

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
11/4/03	UCSC Long Range Development Plan	03055.00	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
10/30/03	LRDP Committee Meeting #1	UCSC Inn and Conf. Center	
<i>By</i>	<i>Signed</i>		
Bill MacIntosh			
<i>Present/Copies to</i>	<i>Company</i>	<i>Copies to</i>	<i>Company</i>
See below			

1. Welcome by Tom Vani, Chair LRDP Committee

2. Introduction. Each committee member is asked to note their main goal for the UCSC Long Range Development Plan (LRDP),
 - Mayor Reilly- Better ideas for cooperation between UCSC and Santa Cruz, housing, green business
 - Mardi Wormhoudt- Concern with growth impacts on city and county
 - Maggie Fusari- Protect Campus Natural Reserve while optimizing spatial use
 - Fran Owens- Resolution of new colleges and development of North Campus
 - Jean Marie Scott- Best outcome synergy to benefit UCSC and city
 - Gail Heit- Ensure appropriate size of student life facilities
 - Matt Waxman- How student experience can be enhanced
 - James Sheldon- Involvement from all members of UCSC community, including students
 - Michael Bade - Representing UCOP and the broad extent of the Regents
 - David Rinehart- Goal for UCSC people to know and better use whole campus,
 - Steve Kang- outreach and partnering with city of to enhance job opportunities, engineering school
 - Bob Miller- Establish research enterprises locally and in greater region
 - Francisco Hernandez- Need to provide higher education opportunities for California students
 - Larry Merkely - Ensure planning infrastructure is robust and adaptive
 - Patrick LeCuyer- Take into account communications infrastructure, including off-campus sites
 - Ilse Kolbus- Provide proper infrastructure and utilities to support mission with minimal impact on the environment
 - Larry Pageler- Access to and from campus
 - John Barnes- Optimize circulation to and from campus and within the campus
 - Ken Thomas - City General Plan to inform city and UCSC
 - Beau Willis- Preserve UCSC legacy and access is critical for the future
 - Meredith Michaels- Provide higher education opportunities for students in the state
 - Donna Blitzer- Opportunities of joint ventures with Santa Cruz such as housing, including community in process
 - Harriet Deck- Housing and land use

Meeting Notes

Amy Everitt- Protecting quality and character of UCSC while accommodating growth
Pamela Edwards- Finding creative solutions for transportation needs
Leslie Sunell - Concerned with all aspects of plan, especially working with the community
Christina Valentino - Coming up with an outstanding plan, good planning for implementation
Wes Scott- Access, ways to accommodate growth that avoid negative impacts
Gene Arner- Turning impacts and challenges into opportunities. Campus is part of Santa Cruz. Need seamless integration of infrastructure.
Bill MacIntosh- Listen well to concerns, optimize outcome through creative solutions
David McGregor- UCSC is a remarkable campus, do well by you
Alex Cooper- useful and beautiful outcome
Charlie Eadie- Arriving at a product people are proud of, that illustrates a vision with the community, and is practical, able to be well implemented
Liz Irwin- open and clear communications on and off-campus and in the region
Tom Vani- Education, ways to balance policies on and off campus

3. Consultant Introduction: Cooper, Robertson & Partners, Architecture and Urban Design, New York
 - a. Alex Cooper gave an overview of comparable CRP projects:
 - i. Duke Medical School- inserting new buildings in sensitive environment
 - ii. Monticello master plan- similar issues of topography, hydrology, limited opportunities on top mountain
 - iii. UCLA capacity study- found 4.5-6 million sq. ft. new space that could improve open spaces
 - iv. UNC Charlotte- How to get from 15,000 FTE to 30,000? New loop road, entrance
 - v. Yale Master Plan- Developed strategy for how to respond to surrounding neighborhoods, strengthen linkages to community
 - vi. Museum of Modern Art- Complex, multi faceted client. CRP developed agreement on a single vision for expansion plan
 - vii. Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts- Master Plan for redevelopment, consensus from 11 constituents
 - b. Campus impressions
 - i. UC Santa Cruz campus- Nothing like it
 - ii. Topography is destiny, most commanding feature to deal with
 - iii. Circulation- very complex, different typology from most campuses
 - iv. Character- complex, a long time to get to know it
 - v. Organic pattern of growth- what is logical next step for such a unique place?
 - vi. Landscape- extreme variety of compelling landscapes, trees create unique opportunities for buildings: scale, character, siting
 - vii. Architecture- phenomenal breadth of styles, variety of materials
 - viii. Residential colleges- signature element for UCSC. Pattern of individual college clusters similar to pattern of a whole typical university. Interesting implications. Scale comparison with Yale's residential colleges, more compact, urban, rectilinear
 - ix. Transport- A lot of serious issues to be with how people move about

Meeting Notes

- x. Compelling terms heard for UCSC: memorable, magic, unspoiled, medieval
- xi. UCSC campus is actually quite urbanized. Urban as a virtue: Creative congestion can be a good thing
- xii. Not a mature campus, it will evolve
- xiii. Remarkable scale- vertical- the trees, horizontal- the bay
- xiv. Paradigm still works, center surrounded by colleges. How far can it be stretched? Basic idea will still survive
- xv. Buildings can be modest construction
- xvi. Students- CRP seeking participation
- xvii. Faculty- conscience. To hear from more.
- xviii. Administration- pragmatic, know what UCSC needs to become
- xix. Staff- dedicated, their knowledge, data will be an important resource for LRDP

4. LRDP Workbook Review

- a. Overview of workbook contents. A resource document. References to web sites for other campuses. Many examples to learn from.
- b. Requirements for UC LRDP specified, format flexible, legal document
- c. LRDP is a framework. It does not site individual projects or specify implementation
- d. Goal- an easy to use document

5. Outline of Overall LRDP Process

- a. Charlie Eadie reviewed the organization of Framework for the Future process: LRDP and Strategic Futures (SF) Committees, reporting to Executive Committee and Chancellor
- b. LRDP is tool to implement academic goal of UC system. SF Committee making recommendations on enrollment, program issues. To be informed by physical process. Synthesis of each.
- c. Review of schedule, main phases. To Regents in 2006.
- d. Bill MacIntosh reviewed milestones for Phase 1 (attached). Phase 1 ends March 19, 2004 with the selection of a preferred enrollment scenario which will then be analyzed.

6. Process for LRDP Committee

- a. Committee procedure: comments by email lrdp-admin@ucsc.edu (revised)
- b. Consensus approach
- c. Work Groups proposed to address topics in more depth:
 - i. Land Use / Environment: Franz Zwart chair
 - 1. How to best site uses to minimize impacts
 - ii. Housing / Student Life: Jean Marie Scott
 - 1. Future of model for colleges
 - 2. How to reflect needs for student life
 - iii. Transportation / Circulation: Wes Scott
 - 1. How to get to campus in most gentle way possible?
 - 2. How to get around campus?
 - iv. Infrastructure / Campus Support: Ilse Kolbus
 - 1. What are existing constraints, capacity for utilities and infrastructure in assessing campus growth?
 - 2. IT will be covered in this work group
- d. Distribution of cards to express interest in committee

Meeting Notes

- e. All LRDP and SF Committee members to get white papers
- f. SFC will focus on academic, how to respond to Tidal Wave II? Will be informed by physical studies.
- g. Is there a way campus can help city: economic development, housing, access/traffic

Comments:

Bob Miller: UCSC is evolving from small liberal arts college to research university. University of Washington example of research growing faster than enrollment. 1 million square feet space rented off campus. He thinks UCSC will become major research university. Permanent high-tech jobs- they don't cycle, go away.

Mardi Wormhoudt: No work group on growth impact on community. All topics have impact. Jobs, housing, transportation balance is important- not just more jobs.

All LRDP Committee members to get all white papers. Each work group will likely have a different approach to proceeding, charrettes etc.

Emily Reilly: City/County representatives will get together off-line to understand how they can be represented in the work groups. Goal is not to be reactive, only avoiding negative outcomes, but to optimize outcome, initiatives - such as sustainable business.

Emily Reilly - How was public meeting advertised? Public feedback? Put on community TV?

Announced in the Sentinel and other places, with press release. Public meeting could be taped for broadcast. Web site that can receive comments.

Liz Irwin- Campus shares concern with care for the environment.

Tom Vani- UCSC to coordinate with city on ways to get public input. UCSC will also have other public events, campus workshops. We expect a lot of outreach in addition to what we state here

Matt Waxman- Can 2 students each be on 2 committees?

Tom Vani- Yes. Looking for grad student rep. too.

Steve Kang- What is City timeline for master plan?

Meeting Notes

Gene Arner- Full schedule is not laid out, but generally in parallel with UCSC LRDP. Decision making structure will be different. Procedures and processes to inform each other. Possible presentation by City on history of development, capacity, opportunity for university generated business.

Alex Cooper- What has changed since 1988? External and internal environment? Job movement. Regulatory environment. Financing. To do baseline document. Not just more of the same.

City study will be ready in January, comparing 1990 to now.

7. Discussion of current LRDP, Charlie Eadie
 - a. 15,000 Full time equivalent (FTE) by 2005. We are just about there.
 - b. Plan allowed for flexible implementation, has worked well
 - c. Conservation measures largely worked well.
 - d. Growth did occur as more colleges.
 - e. Academic goals largely fulfilled as anticipated.
 - f. Move into North Campus not realized- no loop road or additional access roads
 - g. More infill, density.
 - h. Environmental policy has evolved.
 - i. UCSC more regional and community based: Long Marine Lab, other initiatives
 - j. Goals for housing (70%) difficult to achieve: costs for on-campus, off-campus student preference.
 - k. Now looking at a lot of the same topic areas- we know more about them, what works and doesn't. Also good working relationship. Not starting from scratch, an update.
8. Next Steps
 - a. Next LRDP committee meeting confirmed for 11/24. Time to be determined.
 - b. Materials to be distributed in advance.
 - c. Homework? Read workbook, chairs of work groups to organize meetings.

End.

Committee Members Present

Tom Vani, Chair

Emily Reilly

Mardi Wormhoudt

Gene Arner

Michael Bade (for Jack Zimmermann)

Donna Blitzer

Harriet Deck

Charlie Eadie

Pamela Edwards

Robert Miller

Fran Owens

Christina Valentino

David Rinehart

Jean Marie Scott

Wes Scott

James Sheldon

Leslie Sunell

Meredith Michaels

Meeting Notes

Amy Everitt

Matt Waxman

Maggie Fusari

J. A. (Beau) Willis

Gail Heit

Larry Merkely

Francisco Hernandez

Ilse Kolbus

Liz Irwin

Steve Kang

Members not Present

Wlad Godzich

Frank Zwart

Gary Griggs

Jack Zimmermann

Consultants

Alex Cooper, Cooper, Robertson & Partners

Bill MacIntosh, CRP

David McGregor, CRP

Staff Present

Larry Pageler

Dean Fitch

John Barnes

Patrick LeCuyer

Ken Thomas (city planner)