

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
5/21/04	UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan	03055.02	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
5/18/04	LRDP Committee Meeting #8, with Strategic Futures Committee	UCSC Inn and Conference Ctr	
<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. Overview of LRDP Process, Bill MacIntosh
 - i. Goal for this meeting is to identify elements of each option considered promising and those that should not be considered any further.
 - ii. Goal for next meeting on June 17 is to select preferred LRDP approach for land use, circulation, infrastructure. Will have preliminary cost assessment. This is likely to be a blend of elements from the options.
 - iii. LRDP to be developed over summer and fall. Mitigation strategies to be developed in 2004 and during EIR in 2005.
 - iv. Summary of recent outreach on and off-campus. CRP presented last week to Executive Committee of Academic Senate, Student Union Assembly, Student Forum and conducted work sessions with Land Use and Environment Work Group, Housing and Student Life representatives, TAC/TOC Committee, Physical plant staff. Gary Lawrence of Arup met to review goals for sustainability with campus and city and county representatives.
- c. Report on Student Involvement. Matt Waxman
 - i. Mat Waxman has been hosting weekly LRDP student meetings and summarized some issues from these.
 - ii. Generally these have gone very well. Some students concerned that they have not had enough input.
 - iii. The Student Union Assembly and Graduate Student Association have been included.
 - iv. Some students have noted how their input has been reflected in the plan.
- d. Report from Strategic Futures Committee. Gary Griggs
 - i. The interim Strategic Futures Report is complete and posted on the website.

Meeting Notes

- ii. Gary thanked the members of the committee for their commitment.
- iii. The final report is due in June. The Strategic Futures Committee completes its work at that point.
- e. Report from Campus and Community Work Group, Emily Reilly
- i. The work group met 8 times and has finalized its white paper, which is now posted on the web.
- ii. Want paper to be taken seriously by the planning team. The white paper represents a consensus of the members.
- iii. At the next meeting, they would like Alex Cooper to say what he has learned from the Campus and Community white paper and how it has affected the plan, or how it will be addressed. They would also like to meet informally with Alex to see how their issues have been addressed.
- iv. Key areas of concern in the white paper: Housing, Traffic and transport, Infrastructure, Economics and Recreation and Open Space. Also Overarching Issues.
- v. CRP confirms findings of the white paper will be useful even with the delay completing it. These issues will continue to be studied and refined as the LRDP is developed.
- vi. Mardi Wormhoudt asked that the Campus and Community work group be on the agenda for the June 17 LRDP/SF Committee meeting. They would like all work group members to attend, to have the chance to speak to the LRDP committee directly and share their opinions.
- vii. John Barnes noted how the Campus and Community work group is different from the other work groups and considers it a resource for the LRDP. He expects their role and input to be on-going..

2. Land Use Concept Plan Options, Alex Cooper, Bill MacIntosh; Cooper, Robertson & Partners

- a. Alex Cooper introduced the discussion of the options. Four options will be refined based on what is heard tonight. Appearance of a zoning diagram in some places at this point. This will be addressed to make sure there is an appropriate mix of uses and vitality throughout the campus.
- b. By the nature of CRP's work, the focus is on on-campus systems. The work is informed by recognition of off-campus issues.
- c. By September the planning team will have a set of physical proposals and policy proposals.
- d. Question: How will costs be addressed? Response: a consultant is being retained to assess relative costs of different approaches to campus development. Preliminary findings should be ready at the next meeting.
- e. Option A summary: North loop road; no change to 1988 land use boundaries; new student housing is mostly to the north; graduate college at north remote lot; colleges 11 and 12 north of Crown Merrill inside loop road; moderate housing in-fill. No core expansion; extension of Meyer Drive to Hagar; Employee housing in north campus; no core expansion.

Meeting Notes

- f. Option B summary: North loop road; change to 1988 LRDP boundaries including Campus Natural Reserve; core expansion to north; graduate college at north remote lot; colleges 11 and 12 north of Crown Merrill outside loop road; moderate infill housing; extension of Meyer Drive to Hagar.
- g. Option C (dropped at last meeting)
- h. Option D summary: No north loop road; change to 1988 LRDP boundaries; Graduate college at north end of Porter Meadow; Colleges 11 and 12 at OPERS fields; relocated and expanded OPERS fields in east meadow and elsewhere; maximum in-fill for housing; extension of Meyer Drive to Hagar.
- i. A new variation on Option D was identified to address concern for impacts to OPERS facilities and views from Colleges 11 and 12. Option D' locates Colleges 11 and 12 north of Kresge College, with a road extension to Empire Grade and a relocated corporation yard. No north loop road.
- j. Working on-campus housing assumptions: 50% undergraduates; 25% graduate students; 25% faculty; 5% staff
- k. All options show additional land required to provide on-campus housing for : 70% undergraduates; 50% graduate students; 35% faculty; 8% staff
- l. Update of Science Hill Area plan (Anshen + Allen Study) and Arts Area shown. Core will be studied in more detail to address capacity and character issues.
- m. Preliminary study of redeveloped family student housing shown. Additional land area will be needed for another 100 units for a new total goal of 380 new units.
- n. Porter Meadow studied for 2 undergraduate colleges. Too small.
- o. Revised study for Colleges 11 and 12 at OPERS fields indicates that retaining some existing fields would result in colleges smaller than the desired program, or one college at program.
- p. Studies for decking east remote lot for 2 or 3 levels and for parking structure north of Cowell Stevenson shown.

3. Options for Campus Circulation and Parking, Jim Daisa, Kimley-Horn Associates

- a. Jim Daisa reviewed circulation in each Option for vehicles and bicycles.
- b. Meyer Drive is extended to Hagar in all Options. This is important for making campus core more pedestrian centered. Different options for Meyer - one or two bridges.
- c. A road past the east remote lot is included in all options to connect Hagar and Coolidge.
- d. McLaughlin is shown with access limited to shuttles, service and disabled in all options.
- e. Comments that this appears problematic in Options D and D' with no north loop road. More study needed.
- f. Class 2 bicycle trails recommended on some existing (Heller) and proposed new roads.
- g. Concern about use of Moore Creek for bicycles and impact on natural reserve and drainage.

Meeting Notes

- h. Question: will LRDP look at off-campus drainage? Response: Frank Zwart confirmed this would be covered in the EIR.
- i. Question: Is a version of the Meyer Drive extension possible with shuttles and pedestrians but no cars? Jim Daisa responded that this might be possible.
- j. Locations of possible pedestrian bridges were noted to address conflicts at road intersections and improve shuttle headways. These include: College Nine to north east expansion; College Ten to Heating Plant/engineering; Crown/Baytree pedestrian crossing at Hagar/McLaughlin; Science Hill/McLaughlin pedestrian undercrossing.
- k. A parking garage at performing arts could include pedestrian bridges across Meyer and across Heller to Porter.
- l. In a one-bridge version of Meyer Drive extension a potential pedestrian bridges to the Hahn "peninsula" is desirable.
- m. Two scenarios for parking structures were reviewed. Each assumes a loss of about 600 existing spaces. In one scenario, the east remote has one deck for about 1000 additional spaces. In the other, two decks for about 2000 additional spaces. A garage at performing arts with about 1,000 spaces and one north of Cowell/Stevenson would provide an additional 1,000 spaces.
- n. Question: Are pedestrian paths part of LRDP scope? Response: Main connections such as pedestrian bridges and over passes will be studied. A design of all paths is beyond the LRDP scope.
- o. Question: Concern about not getting people onto transit until they are on campus. Response: Off-campus travel demand management strategies, summarized at previous meetings, will be used to minimize use of single occupant vehicles as much as possible. Assessment of off-campus traffic is part of the LRDP and EIR process.

4. Landscape and Open Space Concept Options, Marcia Tobin; EDAW

- a. Marcia Tobin assessed options for pedestrian connections and wildlife impacts.
- b. Option A: Wildlife continuity zones provided; no impact to Campus Natural Reserve; need to study regional trail impacts; fire management plan required for north campus development, Connections: grad college is 0.2 miles and 20 feet above engineering; colleges 11 and 12 are 0.4 miles and 140 feet above Quarry Plaza. Northern most apartments are 0.7 miles and 190 feet above colleges 11 and 12.
- c. Option B: Wildlife continuity zones need study; impact to Campus Natural Reserve boundaries; need to study regional trail impacts; fire management plan required for north campus development; core expansion on sloped areas; Connections: similar to Option A
- d. Option D: Maximum preservation of open space and Campus Natural Reserve; Connections: new colleges and housing are within currently developed campus.
- e. Comparison of colleges in Option D and D': Similar distance to center of campus core for D and D'

Meeting Notes

- f. Presentation of alternatives for extending Meyer Drive to Hagar with one or two bridges, and for depressing McLaughlin at Science Hill to provide a continuous pedestrian connection from engineering to physical sciences. Utilities under McLaughlin may require a combination of a partial underpass and an overpass.
- g. Presentation of draft environmental concerns for further study. In Options A and B there are potential impacts that can be mitigated: storm water management, the Campus Natural Reserve, listed species or habitat, the seep zone, stream sedimentation, and fire/vegetation management. In Option D there are potential impacts that can be mitigated for storm water management and the Campus Natural Reserve. This preliminary assessment indicates that there are no option includes potential impacts that cannot be mitigated.

5. Infrastructure and Utility Studies, Aidan Hughes, Arup

- a. An assessment of utility supply and demand is still a moving issue at this point given many factors that are still not defined.
- b. Campus water distribution network was assessed for Options A, B, D. More new piping is needed in A and B, but significant upgrades of existing pipes in Option D result in not a great deal of difference in likely costs.
- c. A new water tank will be needed to serve areas above the 900-foot elevation.
- d. Campus gas distribution network would need a moderate amount of new piping for A and B. Existing lines are sufficiently sized to serve new in-fill development in Option D. Impacts of new in-fill development on existing lines cannot be determined at this preliminary level of detail.
- e. Campus electrical distribution network is similar to gas- new feeders are needed in Options A and B. Least new infrastructure is needed in Option D.
- f. Considerations for Water Use. The campus is already doing a good job conserving water compared to comparable campuses. To continue and enhance water efficiency, the following measures could be considered. Each has its own associated costs and trade-offs:
 - Additional conservation, efficient irrigation, retrofitting of existing buildings
 - Rainwater harvesting
 - Gray water recycling
 - Waste water recycling
- g. Considerations for energy storage. The following approaches could be considered to enhance energy efficiency.
Costs and trade-offs will have to be considered:
 - Thermal storage
 - Retrofitting and/or recommissioning of existing buildings
 - Absorption cooling
 - Emerging technologies (such as photovoltaics)

Meeting Notes

- Expanded generation

- h. Goal will be to identify strategies to keep UCSC utility usage in line with available supply in normal conditions and to identify strategies to further decrease usage during drought periods.

6. Breakout Session

Questionnaire responses.

a. Expansion of the core land area

20 Core land area should expand, even if this requires revising boundaries to part of the Campus Natural Reserve.

11 Core land area should expand as long as there is no change to the boundaries of the Campus Natural Reserve.

4 Core land area should not expand; all additional facilities to be in-fill.

b. For the LRDP, the project to bridge Cave Gulch with a road to Empire Grade and relocate the corporation yard should be a:

10 High priority

18 Medium priority

7 Low priority

6 Need more information

c. Your assessment of the proposal to locate two new colleges in the OPERS east playing field (based on the premise that relocated and expanded field area will be provided in the lower east meadow and as part of north campus development):

5 Desirable

20 Undesirable

10 Undecided / need additional information

d. New buildings (or building clusters) along the edge or at the north end of the Great Meadow

6 Should not be considered

26 Could be acceptable if buildings are sited along the tree line

3 Could be considered throughout the upper part of the Great Meadow

e. The extension of Meyer Drive to Hagar Drive

7 Should not be visible from the Great Meadow

21 Could be partially visible from the Great Meadow if largely screened and unobtrusive

6 Could go through part of the Great Meadow if this provides significant benefits to public space in the Arts Area

Meeting Notes

Summary of breakout session findings, by table leader :

a. Bill MacIntosh, table discussion

- General support for north loop road as important element. Gets traffic out of core. Tighter configuration better.
- Need wildlife continuity if loop road, underpasses etc.
- No support for location of colleges 11 and 12 in OPERS fields in Option D. Would be a negative change to campus character
- Support for graduate college at Porter Meadow, Colleges 11 and 12 to West (D' location), more housing infill
- Support for relocation of corp yard for enhance main campus entrance
- Concern for maintaining natural character of the core. Need to maintain vitality in the core.
- Most supportive of core expansion for future flexibility, Option B
- Need to consider how we use the environment. Are policy changes possible that could improve things such as scheduling, parking, etc
- Student general reaction is negative to maximum in-fill housing. Could kill the college system if unaffiliated housing next to colleges.

b. Alex Cooper, table discussion

- Support for loop road
- Concern for "super collector" east remote lot. Requires mode change. Extra time for faculty to get to class. Other garages closer to teaching spaces desirable.
- Great Meadow sacred. Be careful there.
- Proposal to close McLaughlin to cars not popular with people in cars.
- Support for relocation of corp yard to make a more public, enhanced main entrance
- Support College locations in Option D'. Grad College and 11 and 12 on west side provide more balance.
- Cost questions? How will this be addressed? Preferred approach needs to be informed by this.

c. John Barnes, table discussion

- Support for "super collector" garage at east remote lot.
- Recognition that faculty/staff housing location is problematic in each option. Separate unit on-campus is not part of campus.
- Explore off-campus opportunities? Main issue for faculty is affordability.
- Show Laureate Court as part of campus housing portfolio.
- North loop road probably a good idea. Tighter better.
- Support for closing McLaughlin to cars. Necessary if pedestrian separation at Science Hill and east side?

Meeting Notes

- Serious questions about development on west side and run off to Cave Gulch, especially Corp yard. Show watersheds.
 - Relocation of corp yard supported. Just need to mitigate. Getting gas there for TAPS a problem.
 - Students support some academic infill to north acceptable as long as no adverse impacts to Colleges 9 and 10
 - Keep Academic resource Center clear of development impacts
 - Concern with patchwork nature of north campus areas. Now is the time to do tradeoffs to make this area more coherent.
- d. Aidan Hughes, table discussion
- Strong support for the loop road.
 - Feeling that 11/12 could go anywhere but favoring west side
 - Option D too dense.
 - Dismissed D but felt there were some elements that had merit
 - Good idea to keep the housing up the hill, even if only as a longer term option beyond 2020
 - Keep Porter meadow as a housing option as above
 - College 11/12 option on Option D' is OK at camper park
 - Like option B with expansion of academic core to north but think new faculty/staff housing will be
challenging to implement.
 - Support moving Corp Yard but what moves/what stays needs more work.
 - Support Hagar-Coolidge link and expanded "super lot".
 - Support McLaughlin transit and access only. Access to health center an issue.
 - Think Meyer Drive needs to be full access therefore move road alignment into north part of Meadow.
- e. Jim Daisa, table discussion
- Fatal flaw for Option D is densification with no space for the future. Likely storm water issues.
 - Options A and B better for storm water management.
 - Circulation problematic in D with no north loop road
 - Could McLaughlin remain open to cars with pedestrian overpasses? Yes, but need to understand how bus stops work
 - Support for Meyer extending south of the Arts facilities. Don't recreate pedestrian problems of McLaughlin here.
 - Support for importance of north loop road
 - Don't impact informal recreation areas to north
 - Concern for location of faculty housing in far north in Option B. Close location to developed campus preferred.

Meeting Notes

- Concern about additional OPERS fields, possible light impacts if these are for evening/night use
- Location of Faculty Housing west of Empire Grade is good if bridge connection is made.

- f. Marcia Tobin, table discussion
 - Similar support as other tables for north loop road, core expansion
 - Connection to Empire Grade seen as useful
 - No support for locating Colleges 11 and 12 in OPERS fields, Option D
 - Support for extension of Meyer Drive, east remote super lot, and road connection there from Hagar to Coolidge
 - No consensus on closing McLaughlin to cars. Faculty concern.
 - Denser development considered more favorable

7. Next steps

- a. Public Workshop #4, June 9
- b. LRDP Committee Meeting #9, June 17 Joint meeting with SFC. [5:30- 9:30 PM, University Conference Center, space above College 9 dining hall]

Meeting Notes

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Gene Arner
Tamara Belknap
Mike Bolte
Donna Blitzer
Harriet Deck
Peggy Delaney
Pamela Edwards
Amy Everitt
Maggie Fusari
Wlad Godrich
Gary Griggs
Gail Heit
Francisco Hernandez
Karen Holl
Liz Irwin
Steve Kang
Ilse Kolbus
Larry Merkley
Meredith Michaels
Fran Owens
Emily Reilly
Jean Marie Scott
Wes Scott
James Sheldon
Ron Suduiko
Matt Waxman
Mardi Wormhoudt
Frank Zwart

Members Not Present

Michael Bade
Jim Dunne
Greg Gilbert
Gary Glatzmaier
Bill Hyder
Patrick LeCuyer
Robert Miller
David Rinehart
Leslie Sunell
Christina Valentino
Carl Walsh
Jack Zimmermann

Staff present:

John Barnes
Teresa Buika
Dean Fitch
Galen Jarvinen
Ken Thomas

Consultants present:

Alex Cooper
Bill MacIntosh
Jonie Fu
Jacinta McCann
Megan Walker
Jim Daisa