

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
10/7/04	UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan	03055.03	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
10/6/04	LRDP Committee Meeting #10	University Town 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. Introduction

- a. Welcome by Tom Vani, Chair LRDP Committee
 - i. The First Draft of the UC Santa Cruz Long-Range Development Plan 2005-2020 (2005 LRDP) is complete and being issued to the Committee this evening.
- b. Review of schedule, process: Frank Zwart
 - i. Process started last October. Draft and beginning of EIR process to start in December, with draft EIR to be completed May 2005 and public hearings afterwards.
 - ii. LRDP is a broad framework and guide for future development that describes a maximum envelope of potential development over a 15-year period. It is not a mandate or commitment to grow to the level described.

2. Presentation of First Draft 2005 LRDP, Bill MacIntosh, Cooper, Robertson & Partners

- a. The 2005 LRDP Format follows guidelines established by the U.C. Office of the President. Its scope covers the campus itself. Off-site impacts of on-campus growth will be assessed during EIR process of the LRDP.
- b. The 2005 LRDP is organized as follows: 1. Executive Summary, 2 Introduction (including a description of purpose, process, and academic and research vision), 3 Planning Context (including existing conditions for enrollment, development, physical setting), relationship to the community, and planning history), 4 Physical Planning Principles and Guidelines (arranged thematically: Land-Use Patterns; Natural and Cultural Resources; Access and Transportation, Sustainability; Campus Life, The Santa Cruz Community), 5 UC Santa Cruz Long-Range Development Plan 2005-2020 (including Enrollment and Population, Building Program, Land-Use Plan, Landscape and Open Space, Circulation and Parking, Utilities and Infrastructure, and Housing and Student Life)
- c. The presentation will focus on elements of this fifth section, the plan itself
- d. Enrollment, Population and Program Projections

Meeting Notes

- i. Projected student enrollment for the 2005 LRDP: up to a maximum of 21,000 full time equivalent students (fall/winter/spring, three-quarter average). Faculty and Staff to increase proportionately to approximately 5,000.
 - ii. Building program is projected to increase up to a maximum of approximately 9 million gross square feet from the current 4.7 million. This is based a 100% CPEC standards for Instruction and Research space. Actual development would likely be less than this.
- e. Land-Use Plan concept
- i. The concept for the campus land-use plan reflects the consensus of the LRDP and Strategic Futures Committees at the June 17 joint meeting for the proposed preferred plan approach. The plan blends elements of earlier plans, and is characterized by continued infill in the developed campus, a north loop road to support carefully-sited growth of academic, research and housing in this area, and other elements.
 - ii. The plan was refined over the summer. An additional area of possible core expansion was added north of the Engineering Building based on new topographic information showing a relatively level area, and the recommended location for expanded employee housing was relocated from the Coastal Zone to the north campus.
 - iii. The proposed land-use concept is consistent with the current development pattern of clusters of development, with an academic core surrounded by housing and recreation. The plan also generally reflects the approach of previous LRDPs which recognized the importance of growth north of the developed core as the campus matures.
- f. The 2005 LRDP Land-Use Plan
- i. The intent for the 2005 LRDP Land-Use Plan was to convey more clearly the physical planning intentions of the campus, while recognizing and current land-use designations. The 2005 LRDP land-use categories largely follow those in the 1988 LRDP but with a more simplified and representational color coding. Inclusion Areas were dropped and re-categorized as Campus Resource Land. Campus Habitat Reserve is a new category in the first draft 2005 plan.
 - ii. Parking will be allowed in all areas where building development is permitted. An overlay zone for the location of possible structured parking garages is included to support the concept of collector lots around the academic core to promote a walkable campus.
 - iii. The first draft 2005 LRDP indicates more acreage on campus where development is restricted going from 42% to 53% (Campus Natural Reserve, Protected Landscape, Site Research and Support, Campus Habitat Reserve).
 - iv. Areas where development is permitted decrease slightly from 34 to 30% (Academic Core, Campus Support, Colleges and Student Housing, Family Student Housing, Employee Housing, Physical Education and Recreation). This reflects the

Meeting Notes

principle of a more sustainable approach as identified in the principles, which minimizes sprawl and reflects actual site constraints more accurately.

- v. In the 2005 LRDP, Campus Resource Land is defined as likely being left in a natural state but with a portion able to be considered for development in the 2005-2020 timeframe with appropriate environmental reviews. This land area changes from 24 to 17% of the campus.
 - vi. The location of the different land-use areas was shown, and compared to 1988 for Academic Core (25% increase in acreage), colleges and housing (% increase)
 - vii. The Campus Natural Reserve increases 7% in area and is reconfigured in select areas to provide more habitat continuity on the west side of the upper campus east of the Cave Gulch neighborhood and to provide additional area for development in key locations.
- g. Landscape and Open Space
- i. The landscape framework of the 2005 LRDP builds on the existing landscape, strongly characterized by the three zones of meadows, forest and chaparral. New development areas would be in clusters similar to existing campus development that respect the natural setting.
 - ii. The topography of the north campus has a terrace. The elevation of this terrace varies. At the center, it is 150 feet higher than the Engineering area. This is comparable to existing campus height differences; there is 200 vertical feet of difference between Oakes College and Engineering.
 - iii. The unique "warped grid" of UCSC's network of pedestrian paths in the academic core would be extended into the north campus. Important existing pedestrian corridors would be reinforced and enhanced.
- h. Circulation and Parking
- i. The 2005 LRDP adds a new campus entrance for service and egress at the northwest. This will require a bridge to span Cave Gulch.
 - ii. New roads planned include a north loop road and an extension of Meyer Drive to Hagar to permit Hager and more roads in the core to be restricted to general traffic and more pedestrian-centered.
 - iii. Locations for possible collector parking lots are shown at the east remote lot, west remote lot, west of the arts area, and north of Stevenson College. Surface parking would be provided in the north campus to serve new adjacent development.
 - iv. New bicycle paths and enhancements to the existing system are outlined.
- i. Next steps
- i. Land Use and Environment work session
 - ii. LRDP Committee Meeting #11, October 19.
 - iii. Public Workshop #4, October 20
 - iv. Comments from LRDP Committee on first draft: November 5
 - v. LRDP Committee Meeting #12, November 15.
 - vi. Draft 2005 LRDP to be issued/beginning of environmental review: December

Meeting Notes

2. Question and Answer Session

- a. How did the physical planning principles evolve? (Matt Waxman)
Principles were provided by the work groups in a series. These have been edited in some cases to be more concise and consistent in level of detail across the different topics. Work group chairs should review the first draft and provide any comments to the office of Physical Planning and Construction (PP&C).
- b. How was the Strategic Futures Report integrated into 2005 LRDP first draft? (Matt Waxman)
As a statement of the academic goals and vision, the SFC report is embodied in the enrollment and population, building program and academic and research vision sections of the LRDP. The Strategic Futures Committee was part of the meetings to review land-use options and select the preferred approach.
- c. What happened to public comments and student comments? How were these addressed? It is important that people know they are being heard. (Matt Waxman, Emily Reilly)
CRP has been taking notes for public workshops, LRDP Committee meetings and student meetings. The plan many of these reflects comments, but cannot reflect all comments. UCSC PP&C will post meeting notes.
- d. What is the protocol for making comments now? (Matt Waxman)
Comments can be submitted to the lrdp-admin@ucsc.edu email. There will be additional opportunities to make comments on the first draft of the plan at the upcoming public workshop (10/20) and during the EIR process.
- e. How was the June 17 "Potential Preferred Plan" selected? Some students do not agree with elements of this. (Matt Waxman)
This plan was selected based on input from the LRDP and Strategic Futures Committee at the joint June 17 meeting. It represents a blend of the two options which the committees considered most promising from earlier meetings. At the June 17 meeting breakout sessions, there was a consensus behind this development approach at each table. The plan is a preferred direction, to be refined going forward. Revisions over the summer include consolidating family student housing and relocating employee housing out of the coastal zone to an area in the north campus.
- f. How many additional parking spaces are planned? (Emily Reilly)
Between 3,100 and 3,700 net additional spaces are projected.
- g. The projected increase in parking spaces appears inconsistent with the planning principle of encourage alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use. A 60% increase in parking spaces is enormous compared to a 40% increase in students. (Andy Schiffren)
The LRDP parking projection is a maximum allowable number, not a commitment to provide this many spaces. The actual number of additional parking spaces may be much less, as is the case with the last LRDP. Since 1988 there are almost no net additional parking spaces on campus. Spaces in the garage were offset by spaces lost to new buildings. New structures will have to account for cost factors since parking is self funding. The campus will continue to encourage transportation alternatives to the single

Meeting Notes

occupancy vehicle while providing adequate parking for those who have to bring cars on campus.

- h. Where is housing addressed in the plan? (Andy Shiffren)

In Chapter 5, section h, (page 87) Housing and Student Life. Land will be identified for housing 50% of undergraduate students, 25% of graduate students, 25% of faculty, and 3% of staff on campus. Additional land is identified, either with a housing designation, or Campus Resource Land, to accommodate more if market factors permit.

- i. Can the traffic analysis to be presented at the next meeting be distributed in advance to members of the LRDP Committee? (Andy Schiffren). Will try to have available.

- j. How can the 2005 LRDP reflect discussions of potential off-campus opportunities for the city and university to work together to address common goals, such as housing? (Emily Rielly)

While the UC Regent's format guidelines for a campus Long-Range Development Plan do not include off-campus initiatives, UCSC recognizes the importance of these and will continue to engage with the city in other ways such as the joint housing task force to explore how mutual concerns can be constructively addressed. The LRDP EIR will address off-campus impacts and also include the UCSC 2300 Delaware Avenue property (former Texas Instruments).

- k. Shouldn't consideration of fewer cars in the campus core be extended to the whole campus? (Emily Reilly)

Restriction of cars in the campus core is part of an overall strategy that includes exploring and encouraging transportation alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle for getting to and from campus. By adding Meyer Drive and possible collector lots at the core periphery, the academic core can be enhanced as a more pedestrian-centered environment.

- l. Will a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) be done for the north campus? (Karen Holl) will be considered

- m. How will Family Student Housing be funded to make it affordable, given the significant need for this? (Emily Reilly)

UCSC is aware that affordability is important for students with families. UCSC will be investigating the delivery mechanism.

- n. How will the campus land-use map be referenced on the ground? The current map is a "cartoon". This needs to be geo-referenced, particularly for the Campus Natural Reserve. (Maggie Fusari)

PP&C recognizes this is an issue. Some would like to see metes and bounds identified. The Regents reportedly do not want this level of specificity.

- o. How is Protected Landscape defined in the 2005 LRDP first draft? (Karen Holl)

The 2005 LRDP identifies Protected Landscapes in order to maintain special campus landscapes for their scenic value and to maintain special vegetation and wildlife continuity zones. To the extent feasible, Protected Landscape will be retained in an

Meeting Notes

- undeveloped state as the campus grows. Any development within Protected Landscape will not impinge on its overall character. (Chapter 5, Section d, Land-Use Plan p. 65)
- p. Have actual slopes been identified in the north campus? (Maggie Fusari)
CRP has verified the topography of the west portion of the north campus below Upper Fuel Break Road, using earlier surveys done on the ground. These surveys were combined and traced to produce an updated CAD drawing for topography in this part of the campus. This work has identified a relatively level area north of Engineering that could be used for core expansion and confirmed that two residential colleges of 750 beds each can fit west of the north remote lot.
- q. Maggie Fusari requested a version of the 2005 Land-Use map, first draft in "shape file" format so she can have this in a compatible format for understanding the proposed reconfiguration of the Campus Natural Reserve.
CRP will work with PP&C and Maggie Fusari to provide a file version that is compatible from the CAD program.
- r. What are the options for the extension of Meyer Drive? (Matt Waxman)
The proposed Meyer Drive extension connects the arts area with the "Hahn peninsula" and Hagar Drive with two new bridges. This alignment can allow both a pedestrian and transit-only connection (with signage) and also a car connection. The planning team recognizes that adding car traffic through the arts area is not desirable. For this reason, a pedestrian and transit-only approach appears preferred. Opening the road to cars during special events could be beneficial.
- s. Who makes the final decision on the 2005 LRDP? (Matt Waxman)
The Chancellor, in consultation with the Executive Committee (Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor, and Academic leaders)

End

Meeting Notes

Estimate (complete sign-up list unavailable)

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Carl Walsh
Matt Waxman
Mike Bolte
Donna Blitzer
Karen Holl
Gary Glatzmaier
Pamela Edwards
Amy Everitt
Maggie Fusari
Wlad Godrich
Trace Camacho
Gail Heit
Francisco Hernandez
Ken thomas
Liz Irwin
Ron Suduiko
Christina Valentino
Emily Reilly
Fran Owens
Frank Zwart
Larry Merkley
Andrew Schriffren (SC County)
Jean Marie Scott
Wes Scott

Members Not Present

Jim Dunne
Greg Gilbert
Ilse Kolbus
Bill Hyder
Patrick LeCuyer
Robert Miller
David Rinehart
Leslie Sunell
Jack Zimmermann
Tamara Belknap

Staff present:

John Barnes
Teresa Buika
Larry Pageler
Dean Fitch

Consultants present:

Bill MacIntosh
Jonie Fu
Jim Daisa