 170 170 170</td><td></td></t<>	310 80 300 100 880 177 170 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 17	1 1 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	310 80 2,400 600 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Storage Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Magon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crustodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Dance Storage Prape Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Darker Storage Draker Storage Draker Storage Draker Storage <t< td=""><td>310 80 300 100 880 177 170 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 17</td><td>1 1 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>310 80 2,400 600 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120</td><td>200 880 170 170 170</td><td></td></t<>	310 80 300 100 880 177 170 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 17	1 1 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	310 80 2,400 600 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Custodial Closet Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Quick Change Room Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Prop Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Darpe Storage Darp	80 800 300 200 880 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 17	1 3 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	80 2,400 600 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Back of House Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Bet and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	800 300 200 886 170 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200 1200	3 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2,400 600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170	200 880 170 170 170	
Chorus Dressing Rooms Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Usiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage	300 200 100 880 177 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lourge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	300 200 100 880 177 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	600 400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Small Dressing Rooms Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lourge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	200 100 177 170 170 170 170 120 120 1200 1600	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	400 200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Soloist Dressing Rooms Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	100 880 177 170 170 170 170 170 170 1200 1200	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	200 880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	200 880 170 170 170	
Quick Change Rooms Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catring Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage	880 170 170 170 170 170 170 1200 1200 1600	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	880 170 170 170	
Green Room Stage Manager's Office Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lourge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Prop Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Darae Storage	170 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	880 170 170 170 170 170 170 120	170 170 170	
Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Cchair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	170 170 170 170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	170 170 170 170 170 170 120	170 170 170	
Tech Directors Office Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Cchair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	170 170 170 120 400 1200 1200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	170 170 170 120	170	
Visiting Manager's Office Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	170 170 120 400 1200 1600	1 1 1 1 1 1	170 170 120		
Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	170 170 120 400 1200 1600	1 1 1 1 1 1	170 170 120		
Security Office Building Engineer Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	170 120 400 1200 1600	1 1 1 1	170 120		
Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	120 400 1200 1600	1 1 1	120	120	
Copy/Storage Room Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	400 1200 1600	1		120	
Wardrobe Room Orchestra Pit Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	1200 1600	1	400		
Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	1600				
Trap Room Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage Drape Storage	1600		1200	1000	
Chair Wagon Storage Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage					
Loading Dock/Receiving Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage			1420		
Catering Kitchen Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	1500		1500	1500	
Control/Projection Room Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	220		220	220	
Follow-Spot Booth Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	650	1	650		
Electrical Shop Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	230		230		
Crew Room/Lounge Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	480		480		
Custodial Closet Instrument Storage Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	250	1	250		
Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	65	1	65		
Piano Storage Dance Storage Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	480	1	480	480	
Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	200	1	200	200	
Set and Crate Storage Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	220		220		
Chair and Table Storage Prop Storage Drape Storage	980	1	980	980	
Prop Storage Drape Storage	500		500	500	
Drape Storage	250	1	250		
	400		400		
	110		110		
Platform and Riser Stor.	850	1	850		
Oversized Corridor	1500	1	1500	1500	
Administration	3500	1	3500		
Total Assignable Area			58170	31545	
Efficiency			1.62	1.62	
Gross Area			94,235	51,103	
Square foot cost			\$550	.,	*
Construction Cost			\$51,829,470		
Soft Cost multiplier			1.2		From UCR
Project Cost			\$62,195,364		
		1			d on other similar
Program developed by Adam Shalla	ak of Augertaat	Dellack E	roidlondor c++		
facilities. Service Criteria: Administr					
Loading Dock: 3 truck bays wide with rear corner back or side of stage with	rative parking f	or 50 cars, '	1 bus, 2 limous	ines and er	

Program developed by Adam Shallack of Auerbach, Pollack, Freidlander and THA, based on other similar
facilities. Service Criteria: Administrative parking for 50 cars, 1 bus, 2 limousines and engineering vehicles.
Loading Dock: 3 truck bays wide with 3' vertical ramp down to 65' of flat length adjacent to dock - must be to
rear corner back or side of stage with straight path. Adjacent dumpster and recycling area. 80' semi truck
radius.

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Footprint	Comments
Stage		2500	1	2500	2500	
Auditorium	350	3500	1	3500	3500	
Choir Loft		900	1	900		
Organ Loft		300	1	300		
Main Dressing Rooms		1200	1	1200	1200	
Soloist Dressing Rooms		300	1	300	300	
Green Room		400	1	400	400	
Control Room/Projection		300	1	300		
Musician Warm-up Room		600	1	600	600	
Lobby		2100	1	2100	2100	
Instrument Storage		1000	1	1000	1000	
Backstage		1500	1	1500	1500	
Bathrooms		500	1	500	500	
Offices		150	3	450	450	
Total Assignable Area				15,550	14,050	10,000sf in 5-yr NS Capital Plan
Efficiency				1.62	1.62	
Gross Area				25,191	22,761	
Square foot cost				400		
Construction Cost				\$10,076,400		
Soft Cost multiplier				1.2		From UCR
Project Cost				\$12,091,680		\$10M in 5yr. NS Capita Plan

imilar facilities. This program does not include faculty spaces or practice rooms and thus should be placed near other Music Department Facilities or be increased dramatically to house the department. Loading of medium sized trucks should be accommodated assuming a "tommy gate" or ramp down 3' with 40' of flat area adjacent to dock. Dock should be adjacent to backstage and have straight path to stage

Detailed Program Assumptions

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Comments
-					Covered Outdoor area of 350
					sf, and Special Events
Reception		200	1	200	courtyard not included
Exhibition					
Temporary Exhibits		3000	1	3000	
Temporary Exhibits		1000	1	1000	
Interactive Gallery		1000	1	1000	
Permanent Collection		900	1	900	
Administrative					
Offices		225	3	675	
Work Area		100	2	200	
Office Supplies		150	1	150	
Office/reception support		150	1	150	
Storage					
Exhibition Furniture		200	1	200	
Catalog Storage		100	1	100	
General Storage		100	1	100	
Chair Storage		350	1	350	
Registrarial					
Collection Storage		1200	1	1200	
Crate Storage		400	1	400	
Registrars Office		225	1	225	
Gallery Shop		400	1	400	
Design/Production Areas					
Workroom		225	1	225	
Preparator Storage		120	1	120	
Carpentry Storage		200	1	200	
Restrooms		270	2	540	Truck Dock with leveler 1425 NIC
Fotal Assignable Area				11335	
Efficiency				1.33	
Gross Area				15,076	Assume one story building
Square foot cost				265	
Construction Cost				\$3,995,021	
Soft Cost multiplier					from UCR
Project Cost				\$4,794,025	\$5M in 5-yr NS Capital Plan
Notes: Program developed in Art Gallery prepared by Rand ront door, and adjacency to the existing Sweeney Gallery name which is currently dispersed in building with room for additiona	dall Stout Archit e proposed Perfo e should be retain various buildings	ects, date ormance C ned. The on camp	ed 11/2/00. Center are o university l us. This co	Proximity to criteria for the has an existir ollection woul	o existing Art Building, at the Museum/Gallery. The ng small permanent collection d be housed in the new

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Comments
Classrooms	30	600	2	1200	
	60	1200	2	2400	
	120	2400	1	2400	
_abs (wet)				0	
Research	10	1200	25	30000	
Teaching	16	1200	6	7200	
_ab Support		200	31	6200	
Design Rooms		300	4	1200	Project Rooms
Conference Room		1500	1	1500	
Conference Room		700	2	1400	
Bio-Engineering Offices					
Director's Office	1	180	1	180	
Faculty Offices	1	135	12	1620	
Administrative Support	4	240	1	240	
Teaching Assistants	25	1100	1	1100	
Work Room		400	1	400	
Storage		200	1	200	
Post Dr./Visitor/Lecturer					
Offices	2	135	15	2025	
Vaterial Science Offices				0	
Director's Office	1	180	1	180	
Faculty Offices	1	135	13	1755	
Administrative Support	4	240	1	240	
Teaching Assistants	25	1100	1	1100	
Work Room		400	1	400	
Storage		200	1	200	
Post Dr./Visitor/Lecturer					
Offices	2	135	15	2025	
Fotal Assignable Area				65165	
Efficiency				1.74	Based on MS&E
Gross Area				113,492	Based on MS&E
Square foot cost				\$317	
Construction Cost				\$35,977,109	
Soft Cost multiplier				1.2	From UCR
Project Cost				\$43,172,531	

Detailed Program Assumptions

Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Comments
Classrooms	30	600	5	3000	
	60	1200	5	6000	
	120	2400	2	4800	
Labs (some dry, most wet)					
Research	10	1200	20	24000	
Teaching	16	1200	10	12000	
Lab Support		200	30	6000	
General Faculty Offices				0	
Faculty Offices	1	135	20	2700	
Visiting Post Doc.	1	135	10	1350	
Administrative Support	4	240	1	240	
Teaching Assistants	25	1100	1	1100	
Work Room		400	1	400	
Storage		200	1		
Design Rooms		300	4	1200	
Conference Room		1500	1	1500	
Conference Room		700	1	700	
Total Assignable Area				64,990	
Efficiency				1.74	Based on MS&E
Gross Area				113,188	
Square foot cost				\$317	Based on MS&E
Construction Cost				\$35,880,493	
Soft Cost multiplier				1.2	From UCR
Project Cost				\$43,056,592	

	Current Space	Projected		
Space	(Fall 02)	Growth	Total	Comments
Campus Health	6,960	4,000	10,960	
Counseling Center	2,852	3,648	6,500	
Student Special Services	2,901	1,499	4,400	
Total Assignable Area	12,713	9,147	21,860	
Efficiency			1.54	
Gross Area			33,664	
Square foot cost			\$265	From SASS
Construction Cost			\$8,921,066	
Soft Cost multiplier			1.2	From UCR
Project Cost			\$10,705,279	

Space	Net Area	Gross Area	Comments
Existing Space in Hinderacker	26,722	41,152	
Square foot cost		\$265	From SASS
Construction Cost		\$10,905,280	
Soft Cost multiplier		1.2	From UCR
Project Cost		\$13,086,336	

Detailed Program Assumptions

Space	Net Area	Gross Area	Comments
Foot Print Avaiable	12,300	20,500	Net assumed to be 60% of Gross
Total Area	36,900	61,500	Assume 3 floors average
Square foot cost		\$265	From CHASS
Construction Cost		\$5,432,500	
Soft Cost multiplier		1.2	From UCR
Project Cost		\$6,519,000	

13. Bannockburn Program									
Meeting with Susan Marsh Plan for Housing, dated M									
Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Comments				
Apartments	500 beds			190,000	1br, 2br, & 4br units				
					15-20,000 retail, balance				
Retail/Offices				30,000	offices				
Gross Area				220,000					
Square foot cost				\$177					
Construction Cost				\$38,837,000	Strategic Plan for Housing				
Soft Cost multiplier				1.30					
Project Cost				\$50,507,520	Strategic Plan for Housing				

Notes: Office space in the current Bannockburn is "leased" to a number of campus offices, such as Capital and Physical Planning and the Office of Design and Construction as well as private concerns such as Getaway Cafe and Sub Station. It is desired that the new Bannockburn have offices related to Student Services. As the University uses are essentially tenants, if was concluded that the space should not be assigned to a specific department, but should be leased, on a long term, as needed. It was desired that the buildings be single use, e.g., office use should be over retail, and housing should be over parking (related to the housing).

Based on Conceptual Design Esquisse, dated January 2000, by Stichler					
Space	Capacity	Area	Number	Total	Comments
Parking	1248			410,200	
Retail Špace				12,800	
Total Area (gsf)				423,000	
Square foot cost				\$50	
·					from Stichler DPP, inflated to
Construction Cost				\$21,150,000	2003
Soft Cost multiplier				1.20	From UCR
				\$25,380,000	

structure. Retail on the ground floor and allowances for setbacks and other façade articulation are proposed to mitigate the mass of the building on Canyon Crest Drive Additional floors can be added. Each floor would add approximately 280 spaces and cost and add \$4.7M Construction Cost, or \$5.7M Project Cost.

15. Parking Lot 1 Program

Comments: No program has been defined at this time.



Costs

For the development of the East Campus Entrance Area Plan to proceed, a system of essential infrastructural upgrades will be required. There are cost savings to be achieved by combining various upgrades together at the same point in time, perhaps in relation to a specific campus building development. The diagram at right shows the infrastructural upgrades expressed as discrete, stand-alone "phases."

Assumptions:

The cost of a proposed infrastructure upgrade (or 'construction project') is usually divided into two parts: construction costs and project 'soft' costs. Construction cost represents the amount of money a successful bidder would charge to build the desired physical improvement. General contractor-incurred costs such as mobilization, overhead, subcontractor mark-up and profit are included in the construction cost.

'Soft' costs include all of those costs and charges that are associated with a construction project, but are not the responsibility of the General Contractor. Examples of soft costs include (but are not limited to): land acquisition, legal fees, survey preparation, specialty studies (e.g. cultural, environmental, geotechnical, traffic), land use or design review approvals, permit charges, utility connection fees, architectural and engineering design fees, project oversight and management and environmental mitigation.

In addition, a project contingency is usually included in an effort to account for "unknowns" related to a project. At the earliest stages of project development, "unknowns" are substantial and a significant factor should be added to known construction costs. As the project is refined, more will be learned about what needs to be done and the project contingency can be reduced.

For public projects, a general rule of thumb is that the construction costs average about two-thirds of the total project cost. For purposes of establishing approximate fundraising targets, the construction cost estimates provided in the following table should be increased by 50% to ensure that an allowance is included for construction costs, soft costs and project contingency. For projects expected to develop after 2004, it will also be prudent to add a factor covering inflation.

While this approach will provide a reasonable 'ballpark' estimate of the probable cost of constructing a project, it is not based on detailed studies. It is important, therefore, that the University of California, Riverside use caution with these numbers and commission more detailed studies and cost estimates as the project scope is refined.



Appendix C

Cost Spreadsheets

The tables on the following pages show cost estimates for basic infrastructure provision in each phase.

TREETS AND SERVICE	ROUTES				
		QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COST
UNIVERSITY AVENUE UP	GRADE				
Subgrade Prep		1,800	LF	\$1.00	\$1,80
Paving		62,500	SF	\$4.00	\$250,00
Curb and Gutter		1,800	LF	\$20.00	\$36,00
Sidewalks (12' wide)	1800	21,600	SF	\$6.25	\$135,00
Crosswalks	4500sf	7	EA	\$5,000.00	\$35,00
Signage and Striping		1,800	LF	\$3.00	\$5,40
Monument Sign			Lump	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.0
Directional Signage			Lump	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.0
Median Planting		5,000	SF	\$5.50	\$27,50
Landscape at Offramp		50,000	SF	\$4.00	\$200,00
Storm Drainage		62,500	SF	\$1.25	\$78,12
Street Trees (\$300 each)	or 60 at 30'o.c.	1,800	LF	\$14.00	\$25,20
Irrigation (assume use of e	xisting controller(s))	5,250	SF	\$1.50	\$7,87
	Trash, Fountains, Bike Racks)	1,800	LF	\$40.00	\$72,00
Street Lighting (or \$5000 e		1,800	LF	\$35.00	\$63,00
2 01 1	University Avenue Subtotal				\$951,90
					ψυ μι, γι
: UNIV. AVE. IOWA to I-215	SIGNAGE				
Signage:					
University District Marker	rs		Lump	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.0
Directional Signage Enhan			Lump	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.0
	University Avenue Signage Subtotal				\$15,00
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
ROUNDABOUT					
Subgrade Prep		600	LF	\$1.00	\$60
Signage and Striping		600	LF	\$3.00	\$1,80
Curb and Gutter		600	LF	\$20.00	\$12,00
Paving		12,000	SF	\$4.00	\$48,00
Center Planting		2,500	SF	\$4.00	\$10,00
Center Sculpture			Lump	\$75,000.00	\$75,00
	Roundabout Subtotal				\$147,40
CANYON CREST DRIVE U	PGRADE				
Subgrade Prep		4,000	LF	\$1.00	\$4,00
Paving (includes visitor dr	opoff for Performing Arts)	72,000	SF	\$4.00	\$288,00
Enhanced Streetscape on E	ast side of CC Drive	24,000	SF	\$5.00	\$120,00
Curb and Gutter	incl curb for median	4,000	LF	\$20.00	\$80,00
Signage and Striping	both directions	2,400	LF	\$3.00	\$7,20
Sidewalks (12' wide)		2,250	SF	\$6.25	\$14,00
Crosswalks	incl half crosswalks	5	EA	\$5,000.00	\$25,00
Monument Sign			Lump	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.0
Directional Signage			Lump	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.0
Median Planting		4,000	SF	\$5.50	\$22,00
Storm Drainage		72,000	SF	\$1.25	\$90,00
Street Trees (\$300 each)	or 75 at 30 o.c.	2,250	LF	\$14.00	\$31,50
Irrigation (assume use of e		30,000	SF	\$1.50	\$45,00
	Trash, Fountains, Bike Racks)	2,250	LF	\$40.00	\$90,00
Transit Shelter		2,230	Lump	\$5,000.00	\$5,00
Onereer					
Street Lighting		2,250	LF	\$35.00	\$78,75

		QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COST
): NORTH ARROYO SERVIC	E DRIVE (proposed)*				
Subgrade Prep		2,400	LF	\$1.00	\$2,40
Paving		40,000	SF	\$5.00	\$200,00
Curb and Gutter	both sides	2,400	LF	\$20.00	\$48,00
Signage and Striping		1,200	LF	\$2.00	\$2,40
Sidewalks (12' wide)		2,400	SF	\$6.25	\$15,00
Retaining Walls		1,200	LF	\$130.00	\$156,00
Storm Drainage		40,000	SF	\$1.25	\$50,00
Street Trees (\$300 each)		2,400	LF	\$14.00	\$33,60
Landscape		14,400	SF	\$5.00	\$72,00
Irrigation (assume use of e	xisting controller(s))	14,400	SF	\$1.50	\$21,60
Street Lighting		2,400	LF	\$35.00	\$84,00
	North Arroyo Service Subtotal				\$685,00
Entry plazas to buildings along	North Service Drive to be included in building bud	gets as design st	andard.		
		0 0			
ALUMNI VC SERVICE DRI					
Subgrade Prep	not incl VC parking	500	LF	\$1.00	\$50
Paving	not incl VC parking	7,000	SF	\$4.00	\$28,00
Curb and Gutter	not incl VC parking	500	LF	\$20.00	\$10,00
Signage, Striping	not incl VC parking	500	LF	\$3.00	\$1,50
	snone can be reused due north of VC)	16	Spaces	\$2,500.00	\$40,00
Sidewalks (12' wide)		2,000	SF	\$6.25	\$12,50
Storm Drainage		30,000	SF	\$1.25	\$37,50
Landscape		13,000	SF	\$4.00	\$52,00
Irrigation (assume use of e	xisting controller(s))	13,000	SF	\$1.50	\$19,50
Lighting at Parking Lot		300	LF	\$35.00	\$10,50
	Alumni VC Service Subtotal				\$212,00
SERVICE DRIVE CHASS, M	IUSEUM & RECITAL HALL				
Subgrade Prep		550	LF	\$1.00	\$55
Paving		7,750	SF	\$4.00	\$31,00
Curb and Gutter		550	LF	\$20.00	\$11,00
Signage and Striping		275	LF	\$3.00	\$8
Sidewalks		9,000	SF	\$5.00	\$45,00
Storm Drainage		7,750	SF	\$1.25	\$9,6
Street Trees (\$300 each)		425	LF	\$14.00	\$5,9
Irrigation (assume use of e	xisting controller(s))	250	SF	\$1.50	\$3
Street Lighting		275	LF	\$35.00	\$9,6
	CHASS/Museum Service Subtotal				\$114,0

Appendix C

Cost Spreadsheets

G: SASS, COSTO & COMMONS SERVICE DRIVE (proposed)				
Subgrade Prep	450	LF	\$1.00	\$450
Paving	5,500	SF	\$4.00	\$22,00
Curb and Gutter	450	LF	\$20.00	\$9,000
Signage and Striping	250	LF	\$3.00	\$750
Sidewalks	10,000	SF	\$5.00	\$50,00
Storm Drainage	5,500	SF	\$1.25	\$6,87
Street Trees (\$300 each)	650	LF	\$14.00	\$9,10
Landscape	10,000	SF	\$5.00	\$50,000
Irrigation (assume use of existing controller(s))	16,000	SF	\$1.50	\$24,00
Street Lighting	250	LF	\$35.00	\$8,750
SASS/Commons Service Subtota	1			\$180,92
I: ACCESS DRIVE TO PARKING 1 (proposed)				
Subgrade Prep	600	LF	\$1.00	\$60
Paving	9,000	SF	\$4.00	\$36,00
Curb and Gutter	600	LF	\$20.00	\$12,00
Directional Signage and Striping	300	LF	\$3.00	\$900
Sidewalks	4,500	SF	\$5.00	\$22,50
Storm Drainage	9,000	SF	\$1.25	\$11,25
Street Trees (\$300 each)	450	LF	\$14.00	\$6,30
Irrigation (assume use of existing controller(s))	150	SF	\$1.50	\$22
Street Lighting	300	LF	\$35.00	\$10,50
Parking 1 Access Subtota	1			\$100,27
Note: Traffic signal at University Ave. not included				

			QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COS
MALLS &	t PLAZAS					
			QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COS
FINE ART	IS MALL UPGRAD	4	<u>`</u>			
	ade Prep	L	400	LF	\$1.00	\$4
	ional Signage		400	LF	\$1.00	\$2,0
Sidewa			27,000	SF	\$5.00	\$135.0
	Trees (\$300 each)		1.100	LF	\$14.00	\$155,0
Landso			19,000	SF	\$5.00	\$15,4
	cape ion (assume use of ex	isting controllor(c))	19,000	SF	\$1.50	\$95,0
Lightii		listing controller(s))	400	LF	\$1.50	\$20,3 \$14.0
	Furniture		400	LF	\$33.00	\$14,0
Stitet	Furniture	Fine Arts Mall Subtotal	400	LI	ş 1 0.00	\$306,3
		Fille Arts Mail Subtotal				\$300,3
CARILLO	N MALL UPGRAD					
	ade Prep		1,000	LF	\$1.00	\$1.0
	ional Signage		775	LF	\$5.00	\$3,8
Sidewa	0 0		32,700	SF	\$5.00	\$163,5
	Trees (\$300 each)		10,000	LF	\$14.00	\$140,0
Landso			40.000	SF	\$5.00	\$200.0
	ion (assume use of ex	isting controller(s))	40,500	SF	\$1.50	\$60,7
Lighti		listing controller(0))	1,100	LF	\$35.00	\$38,5
	Furniture		1,100	LF	\$40.00	\$44,0
ourcee	r unincure	Carillon Mall Subtotal	1,100		<i>φ</i> 10.00	\$651,6
		Carmon Man Subtotar				JUJ1,0
: CENTRA	AL ARTS PLAZA					
Subgra	ade Prep		1,000	LF	\$1.00	\$1,0
Paving			35,000	SF	\$4.00	\$140,0
	ional Signage		300	LF	\$5.00	\$1,5
Sidewa	alks		10,000	SF	\$5.00	\$50,0
Storm	Drainage		35,000	SF	\$1.50	\$52,5
	cape Trees (\$400 eac	h)	400	LF	\$14.00	\$5,6
	idcover	/	7,000	SF	\$5.00	\$35,0
	ion (assume use of ex	isting controller(s))	15,000	SF	\$1.50	\$22,5
Lightin	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		500	LF	\$35.00	\$17,5
	/Ramps		450	LF	\$50.00	\$22,5
Railing	*		200	LF	\$50.00	\$10,0
Stone	0		300	LF	\$60.00	\$18,C
	d Lawn		13,800	SF	\$0.25	\$3,4
	l Planters		7,500	SF	\$4.00	\$30,0
		Trash, Fountains, Bike Racks)	300	LF	\$50.00	\$15,0
		Arts Plaza Subtotal			+	\$424,5
		THE THE SUPERIOR				φ 12 1,-
	OPEN SPACE					
	ade Prep		1,000	LF	\$1.00	\$1,0
Direct	ional Signage		1,000	LF	\$5.00	\$5,C
	s/Stairs/Ramps		50,000	SF	\$5.00	\$250,0
	s/Drainage		200	LF	\$450.00	\$90,0
Trees			2,000	LF	\$14.00	\$28,0
Landso			125,000	SF	\$5.00	\$625,0
	ion (assume use of ex	tisting controller(s))	125,000	SF	\$1.50	\$187,5
	trian Lighting		1,000	LF	\$35.00	\$35,0
Site Fu	urnishings (Benches,	Trash, Fountains, Bike Racks)	1,000	LF	\$40.00	\$40,0
1		Arroyo Open Space Subtotal				\$1,261,5

Appendix C

Cost Spreadsheets

	QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COST
MISC.				
	QUANTITY	UNIT	COST/UNIT	TOTAL COST
M: WEST ARROYO PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE				
Bridge Structure	5,000	SF	\$100.00	\$500,000
Directional Signage	150	LF	\$5.00	\$750
Lighting	300	LF	\$35.00	\$10,500
Site Furnishings (Benches, Bollards)	300	LF	\$30.00	\$9,000
West Arroyo Ped Bridge Subtotal				\$520,250
N: CENTRAL ARROYO PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE				
Bridge Structure	5,500	SF	\$60.00	\$330,000
Directional Signage	200	LF	\$5.00	\$1,000
Lighting	400	LF	\$35.00	\$14,000
Site Furnishings (Benches, Bollards)	400	LF	\$30.00	\$12,000
Central Arroyo Ped Bridge Subtotal				\$357,000
O: MS&E PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE				
Bridge Structure	2,500	SF	\$60.00	\$150,000
Directional Signage	75	LF	\$5.00	\$37
Lighting	150	LF	\$35.00	\$5,250
Site Furnishings (Benches, Bollards)	150	LF	\$30.00	\$4,500
MS&E Ped Bridge Subtotal				\$160,12
NOTES:				
See accompanying description of elements not included in this estimate.				
MS&E Pedestrian Bridge (from Bldg to North Campus Drive) to be constructed	l within building	g project bu	ıdget	
Include 4% inflation allowance	Ĭ		-	
Include 20% contingency				

NOTE: Reservoir Relocation Costs

There is a buried City of Riverside water reservoir south of University Avenue adjacent to I-215/SR-60. Built in 1936, this 5-million gallon concrete tank is in excellent condition and continues to be more than adequate for the Campus water supply. The ECEAS concept proposes the potential relocation of this reservoir to another part of campus, perhaps under the Central Arts Plaza. If the reservoir is to be relocated to provide a site for a mixed-use building, it will cost roughly \$4 to \$5 million and must meet certain conditions. The reservoir does not need to be at this precise location, but it cannot go much higher than 1077' above sea level (it currently sits at 1037') so it must be within close proximity to the existing site. If relocated, the reservoir could be downsized to 4 million gallons if necessary, which would require a tank of approximately 150' in diameter. It could be located entirely underground, under the proposed Central Plaza, for example, at the end of University Avenue.

The relocation cost cited above by the City was very speculative. It is worth noting that the land value of the reservoir site could warrant redevelopment if a higher and better use could be programmed for the site and if relocation costs could be factored into the development proforma.

Appendix D

University Avenue Fly By



1. View over the interstate off ramp heading down University Avenue looking East towards campus. The mixed use buildings lie directly ahead with the main campus beyond.



2. Heading past the mixed use buildings on University Avenue towards main campus. Directly ahead sits the roundabout and the Arts Plaza flanked by the Performing Arts Hall, Recital Hall and Museum, and CHASS I&R Building.

Appendix D

University Avenue Fly By



- **3.** Heading East over the Arts Plaza, between the Performing Arts Hall and CHASS I&R, and into the central University Arroyo. The Plaza is represented here, for example, as a broad lawn tilted towards the Recital Hall, providing space for students to relax, for impromptu outdoor class session, and for informal performances. A stone wall on this lawn's western edge offers a potential location for a campus identifier or monument.
- **4.** Looking East through the central University Arroyo space towards The Glade, lined with the Engineering buildings and Materials Science and Engineering. The landscape of the arroyo, once cut off by Athletic Fields, is now extended into this space framed by Engineering buildings. View continues East to the Glasde.

University of California Riverside

East Campus Entrance Area Study

Canyon Crest Drive Fly By



1. Going south down Canyon Crest Drive from Linden Street, with a new center median and street trees providing a visual extension of the Arts Mall landscape into the campus' future growth area. The massing of the proposed Parking Structure 24 is located on the east side of Canyon Crest Drive. A potential redevelopment scheme for Bannockburn is shown, (but existing private development north of Bannockburn is not shown.)



2. Passing over Parking Structure 24, the fly-loft of the Performing Arts Center emerges into sight. Across Canyon Crest Drive sits a new Alumni Visitor Center on the site of Watkins House, looking into the Gage Basin.



Appendix D

Canyon Crest Drive Fly By



- **3.** Nearing the roundabout, the scene shows the widened sidewalks, plazas and steps as well as lush street tree plantings that help give character and a sense of place to this crucial node at UCR.
- Looking west along University Avenue, this scene shows the potential for new mixed-use buildings that back onto the University Arroyo on the north, and a parking structure on Parking Lot 1 to the south. Residential units could have balconies, while ground-floor spaces could spill out onto terraces overlooking the naturalized landscape to the north. (Note: The campus telephone building is not shown on the south side of the street just east of the freeway.)

University of California Riverside

buildings.

95

East Campus Entrance Area Study

North Campus Drive Fly By



storm drain pipes. The arroyo open space maintains a minimum 90 feet of open space between





2. Continuing west across a proposed "Performance Lawn" on the south side of the Performing Arts Center, a space for outdoor theater and music, as well as student activities and informal recreation. A pedestrian bridge crosses the arroyo green space, linking athletic facilities and the Recreation Mall to the north with the East Campus academic core to the south.

Appendix D

Appendix D

North Campus Drive Fly By



3. View looking west over proposed Arts Plaza, a new dynamic space fronted by two major Arts performance facilities, the new CHASS I&R Building and the Arts Building.



4. Turning to the northwest, over the new Performing Arts Center, showing a potential pedestrian bridge linking the new Parking Structure on Lot 24 with the PAC.

University of California Riverside

Carillon Mall Fly By



1. Looking east over the proposed Parking Structure 1 and I-215/SR-60. To the north of the flagpole plaza, a new building has been added adjacent to the Arts Building to accommodate

expansion needs. This helps to frame the green portal to the Carillon Mall.

- - 2. Continuing east over the flagpole, one sees the new CHASS I&R Building on the east side of the Arts Mall, while in the background, the proposed SASS building sits framing the west side of Costo Hall.

Appendix D

Appendix D

Carillon Mall Fly By



3. This scene shows the proposed SASS Building, with a new academic building to the north replacing the Physical Education Building. This site for the SASS building offers strong adjacency for complementary campus functions in a renovated Student Commons behind. The new SASS Building also reinforces the northern edge of the Carillon Mall, making it feel more like the classic quads of older university campuses.