

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
12/23/03	UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan	03055.00	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
12/19/03	LRDP Committee Meeting #3	Bay Tree Building	
<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

A new work group is being formed, University and the Community. Members will be announced at the next meeting.

2. Introduction of committee members and participants

3. Presentation and discussion of Work Group draft white papers

The chairs of each work group presented a summary of findings from their white papers. Draft copies of the four white papers were distributed.

a. Land Use and Environment, Frank Zwart

- i. First looking at 1988 LRDP
- ii. Analyzing and illustrating existing conditions: land use areas and environmental conditions.
- iii. Will develop map for what works and what doesn't on the existing campus.
- iv. Some of the key physical issues: prioritization of development sites, express and detail existing characteristics, sustainability
- v. Key programmatic and qualitative issues: make tangible the explicit character of UCSC, importance of qualitative analysis, development of evaluation criteria for environmental constraints, on/off campus siting, alternative layouts
- vi. Other important considerations: place making, maintaining original vision, future of the colleges, clarifying land use designations.
- vii. Need to address values, qualitative issues as well as quantitative for land use.
- viii. 1963 LRDP- some elements dropped: vertical tower element. Need to decide what to keep.

b. Housing and Student Life, Jean Marie Scott

Meeting Notes

- i. How to frame questions on housing and student life? Will take some time in January to define how to do some focus groups with students to see if questions being asked are the right ones and get input.
- ii. Work group will coordinate with the Strategic Futures Committee
- iii. Goal to get efficient recommendations together for LRDP
- iv. Intersection of campus and city housing goals. Fabric of housing for total community.
- v. Colleges: future role. How does this relate to housing? Consider possible graduate college.
- vi. Issues, challenges and possible considerations: Adequate demand must be substantiated to produce campus housing. Transportation.
- vii. Housing plan to be sustainable and attainable
- viii. Opportunities for joint efforts in housing with the city
- ix. Student life: space in the colleges and on the campus
- x. Key physical issues: Limited space for expansion of athletic fields, cost of developing north campus
- xi. Issues, challenges and possible considerations: How to project space needs for student life based on enrollment? Funding implications. How to project space for community use?
- xii. Will present graphic material at January LRDP Committee meeting.

c. Transportation and Circulation, Wes Scott

- i. Six different ways to look at campus transportation: travel demand management, parking, traffic and access, transit, pedestrians, bicycles.
- ii. TSM transit system management, TDM: travel demand management
- iii. 1988 LRDP EIR called for 40% mode split. Actual current mode split is much better, about 56% of people come to campus other than in single occupancy vehicles.
- iv. Currently well within the number of trips projected in 1988 LRDP.
- v. Campus population is primarily in Santa Cruz, tracked by GIS
- vi. Parking has increased only 500 spaces since 1988, not 3,400 spaces allowed under 1988 LRDP
- vii. Parking is very expensive to create on campus. Large lot can cost \$8000/space. Structures \$24,000/space.
- viii. Concern that increased parking may increase traffic. Opening west garage did not have this effect.
- ix. Shuttle fleet is second largest transit system in the county. Fleet has increased and uses alternative fuels
- x. Students support fee increase to support increased transit routes
- xi. Pedestrian bridges, one added since 1988
- xii. Bicycle carriers added to shuttles.

Meeting Notes

- xiii. TAPS has been able to work with campus growth with no substantial parking growth by active management.
- xiv. Customer satisfaction for parking and transportation will be taken into account in developing LRDP.

d. Infrastructure and Technology, Ilse Kolbus

- i. Issues highlighted in 1988 LRDP energy and utilities; water and sewer; storm drainage; waste
- ii. Mitigation measures proposed for each. Revolved around conservation.
- iii. Existing conditions. Not much has changed. Cogeneration is now down from 80 to 33% of need. Looking for new energy sources.
- iv. Conservation. New monitoring ability to track energy use.
- v. UCSC has maintained policy of having no air conditioning for comfort in buildings
- vi. UCSC has one of the lowest energy consumptions in the UC system.
- vii. Electrical power is unreliable, with blackouts. Important to address this as campus grows.
- viii. Campus growth has been 52% since 1988, but water use has grown only 3.5% in this period.
- ix. UCSC uses about ½ million gallons per day, compared to 2 million gallons permitted in agreement with city.
- x. Waste reduction: LRDP 20% target, now at 27% (from residential) Over 50% considering construction waste.
- xi. Landfill capacity 35 years UCSC to continue to do part in reducing waste stream.
- xii. Network and communications: not big issue in 1988.
- xiii. Key Issues: Infrastructure improvement and funding; support space; sustainability; topography- north campus; environmental constraints.
- xiv. Possible approaches: Issue specific- focus on minimizing impacts, conservation
Overall approach to planning for UCSC as a sustainable community.

e. Discussion

- i. Committee to read white papers and forward any comments to LRDP-ADMIN@ucsc.edu.
- ii. David McGregor of CRP noted that campus infrastructure and transportation may have already "picked the low hanging fruit" with their strategies for accommodating growth to date.
- iii. What is the status of Eastern Access? Tom Vani and Charlie Eadie provided background. Pogonip was purchased by the City from the Cowell Foundation. It is now a city park. UCSC has agreed not to pursue unilaterally an Eastern Access for the 2005-2020 LRDP.
- iv. Student transit ridership has increased by 38%. How has this compared to campus growth as a whole? Wes Scott and Larry Pageler replied that student ridership is up

Meeting Notes

- to Metro capacity at peak times but have dropped somewhat at other times. Students also use alternative means to access campus: bikes, car pools.
- v. Andy Schiffrin noted that parking off campus was not mentioned. Wes Scott replied that this is very much being considered. Where and how UCSC makes off campus investment will be important, including possible long term car storage for students. Off campus parking impacts from recent student growth have been mitigated since 2,200 new beds have been added on campus.
 - vi. Metro bus system is now at capacity given fleet size and hours of service. Service has been cut back in response to falling sales tax funding. How to get more rides out of the same number of buses?
 - vii. How has the city's Master Transportation Study addressed UCSC? There is a proposal for an increase in service to the campus, but no description how this will be funded. Transit is a county wide issue; Metro is not a city authority.
 - viii. Parking increase is linked to parking viability. It is expensive to build.
 - ix. Wes noted that available funding needs to address all 6 modes of transit and satisfy multiple constituents. The 1988 LRDP was brief and elegant. Perhaps it is only necessary to adjust a few formulas. Refer to TAPS annual report.

4. Report from Strategic Futures Committee by Gary Griggs

- a) Strategic Futures Committee (SFC) is organized in 4 sub committees: 1. goals for academic and research 2. implications of California pop demographics 3. academic program aspirations 4. land use implications of research
- b) Work for SFC will be on-going, during the LRDP process.
- c) SFC has identified four enrollment scenarios to be considered in the analysis, described in a handout. These have not been endorsed nor recommended. They are not alternatives; the final enrollment level selected may be different. All scenarios are for on campus enrollment and do not include off campus enrollment.
- d) Scenario 1: No growth. 15,000 FTE On campus undergraduate and graduate to match the 1988 LRDP. Consensus on need to attain 15% graduate enrollment means this scenario reduces undergraduate enrollment.
- e) Scenario 2: Base scenario 17,000 FTE. This holds the undergraduate enrollment at the 1988 LRDP level and grows graduate enrollment to 15% of on-campus total. This scenario does not address future demand.
- f) Scenario 3: Moderate growth. 21,000 FTE. Undergraduate enrollment up 26%. Graduate enrollment at 15%.
- g) Scenario 4: Respond to state demographics 25,000 FTE. Reasonable projections show UCSC share of undergraduate students to be 22-23,000 FTE undergraduates by 2015.
- h) Scenario numbers for LRDP Committee and consultants to consider. SFC believes a wide range of scenarios should be studied as part of the process.
- i) David McGregor, CRP, noted the goal is to come to preferred enrollment by mid to end of March. CRP to work with Fran Owens of UCSC Office of Capital Planning and Space

Meeting Notes

Management plus other staff and SFC to develop areas for these, then show physically what this means.

5. Questions and Comments

- a) Karen Holl noted that demographics show student population peaking in 2013. What about afterwards? Are we planning appropriately? SFC representatives noted projections are more difficult farther out, but they are using a full envelope, low to high and trying to look to 2020. The retention rate is apparently going up, students are staying longer and some students who have left are returning. Michael Bade of UC Office of the President noted actual enrollments have been running ahead of most optimistic projections.
- b) Bob Miller noted that in the knowledge-based economy, three factors were driving demand for a college education: demographics, retention, participation.
- c) Will summer session enrollment be accounted for? Peggy Delaney replied that the scenarios are for non-summer enrollment for three sessions. The effects of summer enrollment and off campus enrollment will also be considered in the LRDP.
- d) Emily Reilly asked who determines the formula for how UC campuses share enrollment. Meredith Michaels responded that there is no set formula per se. It is part art and part science, based both on demographic need and the capacity of each campus. The enrollment is the result of an iterative dialog between each campus and UCOP.
- e) Emily Reilly asked when do we have to raise fees and effectively limit enrollment that way? Meredith Michaels replied that there is likely a connection between enrollment and a price point, but this point is not known. Past fee increases have not seen an enrollment decrease. There is a robust financial aid program.
- f) Andy Schiffrin noted that many other UC campuses are in counties with much larger populations and a less constrained environment. UCSC and UCSB are very constrained.
- g) Gary Griggs noted there may be an effective limit to how many students the campus can accommodate. The Strategic Futures Committee's (SFC) assessment of academic need will also be informed by the physical planning in an iterative process.
- h) Meredith Michaels noted UCSC is the slowest growing UC campus and the smallest.
- i) Will the SFC address the role of the colleges? This impacts housing, student life and land use. Gary Griggs said the vision subcommittee of SFC will address aspects of the colleges. For planning purposes, CRP will assume the make up of future colleges is similar to existing until this is confirmed or revised.
- j) Are academic goals being developed with input from sources other than the deans? Gary Griggs responded that graduate students have been invited. No response yet. SFC is open to suggestions.
- k) Steve Kang noted new means of instruction using networking and asynchronous learning need to be factored into the planning, rather than straight lining the current approach.

Meeting Notes

- l) Andy Schiffrin believes that 25,000 FTE would have horrendous impacts on the community, and that even considering this number is problematic from a community perspective. He was involved in the last LRDP and believes the community thought 15,000 FTE was a cap.
- m) Liz Irwin replied that the new work group, University and Community, will be a forum for addressing these concerns. The work group is to be formed by January 20. It will be co-chaired by a senior administrator of UCSC and a senior community administrator. It will interface with all the other work groups.
- n) Andy ___ asked if LRDP Committee Meetings are open to the public. Tom Vani noted they are intended to be closed meetings with periodic public meetings.

6. Public Comments

- a) Charlie Eadie noted about a dozen comments have been received to date. These have been forwarded to the heads of the work groups and to the consultants, with a response returned to the sender noting that the comment has been recorded and forwarded.
- b) Many comments had to do with the camper park.
- c) The web site is hosted by the Office of Physical Planning and Construction. The capacity will continue to grow. An interactive element is desired. Liz Irwin noted that the SFC letter will be posted on the home page with the enrollment scenarios.

7. Next steps

- a. LRDP Committee meeting January 20. The SFC is invited to attend. The Agenda will include:
 - b. CRP campus analysis, quantification of program for scenarios, submittal of final white papers, draft principles.
 - c. CRP distributed and reviewed the proposed categories of planning principles to be developed with who would draft them.

Meeting Notes

[ATTENDEES TO BE REVISED BASED ON SIGN-IN SHEET]

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Pamela Edwards
Emily Reilly
Andy Schiffrin for Mardi Wormhoudt
Maggie Fusari
Amy Everitt
Harriet Deck
Liz Irwin
Michael Bade for Jack Zimmermann
Gene Arner
Larry Merkley
Charlie Eadie
Gary Griggs
Leslie Sunell
Dario Caloss for Wlad Godzich
Francisco Hernandez
Donna Blitzer
Ilse Kolbus
Gary Glatzmaier
Robert Miller
James Sheldon
David Rinehart
Jean Marie Scott
Wes Scott
Christina Valentino
Carl Walsh
Matt Waxman
Frank Zwart
Peggy Delany
Fran Owens
Steve Kang
Meredith Michaels
Michael Bolte
Karen Holl

Members not present:

Beau Willis
Gail Heit

Guests:

Ken Thomas
Violette Bellieau

Staff present:

John Barnes
Teresa Buika
Dean Fitch
Galen Jarvinen
Larry Pageler

Consultants present:

David McGregor,
Bill MacIntosh,
Marcia Tobin, EDAW