

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
3/6/04	UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan	03055.00	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
2/26/04	LRDP Committee Meeting #5	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. Introduction

- a. Welcome by Tom Vani, Chair LRDP Committee
- b. Report from Campus and Community Work Group
 - i. Main tasks: to define carrying capacity of community, and to inform the LRDP process
 - ii. Mardi Wormhoudt has done a first draft of the group's white paper.
 - iii. Will be discussing housing at upcoming meeting. Want to find opportunities for constructive collaboration. The group is struggling to understand the university's needs. Sustainability is an important consideration. It is important to maintain special character of Santa Cruz.
- c. Project status and schedule
 - i. John Barnes gave an overview of the LRDP process and schedule. There are four phases. Phase 1 ends March with the recommendation of a preferred enrollment. Phase 2 extends from March - June and includes development of plan options and selection of a preferred plan approach. Phase 3 extends from June to December and entails writing the LRDP 2005-2020 document, ending with a final draft, to be studied in the Environmental Impact Report, phase 4, which will last 12-15 months.
 - ii. The UCSC home page has LRDP link for information and comments on the process.
 - iii. Question: When will drawings be posted to this web site? Response: Once they have been seen by the Committee and presented to the public.
 - iv. Question: Can a hard copy be provided for library the downtown. Response: will consider.

2. Update on Draft Statement of Principles

Meeting Notes

- a. Gary Griggs gave an overview of academic and research principles and the Strategic Futures Committee, which is nearing the end of its work.
- b. SFC has four subcommittees. 1. The vision group. This reaffirms UCSC as a research university 2. Demographic/student demand work group is looking at past trends and future projected demographic need. GG believes this is the largest driver. 3. The academic work group and research work group are looking at past 10-year academic plans. Nearly every department would like to grow, to meet teaching needs and aspirations, new programs.
- c. SFC is not developing an academic plan but an envelope and principles. SFC expects to meet jointly with the LRDP Committee March 19 with a draft report and an enrollment scenario. The enrollment level selected will probably change, but will be best estimate.
- d. John Barnes read the draft principles for physical planning: land and use and environment. The Land use and environment work group wants to continue to refine these.
- e. Question: Will the LRDP define sustainability? Recommended. Response: We will try to.
- f. Larry Pageler reviewed the draft physical planning principles for transportation and circulation.
- g. Ilse Kolbus read the draft physical planning principles for infrastructure and technology. Sustainability is an integral part of these.
- h. Question: Does fire control ever factor into an LRDP? Response: UCSC is aware of this as an issue, especially for development to the north, and still grappling with it. Emily Reilly suggests collaboration with local fire departments. This could be more than mutual aid agreement but an opportunity to integrate thinking, and response with similar radios, etc. This may be hard to do, but something worth talking about. Chaparral in north campus is noted as a fire hazard.
- i. Gail Heit read the draft physical planning principles for housing and student life. The principles include a recommendation to study 50% on-campus undergraduate housing.
- j. Question: Does this mean UCSC is backing off the 70% goal? Response: 50% is for study purposes. More students might be housed on and off-campus in facilities, such as the UCSC Inn and the village.
- k. How does the Science Hill master plan coordinate with the LRDP? Is this redundant? Response: This study is just starting and addresses more immediate needs in more detail than the LRDP. The two studies will be coordinated. It is being done by Anshen & Allen-LA.

3. Analysis of Campus Land

- a. CRP showed an updated analysis of land available that is suitable for development. Land use areas from the 1988 LRDP were used as a basis. Campus Resource Land plus areas allowed for development were considered.

Meeting Notes

- b. Land unsuitable for building was eliminated from this, based on filters of topography, geology, hydrology and wildlife and biology constraints.
- c. Slopes 20% or steeper will be avoided in current design studies if at all possible. These sites are more expensive to develop and can contribute to erosion.
- d. Sink holes, seeps, springs, creeks and other geological and hydrological constraints in the current UCSC GIS database have been sited and avoided.
- e. EDAW has met with consultants of previous biological studies and is updating the GIS data.
- f. Special-status species on the campus that may constitute a high environmental constraint include the California red-legged frog and Ohlone tiger beetle (both federally listed species) and maritime chaparral in the north campus (California habitat of special concern).
- g. The resulting buildable land is approximately 894 acres. The pattern is scattered, using unchanged 1988 land use boundaries.
- h. The analysis of buildable land will continue to evolve based on any updated environmental and land use considerations.

4. Program assumptions for enrollment scenarios

- a. For buildings in the core area, the preliminary program assumes 100% CPEC, new division space adjacent to existing, Organized Research space located all on campus, with division, at about 50% growth.
- b. If existing Social Science 1 and 2 are considered core academic buildings, the ratio of core to college I&R space is 88% to 12%.
- c. Program area without housing grows 50% in scenario 1, 74% in 2, 112% in 3 and 150% in 4.
- d. Existing campus population (students, faculty, and staff) is about 18,140. Projected campus population grows 2% in scenario 1 (18,650), 17% in 2 (21,200), 44% in 3 (26,200), and 72% in 4 (31,150).
- e. For current preliminary analysis, CRP is using 50% on-campus housing for undergraduates and graduates, 25% for faculty, and 1.6% for staff (to match existing).
- f. These would result in the following number of additional beds needed on-campus and off-campus: scenario 1: 1,465/-100; scenario 2: 2,465/ 0; scenario 3: 4,465/2,000; scenario 4: 6,465/4,000. Currently there are 5,991 beds on campus and about 8,500 beds off-campus. This will change when infill apartment projects now under construction are completed.
- g. Assumptions for new undergraduate housing: campus will grow by colleges, size of colleges to be increased up to about 1,500 students (affiliated), new colleges located in pairs, no classroom or faculty offices in new colleges. No new undergraduate colleges in scenario 1 and 2. Two new colleges in scenario 3. Four new colleges in scenario 4.
- h. Some scenarios will include a new graduate college.

Meeting Notes

- i. Current parking: 4,800 car spaces. 1988: 4,513 spaces. Allowed under 1988 LRDP: 8,400 spaces. Projected parking to be based on actual utilization, adjusted to meet demand for remote lots.
- j. Projected parking for scenario 1: 5,450 spaces, 2: 6,750; 3: 7,900 4: 9,400 (pending consideration of possible traffic mitigation measures).
- k. Comment: Need to consider impacts of parking on adjacent areas
- l. Comment: Need to consider multiplier effect of students living off-campus on the community.

5. Preliminary campus studies

- a. Alex Cooper presented preliminary studies of the four enrollment scenarios. The focus is on assessing fit, to inform the Strategic Futures Committee in their process. These are a first test and will change to account for a broad range of additional considerations going forward.
- b. These tests try to maintain the paradigm of the core with surrounding colleges, maintaining the 1988 LRDP land use boundaries, and focusing on connections.
- c. Natural open space will be maintained to the greatest extent possible.
- d. The definition of the core is transforming to include areas with both college and academic functions at the periphery, such as the Social Science buildings and humanities.
- e. A north-south spine of pedestrian circulation from engineering to the arts area can be an opportunity to connect the campus and frame development in this area. East west connections with additional bridges will be important as the campus grows.
- f. Existing academic districts were diagrammed. These will need to reflect interdisciplinary opportunities also in the future.
- g. A north loop road will be needed to support growth. Meyer drive should be extended to Hagar. This will allow McLaughlin to become more pedestrianized. Depressing McLaughlin to allow a pedestrian overpass would strengthen this connection and allow better shuttle flow, if viable.
- h. Select buildings identified by UCSC as redevelopment (tear down) sites were reviewed. They either represent opportunities for more density or upgraded facilities. Given cost implications, tear-downs will only be pursued in scenarios where greater growth requires this.
- i. Studies for development of the core area were reviewed. They add 1.2 million gross square feet for scenario 1; 1.7 million gsf in scenario 2; 2.58 million gsf in scenario 3; and 3.4 million gsf in scenario 4. The preliminary studies locate buildings in the existing core area, including next to Social Sciences 1 and 2. Tear downs are limited to selected temporary buildings in the physical plant area.
- j. The preliminary studies show how the program could be accommodated with significant added density for larger enrollment. The studies will evolve and will need to account

Meeting Notes

for access, close-in parking, service, local geological, storm water and landscape considerations.

- k. Question: Do you have a comprehensive plan that shows both the core and housing?
Response: Not at this time. This will be shown at the next meeting.
- l. CRP showed preliminary studies for on-campus housing for 50% undergraduates and graduates, 25% faculty and 1.6% staff. The housing fits based on this preliminary assessment.
- m. Question: Is there space for more housing than 50% of undergraduates on-campus? If so, students may not want to live there? Response: Yes, there appears to be space. Student demand was studied in an earlier report. Cost of housing is a big factor, plus a preference of older students to be off-campus. But if demand did exist, UCSC could look to site more housing on-campus.

6. Transportation and traffic considerations

- a. Jim Daisa of Kimley-Horn Associates (KHA) presented an overview of preliminary off-campus traffic considerations.
- b. The campus currently generates about 25,000 trips per day, with 1.7 vehicle trips per student. UCSC compares favorably to other universities around the country which range from 2.03 to 3.31 trips per student.
- c. Base on projecting current conditions (pre-mitigation, 44% on-campus undergraduate housing) daily trips for the enrollment scenarios range from similar to today in scenario 1 to 17,000 more daily trips in scenario 4. Trips will be less than this additional student housing on-campus.
- d. Current travel mode share is about 40% single occupancy vehicle, 40% carpool and 20% transit. It will be challenging to improve this mix significantly.
- e. Map of intersections near the campus showed most major signalized intersections near the campus operating below capacity, (based on traffic engineering standards, level of service F is considered unacceptable).
- f. Now 44% of cars from campus travel external to the city, with 56% internal to Santa Cruz. The AMBAG traffic model used by KHA for the city Master Transportation Study projects by 2020 this mix will be 10% to the east side, 38% to the west side and 52% external to Santa Cruz.
- g. Traffic mitigation typically can take 2 forms: 1. reducing traffic demand during peaks and 2. Engineering solutions at roads and intersections to accommodate demand.
- h. Mitigation of demand can include considering travel demand management (expand vanpool, car share program, housing/workforce planning, change in class scheduling or work hours), parking management (off-campus park and ride and/or car storage facilities, campus parking cap, fees) and improved transit.
- i. Question: Does on-campus housing create trips to and from the campus also? Answer: Yes, but often in off-peak hours for shopping.

Meeting Notes

- j. Comment: The plan should consider bicycle circulation, particularly in relation to the north-south pedestrian spine in the core.

7. Next steps

- a. LRDP Committee Meeting #6, Friday March 19, 8:30 - 11:00 AM , Bay Tree Conf. Rm.
Joint meeting with SFC.

Meeting Notes

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Gene Arner
Tamara Belknap
Mike Bolte
Donna Blitzer
Harriet Deck
Peggy Delany
Pamela Edwards
Maggie Fusari
Gary Griggs
Gail Heit
Karen Holl
Francisco Hernandez
Liz Irwin
Ilse Kolbus
Larry Merkley
Meredith Michaels
Robert Miller
Fran Owens
Mary O'Keefe for Jack Zimmermann
Larry Pageler
Emily Reilly
Mardi Wormhoudt
David Rinehart
Frank Zwart
Jean Marie Scott
Wes Scott
Ron Suduiko
Christina Valentino
Carl Walsh
Matt Waxman

Members not present

Jack Zimmermann
James Sheldon
Gary Glatzmaier
Michael Bade
Leslie Sunell
Wlad Godzich
Amy Everitt
Bill Hyder
Steve Kang

Staff present:

John Barnes
Teresa Buika
Dean Fitch
Larry Pageler
Galen Jarvinen
Ken Thomas, City Planning

Consultants present:

Alex Cooper
Bill MacIntosh
Jim Daisa
Jacinta McCann
Marcia Tobin