



## Capital Project Approval for Off-Campus Leasing

UC often leases off-campus property from another party (Landlord). Typically, the Landlord makes tenant improvements to the leased premises for the University’s use and is generally responsible for design (subject to tenant approval), construction contracting and project oversight, and “owns” the improvements. The Landlord may also perform seismic retrofit and/or accessibility work per UC requirements. The Landlord is compensated for these improvements from base rent (rent may include \$/sf allowance for improvements), additional rent and/or Tenant lump sum payment (to cover tenant improvement costs exceeding the allowance). Regardless of how the Landlord is compensated, Landlord-delivered improvements do not require capital project approval. However, if UC installs its own furniture systems, data/telecom systems, or constructs the improvement project, that work becomes a UC capital project, and budget and design/CEQA approvals are required. Generally, when the Landlord is responsible for design and construction, the local code authority is responsible for plan check and inspection. When UC manages design and construction for leased space, the Campus Fire Marshal, Division of the State Architect, and the campus’ Building Official are responsible for plan checking and inspection.

*Catherine Kniazewycz @ Gordon Schanck*



## Major Capital Projects Database

Working sessions for the new Capital Projects Database introduced all campuses to the database in early April. Campuses were able to view their project data online with real-time guidance by phone, demonstrating how to enter and update data on the new system. Campuses now can enter Chancellor-approved projects, and update all active projects including the State Quarterly Reports (SQRs) for 3rd quarter 2012-13, and will use the system for the annual Major Capital Report data in this summer. Campuses provided valuable feedback on this initial roll-out.

UCOP Capital Planning Staff loaded budget, funding and schedule data on existing active state and non-state projects for the campuses. We continue to work with campuses to verify active project data. Congratulations and thank you to campuses completing the SQR effort on the new database, and for their valuable suggestions and input!

*Trish Dolan, Linneth Cox, Brian Ross, Alix Wills*

## CPI and Integrated Project Delivery



This year, Capital Programs Institute (CPI) is focusing on emerging construction delivery methods. We started last fall with a primer on Integrated Project Delivery (IPD). This spring, CPI convened panels of UC leaders discussing Lean

Project Principles and Design Build contracts. CPI will build on these sessions and provide additional seminars on Building Information Modeling (BIM), Prequalification, and advanced IPD. Look for announcements in future Dialogue issues for event dates. Additionally, the [CPI website](#) now includes event topics, agendas, and dates; registration; and maps and directions. Past events are on the same website. Handouts from past events are available upon request. If you have ideas for training and events you’d like us to focus on, please contact Chris Hornbeck.

*Chris Hornbeck*

## California Higher Education Sustainability Conference – Register Now !

Registration for the annual California Higher Education Sustainability Conference (CHESC) is now available. CHESC highlights cutting-edge research, as well as case studies with proven successes in curriculum development, operational programs, and community partnerships. This unique event is jointly organized by independent/private colleges, California Community Colleges, California State Universities, and the University of California creating the opportunity for dialogue across institutions. This year the conference will take place from June 23rd to 27th on the beautiful UC Santa Barbara campus.

*Rashmi Sahai*

<http://www.cahigheredusustainability.org/>

## Prevailing Wage and Renewable Energy Projects

The definition of “public works” and prevailing wage requirements for renewable energy projects were expanded under SB 136 (effective on 1/1/2013 per California Labor Code Section 1720.6). Specifically, any construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under private contract that satisfies the following conditions will be subject to prevailing wage rates: (a) the work is performed in connection



with the construction or maintenance of renewable energy generating capacity or energy efficiency improvements; and (b) the work is performed on the property of the state or a political subdivision of the state; and (c) either: (1) more than 50% of the energy generated is purchased or will be purchased by the state or a political subdivision of the state; or (2) the energy efficiency improvements are primarily intended to reduce energy costs that would otherwise be incurred by the state or a political subdivision of the state. Accordingly, all renewable energy and energy efficiency projects on Regents’ property require payment of Prevailing Wage (PW). See **Volume 5, Chapter 14, section 14.2.1** of the Facilities Manual. For further questions regarding PW please consult your campus construction counsel or Chris Hornbeck at OP Construction Services.

*Chris Hornbeck*

### KEY DATES

MAY

22

RIVERSIDE



UC Construction and the Law

29

OAKLAND  
MARIOTT



UC Construction and the Law

29

RIVERSIDE



ASHRAE Level 1 Energy Auditing

JUNE

4

UCSF



ASHRAE Level 1 Energy Auditing

JULY

16-18

REGENTS MEETING

UCSF  
MISSION BAY

## Building Code Effective Date

Per the long-standing agreement between UC and the Office of the State Fire Marshal, and general practice, the applicable version of the building code to a project is the one which is in effect when the first submittal for review is received by the Campus Fire Marshal. This may occur at the end of schematic design. Similarly, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) determines the effective code date based on the date it first receives an application for review. Campuses should decide early in the project when submittals will occur, and coordinate submittals so all aspects of the project are subject to only one version of the building code.

## Mass Notification



The Clery Act requires institutions of higher education to develop and institute an emergency response and notification policy, as part of broader requirements. Colleges and universities are required to inform their campus communities about any “significant emergency or dangerous situation involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees occurring on the campus.” A range of emergencies (e.g., a fire, severe weather, infectious disease outbreak, etc.) is covered by this requirement. The 2010 NFPA 72 code included new requirements and standards for Emergency Communications Systems, also known as Mass Notification Systems. 2013 NFPA 72, which California is

adopting, has additional requirements. Mass notification is required both inside buildings and outside, typically uses several modalities, and is complicated and evolving. The Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for mass notification is the Campus Fire Marshal (CFM), as NFPA 72 is a fire alarm code. If you have questions about mass notification, please contact your CFM.

Jon Kapis, an expert on mass notification from Rolf Jensen & Associates, has advised UC Merced on implementation of mass notification into projects, and has written an article in *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* in 2010 with background and overview of the subject.

<http://www.csemag.com/single-article/higher-education-higher-protection/46de52ac4c2fa701ff5c9b07151625fo.html>

*Catherine Kniazewycz*



## CODE CORNER

### DSA Fee Increases

The Division of the State Architect (DSA) announced on May 3, 2013 that fees for Access Compliance review will increase beginning June 1, 2013. The California Building Standards Commission approved the fee increase on April 24. The new fees are calculated as 0.5% on the first \$500,000 of construction cost (was 0.4%) plus 0.25% on the next \$1,500,000 (was 0.2%) plus 0.1% on costs above \$2,000,000 (was 0.02% [500% increase]) Access review for a \$5,000,000 project was \$5,600, but will now be \$9,250.

[http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/bulletins/BU\\_13-01\\_05-03-13.pdf](http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/dsa/bulletins/BU_13-01_05-03-13.pdf)