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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Area Plan addresses broad campus planning issues and examines a portion of the UC Santa Cruz campus to accommodate future expansion of the Social Sciences Division and Student Affairs development (student life and housing) consistent with the division’s academic plan, the planning principles articulated in the 2005 Long-Range Development Plan and the Physical Design Framework – March 2010. The Plan examines potential sites for the proposed Social Sciences Facility and a Classroom Auditorium building, which have been included in the 2009-2019 and subsequent 10-year Capital Improvement Programs.

Charged by Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger, the Northeast Campus Area Plan Advisory Group began this area planning process in November 2009, supported by a working group, to direct area master planning, engineering studies and evaluate potential building sites. First included in the 2006-07 5-year Capital Program, the proposed new Social Sciences Facility would house the Dean of Social Sciences, Divisional Offices, the departments of Education and Economics, research units, and small classrooms. The anticipated Social Sciences 3 Facility (SS3) program requires a building of over 42,000 assignable square feet (70,000 gross square feet) with the potential to expand to 50,000 assignable square feet (83,000 gross square feet).

The new Classroom Auditorium building is expected to accommodate 1,000 seats, possibly built in phases with a 600-seat lecture hall built first. Sites to accommodate the full program are evaluated in this document.

The plan examines existing conditions and identifies the core campus fabric within which new development could be located. Preliminary and detailed site analyses are captured and were used during the seven-month consultation and deliberations with faculty, students, and staff.

The Area Plan identifies potential improvements to the recommended sites that could be realized in the future but have not yet been planned. Some of these potential site improvements, endorsed by the working group and many members of CPS, are important elements of enlivening and creating vibrant outdoor environments. Outdoor spaces and direct visual and physical connections to already functioning campus areas and facilities assist in broadening the overall experience of the site and learning outcomes.

The Advisory Committee on Campus Planning & Stewardship, functioning as
The Northeast Campus Area Plan Advisory Group ("Advisory Group"), recommended to the Chancellor and Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor that the new Social Sciences 3 Facility be located to the east of Social Sciences 1 and North of the Fire Station on the east edge of Jordan Gulch. This recommendation includes a pedestrian bridge connecting the College 9 Circle to a pathway just south of the building site, parking in close proximity to the building (including increased alternative transportation options), and outdoor/site improvements that improve the opportunity for interactive and interdisciplinary engagement.

The Advisory Group also recommended that a new Classroom Auditorium building be located to the west of the existing Classroom Unit 1 and north of Steinbart Way. Additionally, the recommendations propose that a strong physical connection to the Quarry Plaza with the potential for outdoor gathering space, food venues, and improved pedestrian circulation be included in this project. The Chancellor approved both siting recommendations on August 30, 2010.
In the Fall of 2009, Executive Vice Chancellor/Campus Provost Kliger charged the Advisory Group with conducting a Northeast Campus Area Plan, including area master planning, preliminary pre-design engineering studies and programming for the Northeast Campus Area. The main campus core is at a critical juncture in its development footprint. As the number of infill sites for academic program uses decreases, decisions regarding the “highest and best” use for those sites becomes very important. Additionally, there needs to be a determination of the timing and feasibility of extending development north along an extension of Chinquapin Road. Central to this decision, the Advisory Group was charged with providing a siting recommendation for the proposed Social Sciences Facility and a potential new classroom building.

The Advisory Committee on Campus Planning & Stewardship (CPS), functioning as the Northeast Campus Area Plan Advisory Group (“Advisory Group”) began deliberating on this area planning process in November 2009 supported by a staff and faculty Working Group. The Working Group met over the course of the year to identify, discuss options, and evaluate sites to accommodate these future facilities. Over the academic year 2009-2010, the Advisory Group received and discussed the Working Group presentations and updated reports at monthly CPS meetings.

The Working Group consisted of technical staff from Transportation & Parking Services, Physical Plant, Student Affairs, Information Technologies Services, Physical Planning and Construction, Environmental Health & Safety, and Planning & Budget.

Site tours were conducted with constituent groups and members of the Advisory Group along with members of the Academic Senate Committee on Planning & Budget.

Staff met with the Academic Senate Committee on Planning & Budget to discuss the planning process, justification for the timing of the new academic building, and results of the opportunities and constraints of the sites. Meetings were held with the College 9 and College 10 Provost, the Campus Fire Marshall, College 9 and College 10 Student Governments, including members of the Student Union Association, and general staff of the area.

The planning process began with review of previous studies in order to better focus resources on examining suitable sites for these programs. These previous planning efforts were re-examined to familiarize ourselves with the identified opportunities and constraints in both the developed core and the undeveloped land to ascertain which sites were the best fit for the SS3 and classroom auditorium programs. After this first
review, a total of thirteen sites were selected for further consideration – four sites for SS3 and nine sites for the classroom auditorium.

Initial review of the thirteen proposed sites was done with a comparison matrix. Using criteria of planning, location, site capacity, environmental concerns, utilities services, access and constructability, a score was assigned to each site in each category, weighted by a factor of importance for that criterion. The lowest scoring sites were eliminated from further consideration and a total of six sites (three for SS3 and three for the Classroom Auditorium Building) were identified for further study.

The six sites were evaluated and assigned a theoretical built capacity to meet the program goals based on scale and density that fits contextually with the existing built environment. The evaluation considered the landscape character and natural setting and was consistent with the planning principles that guide physical development on the campus.

The schedule, illustrated below, identifies the tasks and milestones that culminated in this plan.

Studies of environmental factors such as geology, hydrology, and geotechnical setting, were performed on the most suitable sites to understand design or construction constraints or to identify specific conditions that would lend to significant construction cost premiums. Site density studies, looking at physical adjacencies, circulation elements, and potential future development were all discussed as important elements to consider with identifying building sites.

In addition, a preliminary cost plan was developed for several options of the building programs, which also identified cost premiums for elements specific to each site. The cost plan also includes relative off-site cost premiums (for additional circulation elements, extra infrastructure required, and parking options). A summary of the cost plan is included in the Appendix.

This Area Plan articulates the programs, planning principles and assumptions, and describes the analyses which led to the recommendation of sites. On August 30, 2010 the Chancellor approved the siting recommendations.
The 2005 Long-Range Development Plan (2005 LRDP)

The 2005 LRDP is a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the UC Santa Cruz campus. The 2005 LRDP supports UCSC’s academic, research, and public service mission while maintaining the campus’s strong traditions of environmental stewardship and sustainability. It includes a building program and land-use map to guide capital construction, infrastructure development, and land use. This Area Plan builds on the 2005 LRDP document.

The natural landscape is the formative, iconic element of the UCSC campus. The physical planning approach has carefully balanced the campus’ mission with careful stewardship of the remarkable site. The 2005 LRDP Planning Principles are intended to protect the extraordinary features and unique physical character and quality of life for the campus. This Area Plan, the process, and outcomes were all informed and guided by the principles listed on the next page.

The charge letter notes:

“The Northeast Campus Area Plan process will be guided by the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS), which will make an informed recommendation concerning future development. As this committee is charged with campus stewardship, and in consideration of the unique natural environment of our campus, extreme care must be taken in the planning and development of any future project sites and associated infrastructure.”
PLANNING PRINCIPLES

The 2005 LRDP’s Planning Principles

SUSTAINABILITY
- Maintain principles of physical development, institutional operation, and organizational efficiency that meet the needs of present users without compromising the ability of future users to meet their needs.
- Promote sustainable practices in campus development.
- Promote sustainable practices in campus operations.
- Encourage broad-based sustainability initiatives.

LAND-USE PATTERNS
- Respect the natural environment and preserve open space as much as possible
- Integrate the natural and built environment
- Maintain UCSC’s core configuration.
- Encourage sustainability and efficiency in building layouts

NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
- Respect major landscape and vegetation features
- Maintain continuity of wildlife habitats
- Design exterior landscaping to be compatible with surrounding native plant communities
- Maintain natural surface flows as much as possible

ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION
- Promote a walkable campus
- Discourage automobile use to and on the campus
- Consolidate parking facilities at perimeter campus locations

CAMPUS LIFE
- Enrich the academic experience for all students
- Offer university housing opportunities for students and employees
- Create an array of facilities that enrich the quality of campus life

THE SANTA CRUZ COMMUNITY
- Communicate and collaborate with the surrounding community
- The Santa Cruz Community - Encourage the economic health of the surrounding community
- Provide an accessible and welcoming public-service environment
Established early in the planning process were the following goals that helped guide the activities of the Advisory and Working Groups. These goals were used to help frame the outcomes and remind the participants of the importance of a comprehensive planning approach.

**AREA PLAN GOALS**

Identify & recommend a site(s) to accommodate a new Social Sciences Facility that is proximate to Social Sciences 1 & 2.

Accommodate potential Student Housing and Student Life as an integral part of development fabric.

Incorporate Student Life facility improvements and expansion around Quarry Plaza.

Identify & recommend a site to accommodate a Classroom Auditorium Building adjacent to transit and pedestrian corridors.

Identify infrastructure extensions to accommodate future needs.

Identify circulation elements to facilitate all modes of transportation.
Social Sciences Program
The program for the new Social Sciences Facility (SS3) was guided by the division’s projected growth rates and needs for its departments, based upon academic planning.

The need for the new facility was determined, in part, by the need to release existing space, relative to prior space agreements and to overcrowding of current space in Social Sciences 1 and 2. The Economics Department has been occupying 15,100 ASF of space loaned by the School of Engineering in the Engineering 2 Building, and the Education Department will be temporarily occupying space in McHenry Library upon completion of its renovation. The Psychology Department currently occupies 32,800 ASF in Social Sciences 2, and the Anthropology Department occupies 15,300 ASF in Social Sciences 1.

When the Education Department vacates Social Sciences 1 in September 2011, the 8,400 ASF of released space will be used to accommodate space needs for both Psychology and Anthropology. In addition, the Social Sciences Division Administration offices occupy 4,635 ASF in the Humanities and Social Sciences Building, which will be released to Humanities as soon as a Social Sciences Facility is available. The Education Department occupies 2,279 ASF in the Humanities and Social Sciences Building, which will be released to Humanities when the Education Department relocates to McHenry Library.

The program proposed for Social Sciences 3 is comprised of the Economics Department, Education Department, Social Sciences Dean’s Office, Social Sciences Division Administration and Organized Research Units. As the small classrooms in Social Sciences 1 and 2 are consistently heavily utilized, the building program also includes several small (30-seat) classrooms. Program elements considered, in addition to the above, were adjacency requirements, interdisciplinary opportunities, new program initiatives, distribution of all Social Sciences departments across campus, and requests from other critical.

Adjacencies and interdisciplinary opportunities
The core Social Sciences area is separated geographically from surrounding terrain by two branches of Jordan Gulch, one to the east and one to the west. It sits just north of McLaughlin Road, and north of this developed area is steep wooded terrain.

The desire to locate additional development within this core area led to detailed study of any possible “infill” sites. While it may be advantageous to locate another building immediately adjacent to the existing core, it also raised issues of density (and corresponding loss of open space), traffic, noise, and disruption of residential and instructional activities. To get a bigger picture perspective on this issue, a graphic depicting all Social Sciences departments’ space across campus was developed, showing location, department and ASF as of the Fall 2009 facilities inventory. It revealed that 61% of all Social Sciences space was outside of that core area, with 42% of the space sitting across at least one bridge.
## PROGRAM ASSUMPTIONS

### SOCIAL SCIENCES 3 BUILDING

**Draft program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>ASF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Office-Faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Office-Grad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Lab/Studio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly Activity</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offices / Administration</strong></td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Office-Faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Off-Lecturer/PostDoc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Office-TA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Office-Teach Spvr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Office-Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff offices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small (6-station)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large (45-station)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break room (shared)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Room (shared)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Class Lab - Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Class Lab (dry)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Lab Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASF</strong></td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>16,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     |         |     |       |          |     |       |        |       |       |
| **Classrooms**      |         |     |       |          |     |       |        |       |       |
|                     |         |     | 3,600 |         |     |       |        | 60% efficiency for planning purposes |
| 4 - 30-seat classrooms |     |     | 1,640 |     |     | 3,000 |       |       |
| 1 - 60-seat c/r     |         |     | 5,000 |         |     |       |       | Based on minimal growth |
|                      |         |     | 2,000 |         |     |       |       | TBD |
|                      |         |     | 42,170|         |     |       |       | Total program ASF |
|                      |         |     | 70,300|         |     |       |       | OGSF |
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Given the program guidelines provided, as described above, the programming process proceeded as follows:

- Determining growth needs and space requirements for the identified units to 2018 (two years post-occupancy);
- Once a growth factor was determined for each unit, anticipated population to 2018 was projected by department (numbers of staff, faculty, grads);
- Determining specific types of spaces needed, and numbers for each room use (how many research offices, for example, for each department);

Tables were created summarizing ASF totals by room use type, for each prospective unit to be moved.

Multiple tables were generated, corresponding to the multiple building options identified, depending upon building size, location and numbers of buildings.

The Working Group met nine times between December 2009 and June 2010.

At the suggestion of CPS, the building program was reconsidered in order to maximize use of the building site and match the building size placeholder in the Ten Year Capital Plan.

### Social Sciences 3 program

#### Population to be served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>2018 Projection</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Grads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Lec/Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORU’s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Senate faculty growth rates do not include emeriti faculty (4 in Education and 5 in Economics)
Classroom Building Planning Process
At its meetings of September 15 and October 20, 2009, while considering capital improvement priorities for the 2009-19 Capital Improvement Program, CPS stated a need for large classroom space as one of its top two priorities. This conversation occurred in the context of the planning process shifting from a Five-Year Major Capital Improve-
ment Program to a Ten-Year Capital Improvement Program, and the request was made that large classroom space be included in the then-undefined additional future years. A 15,000 ASF Classroom Auditorium Building was included in the UCSC 2009-19 Capital Financial Plan published March 2010. The recommended draft program as developed with the Classroom Subcommittee is shown in the table below.

## DRAFT 2-10-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Space Detail</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>@</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>GENERAL ASSIGNMENT CLASSROOMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Teaching Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Lecture Halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1</td>
<td>400 stations, fixed seating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2</td>
<td>600 stations, fixed seating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Discussion/Seminar Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.1</td>
<td>30 Stations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2</td>
<td>25 Stations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Support Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Conference/Proctor Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.1</td>
<td>12 Stations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.2</td>
<td>20 Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Control Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.1</td>
<td>2 Stations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Equipment Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.1</td>
<td>1 Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>Faculty Instructional Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4.1</td>
<td>Work Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4.2</td>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4.3</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5</td>
<td>Restrooms (non-assignable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6</td>
<td>Custodial (non-assignable @ 100 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.7</td>
<td>ITS Networking Room (non-assignable @ 120 SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.8</td>
<td>Recycling area (non-assignable @ 75 sf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Classroom Auditorium</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>ASF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OGSF</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROGRAM ASSUMPTIONS

In addition to the Social Sciences Facility, various site options were examined in support of the proposed Classroom Auditorium Building. Initial discussions of possible sites examined the broadest possible considerations.

- Campus planners identified 10 possible locations all across campus and considered benefits of each.
- Input from the Work Group and Advisory Group added perspective.
- The Classroom Subcommittee to CPS studied the issues as well and returned to CPS with its recommendation.

Various proposals for types and size of spaces needed were discussed, with the starting assumption being provision of one large classroom building with two 500 seat rooms and support space. A phased program of one 600-seat and one 400-seat auditorium was also studied.
Program Assumptions

- The benefits of one large auditorium versus two smaller (500 each) were considered. Classroom utilization of UCSC's existing largest classrooms consistently exceeds 115%, The largest existing classroom space can accommodate 472 students.
- The Classroom Subcommittee recommended, and the Work Group and Advisory Group concurred, that the new building should be two large classrooms at 600 and 400 seats each, which also allows the possibility of two separate buildings and phased construction.
Several earlier capacity studies informed the initial review of sites for the Social Sciences 3 facility. These previous planning efforts were reviewed in order to examine and understand identified opportunities and constraints in both the developed core and the undeveloped land.
These planning studies, listed below, and site plan excerpts from two of them, were also done to examine building sizes for campus infill sites:

- 2001 Core Capacity Study
- 2003 Student Life Facilities Feasibility
- 2004 Arts Area Plan
- 2005 Science & Engineering Area Plan
- 2005 Long-Range Development Plan
- 2008 Employee Housing Master Plan
PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS
After review from previous work, numerous sites were proposed and considered for the Social Sciences 3 Building(s) (4 sites) and the Classroom Auditorium Building(s) (10 sites). In order to focus resources efficiently, a limit to the number of sites for detailed analysis was necessary. It was crucial to determine those sites deemed to be most workable and focus our resources accordingly.

Initial review of all of the proposed sites was done with a comparison matrix. Using criteria of planning, location, site capacity, environmental concerns, utilities services, access and constructability, a score was assigned to each site in each category, weighted by a factor of importance for that criterion. The top scoring 3 sites for each building were analyzed and evaluated further.
The 1988 College 9 & 10 Master Plan set the framework for physical development in that area and followed these guidelines:

- 1988 master planning for the paired Colleges
- Two large academic buildings
- College academic support & program space
- Residence halls and student apartments
- Considered pedestrian bridge to expansion to the east

The previous studies helped to identify the three sites selected to evaluate for the Social Sciences Facility:

1) between SocSci 1 and SocSci 2,

2) all or some portion of parking lot #164 (just west of College 10 apartments), and

3) northeast campus.

The possible use of a site at Crown College, identified for East Campus Infill housing, has been eliminated and will be held as a future site for a housing project.
Review of all sites incorporated:

- potential interface of proposed Student Affairs development (student life facilities and housing);
- storm water systems in areas affected by site selection;
- developed and undeveloped open space, landscape and topography;
- opportunities for creating sustainable facilities, sustainable use and/or production of water, energy and other resources;
- pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicular circulation routes;
- parking, service and supporting operational needs for the Social Sciences Division, as well as other area users;
- existing utility, ITS, and infrastructure capacities and the demands of potential expansion;
- elevation and slope constraints;
- environmental considerations (see site analysis section)

Three sites were selected to evaluate for the Classroom Auditorium Building

1) McLaughlin, south of the Communications Building,

2) Steinhart Way (east of Kerr Hall and across from the Thimann Lecture Hall), and

3) Adjacent to Classroom Unit 1

Other sites were eliminated from further consideration for the Classroom Auditorium Building:

- Quarry site
- North Remote Parking
- Kerr Meadow site, north of Arts
- Steinhart Way, south of Earth & Marine Sciences Building
- Steinhart Way, adjacent to Core West Parking
- Porter College
- Heller Drive at the Kerr Hall Bridge
The sites studied further for the SocSci 3 building or buildings were:

1. Infill site between SocSci 1 and SocSci 2, and
2. All or some portion of parking lot #164 (just west of College 10 residence halls)
3. Northeast campus (recommended),

The fact that a bridge across the ravine between College 9 and the area north of the fire house would be necessary for any of the 3 sites (due to need for more parking spaces) was an attractive feature to many faculty, who presently slog through the mud of the ravine to get to the existing parking north of the fire house.

Details of each site evaluation are on the following pages.
Infill site between Social Sciences 1 and Social Sciences 2

Advantages:
- Consistent with LRDP land use plan
- Building within college promotes academic community
- Infill minimizes development “sprawl”
- Tree removal not extensive
- Low potential for wildlife impacts

Disadvantages:
- Further densifies an already dense development
- Small, tight site posing configuration, construction constraints
- Small site provides limited opportunity for storm water infiltration
- Would require adjacent improvements to provide adequate transit access
- Might encounter buried archaeological deposits
- Construction noise impacts to College 9 residential areas and staff, faculty and instruction
- Tree preservation may be challenging on tight site, may be difficult to preserve tree screen
- Adjacent staging likely would require use of one of few College 9 open areas

SITE #1 FINDINGS
- Can’t accommodate full program
- Has subsurface geologic issues that require expensive complex design and construction solutions and construction could undermine the footings of adjacent buildings
- Removes open area for nearby residents and could create urban density issues
SITE ANALYSIS

Parking Lot #164

Advantages:

- Consistent with LRDP land use plan
- Building within college promotes academic community
- Infill site requiring little new site work, low potential for physical environmental impacts
- No potential for wildlife, botanical, wetland impacts on site
- Minimal new access infrastructure needed
- Good adjacency to transit

Disadvantages:

- Minimizes opportunity to provide adjacent open community space due to development density
- Small, tight site w/ steep slope on one side
- Will require cut and fill, retaining wall; increase in associated construction haul traffic
- Adjacent staging likely would require use of one of few College 10 open areas
- Proximal to Jordan Gulch: storm water control challenges
- Construction noise impacts to College 10 residence halls
- Noise from Central Plant may inhibit operable windows
- Narrow N/S oriented site with tall buildings to east limits solar access
- Displaces parking that would have to be replaced elsewhere
- Potential Karst – minimal geotech info

SITE #2: FINDINGS

- Removes parking in high utilization lot
- Loss of lot would hinder University Center events
- Construction noise would be disruptive to existing uses
- CoGen Plant adjacency not compatible
- Creates pedestrian congestion and potential urban density issues
**Northeast campus**

**Advantages:**
- Larger, relatively unconstrained site provides more options for size and shape of footprint
- Provides opportunities to avoid particularly sensitive trees on site
- Opportunity to plan as element of a future complex including student life and academic facilities
- Wildland interface provides more open space opportunities
- Avoids karst, use of standard building footings can reduce construction costs

**Disadvantages:**
- Not consistent with LRDP land use plan; would require an LRDP amendment
- Requires tree removal
- Biological and possibly hydrological impacts to forest springs habitat
- Site slope poses access issues, requires extensive ADA/ped infrastructure, extension of roads
- Forest/urban interface entails greater fire hazard, would require additional fire protection

**Constructability:**
- Standard building foundation due to consistent geology
- Capacity for contractor staging on site
- Site large enough to accommodate storm water mitigations
- Construction noise/disruption can be minimized because of independent site access
- Best constructability of the three sites

**SITE 3: FINDINGS**

- Provides maximum potential for future development
- Can accommodate full program with the potential for expansion
- Has proximity to Social Sciences 1 & 2 and provides connectivity to Crown/Merrill
- New parking will be proximate to building and available for events
The sites studied further for the Classroom Auditorium Building(s), were

1 - McLaughlin, south of Communications Building,
2 - Steinhart Way, east of Kerr Hall and across from the Thimann Lecture Hall
3 - Adjacent to Classroom Unit 1
McLaughlin, south of Communications Building

Advantages:
- Consistent with LRDP land use plan
- Almost level, no extensive grading required
- Excellent adjacency, promotes walkable campus and use of transit
- Infill in heavily used area: relatively low potential for significant wildlife or botanical impacts

Disadvantages:
- Very dense development, removes buffer and landscape screen from McLaughlin
- Moderate number of large trees; would be hard to avoid roots, preserve screen
- Small site provides little flexibility in orientation
- Little room for storm water infiltration
- Would increase heavy pedestrian traffic across McLaughlin; transit delays would result

SITE #1 FINDINGS
- Too small to accommodate full program
- Has major geologic issues, creating excessive cost premiums
- Construction activities would be very disruptive to campus operations
- Would require improvements to resolve excessive pedestrian and vehicle congestion
- Removes only tree buffer between buildings north and south of McLaughlin
Steinhart Way east of Kerr Hall

Advantages:
- Consistent with LRDP land use plan
- Good adjacency, promotes walkable campus and use of transit
- Infill would be less dense than Communications site
- Potential for stormwater infiltration

Disadvantages:
- Many large trees; would be hard to avoid roots, preserve screen
- Oaks that would be removed are good potential bat and bird habitat
- Steep site would make ADA access challenging, limits space for service area and access
- Staging probably would need to use Steinhart shoulder—possible need to widen to accommodate peds and transit
- Ped access improvements would be needed along Steinhart

SITE #2 FINDINGS
- Would require major improvements to Steinhart Way for pedestrian/transit
- Has major geologic issues, creating excessive cost premiums
- Adjacency to Kerr Hall may not be compatible
- Would require extensive tree removal
Northeast Campus Area Plan

EXISTING BUILDINGS

PROPOSED BUILDINGS

Adjacent to Classroom Unit 1

Advantages:

- Consistent with LRDP land use plan
- Good opportunities for trail access and outdoor connectivity
- May provide opportunities for infiltration of stormwater runoff
- Larger undeveloped area adjacent may permit some footprint adjustment to avoid largest trees, preserve tree screen
- Good adjacency to library, other classroom building, quarry plaza

Disadvantages:

- Removal of trees required
- Moderate wildlife habitat adjacent to wildlife corridor
- Would require extensive grading in area to provide ADA access to transit and/or quarry plaza
- Transit capacity would be exceeded by two adjacent classrooms
- Pedestrian improvements needed along Steinhart

SITE #3 FINDINGS

- Can accommodate full program of a single building or phased classrooms
- Potential for dynamic outdoor gathering space development
- Potential for improved connection to the student activities core – Quarry Plaza, Upper Quarry Amphitheater, Hahn Student Services
- Consolidated classroom facilities can accommodate conferences
- Close proximity to McHenry Library and Science & Engineering Library
- Site is large enough for contractor staging

Classroom Sub-committee recommendation

Northeast Campus Area Plan
SITE ANALYSIS

Classroom Auditorium Building sites

INFRASTRUCTURE

The expansion of academic and classroom auditorium space will require the construction of additional campus utilities to serve the new buildings. In addition to the new buildings' connection to existing utility systems, utility systems will require upgrades and capacity expansion for certain development sites. To accommodate the planned facilities, sanitary sewer, natural gas, electrical service, data and telecom service, domestic and fire protection water service, and storm water systems were evaluated.
Development of the Social Sciences 3 facility will require new electrical service from the Hagar/ McLaughlin intersection switches. A new gas line would be required along Hagar Drive between Steinhart Way and McLaughlin. Storm water runoff toward the natural drainage systems will have to be carefully designed and controlled. A new service closet for data and telecommunications for the SS3 site #3 will be necessary to serve the building and potential future development in that area.
TRANSPORTATION & PARKING

Hagar, McLaughlin, and Heller Drives provide major vehicular access to campus for private vehicles, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit, campus transit, and emergency/service vehicles. Chinquapin and College Nine & Ten service roads are smaller scale roads serving specific buildings and Steinhart Way is a service/emergency vehicle only road. Steinhart Way also serves as a pedestrian and bike thoroughfare across campus.

Another major component of the vehicular circulation system is UCSC’s shuttle network, which is key in reducing student and visitor dependence on individual cars within the heart of campus. Routes are flexibly designed to also accommodate major campus events and additional shuttles are often added to serve event locations.

Parking capacity of about 60 spaces is required to support the Social Sciences 3 program.
SITE ANALYSIS

TRANSPORTATION & PARKING

Increased way-finding and expanded pedestrian and bicycle pathways are necessary for any additional buildings.

The Classroom Auditorium building could have as many as 1000 seats in two lecture halls which would be a major campus destination. It is critical that improvements to pedestrian circulation elements be included in the planning, design and construction of the new classroom.

The 600 seat lecture hall would be the largest classroom on campus and adjacency to several other classrooms, transit, and food service could prove to be a desirable conference venue.
SITE ANALYSIS

PARKING

Parking Program for Social Sciences 3:

- Place holder in Parking 10-Year Plan for 60 surface spaces for the Social Sciences 3 facility
- 2005 LRDP parking strategy-consolidated collector facilities located at the periphery of the central campus
- SS3 Program requires ~60 spaces
- Requires ADA and service parking accommodations
- Necessitates NE parking lot and pedestrian bridge access

Parking Options

A series of parking options were considered, including a 50-60 space parking lot north of the Fire Station, a parking deck in the Crown/Merril lot, a deck at the Cowell/Steven-son lot, and expansion of the East Remote lot.

A conceptual cost estimate is included for a surface lot north of the Fire Station adjacent to the SS3 site options.
Slope Studies are included to assist in determining constructability.

Classroom Auditorium sites

Social Sciences 3 sites

Northeast Campus Area Plan
Elevation Studies are included to assist in assessing circulation elements.
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SITE ANALYSIS

Classroom Auditorium sites
Social Sciences 3 sites
Existing Buildings
Proposed Buildings

Elevation Studies

Classroom Auditorium sites
Social Sciences 3 sites
Section studies for the Social Sciences 3 sites assist in identifying the relationship to existing facilities and topography.
Concept Rendered Plan

This concept is only a suggestion of the potential of development to the northeast of Social Sciences 1 & 2. It depicts a development potential of new academic facilities and a vibrant student housing complex that has direct connection to the existing developed campus.

The landscape spaces can be defined by buildings, the flanking terraces and the bridges. The landscape to the north becomes gradually more dense with redwoods, opening into a student housing complex while the landscape to the south opens into existing Colleges and pockets of sun.

The edges are strongly defined by the density of trees in the ravines and the experience of crossing the bridges.

Students and visitors, in a sense, arrive in the residential colleges, and then filter into the core for academics—adding to the learning experience and social life.

The experience of the landscape is one of contrast along pathways: light and dark, open and closed, vertical and horizontal, active and quiet and so forth.

The area is a microcosm of the campus, since it sits on a ridge between ravines.

The ravines and the bridge crossings through the trees are the genius loci of the core and should be reinforced as an experience of arrival—perhaps a bridge from parking or transit to the new facilities.
Northeast Campus Area Plan

This concept looks at two lecture halls that total an 1000 seats (a 600 seat auditorium and a 400 seat auditorium) at the Classroom Unit 1 site.

It identifies common facilities that are focused around a courtyard in a cluster of classroom facilities with close and direct connections to a vibrant heart of student life: Quarry Plaza and amphitheatre, student health care, student governments and administrative facilities, food and bookstore, with McHenry Library not far away.

This classroom hub connects to a suggestion of a sequence of student services spaces that define the heart and haven of student life, from the Cowell Student Health Center to the Bookstore and Hahn Student Services to the recreation facilities.

Support facilities, such as the central library, bookstore, health care, administration, offices, the quarry amphitheatre and food service are uniquely aligned in transitional spaces at the edges of the area and would all be linked to the new classroom complex.

Pedestrian circulation winds around and through the area, originates at transit stops and links to Science Hill over a ravine via a bridge.

This experience is a rich sequence of open and closed spaces, sun and shade, green trees and golden meadow, ridge and ravine, as well as the more intimate landscape of courts, walks, lawns, steps, ferns, flowers, buildings and bridges.

The landscape provides separation between areas and supports the academic and social structure of the campus.

Concept Rendered Plan

Conceptual site rendering showing a potential development configuration for the Classroom Auditorium facilities and future student life facilities around Quarry Plaza.
APPENDIX - COST PLAN

Preliminary conceptual costs were developed for five alternative options for the Social Sciences 3 facility and three options for the Classroom Auditorium.

Each site location includes construction budgets for the building and site specific premiums associated with geological conditions, staging and access, utility infrastructure, offsite improvements, biological and environmental mitigations, site development and improvements, parking, pedestrian bridges as required, and the Chinquapin Expansion project as required.

Alternates were provided for different parking options - an expanded at grade parking lot, a single deck of parking above at grade parking, and parking below grade and beneath the new building at the Parking Lot 164 site.

Social Sciences Building and Auditorium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GFA</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>$,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences - Alternate 1 (updated)</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences - Alternate 2 (updated)</td>
<td>72,333</td>
<td>$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences - Alternate 3</td>
<td>73,333</td>
<td>$726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences - Alternate 4</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences - Alternate 5</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 1</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>$946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 2</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALTERNATES

- Expanded parking: Add 40 additional stalls on an adjacent lot $494
- Parking deck premium: Construct single-level 55 stall parking deck $1,184
- Parking structure beneath building at Parking Lot 164 site (updated) $2,673
APPENDIX - COST PLAN

Social Sciences - Alternate 1
Social Sciences - Alternate 2
Social Sciences - Alternate 3
Social Sciences - Alternate 4
Social Sciences - Alternate 5

Auditorium - Alternate 1
Auditorium - Alternate 2
Auditorium - Alternate 3
### Overall Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences - Alternate 4</th>
<th>70,283</th>
<th>$669</th>
<th>$47,048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>$29,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast site</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>$29,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td>Geological conditions</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$1,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td>$454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td>$1,393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking expansion (55 stalls)</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiuapin Extension Infrastructure project</td>
<td>$11,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

(1) Site premiums address unique conditions that add costs based on the site location.

### ALTERNATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences - Alternate 1</th>
<th>70,283</th>
<th>$566</th>
<th>$39,771</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$29,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot 164 site</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$29,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td>Geological conditions (updated)</td>
<td>$1,886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td>$1,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td>$1,173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking expansion (95 stalls)</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

(1) Site premiums address unique conditions that add costs based on the site location.

### APPENDIX - COST PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences - Alternate 2</th>
<th>72,333</th>
<th>$617</th>
<th>$44,611</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>72,333</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$44,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot 164 site</td>
<td>25,233</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$11,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill site</td>
<td>47,100</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$19,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td>Geological conditions (updated)</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$4,059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td>$712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td>$2,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking expansion (80 stalls)</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

(1) Site premiums address unique conditions that add costs based on the site location.

### Social Sciences - Alternate 3 | 73,333 | $726 | $53,210 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>73,333</td>
<td>$726</td>
<td>$53,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill site</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$8,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast site</td>
<td>53,333</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>$22,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td>Geological conditions</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td>$1,274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$2,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td>$765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td>$2,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking expansion (55 stalls)</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiuapin Extension Infrastructure project</td>
<td>$11,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

(1) Site premiums address unique conditions that add costs based on the site location.
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### Overall Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences Building and Auditorium</th>
<th>GFA</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>$,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 1</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>$946</td>
<td>$24,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$9,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr Hall site</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>$798</td>
<td>$6,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 2</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$923</td>
<td>$23,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$676</td>
<td>$16,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr Hall site</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$676</td>
<td>$16,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium - Alternate 3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>$21,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building including base utilities</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$602</td>
<td>$15,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom site</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$602</td>
<td>$15,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site premiums (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging and access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Site premiums address unique conditions that add costs based on the site location.

---
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