

Meeting Notes

---

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
10/28/04	<b>UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan</b>	03055.03	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
10/19/04	LRDP Committee Meeting #11	University Inn and Conf. 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. Review of schedule, process: Frank Zwart
  - i. Comments due November 5 on the 2005 LRDP first draft.
  - ii. Draft to be issued early December. EIR process will start at this time.
  - iii. LRDP focuses mostly on campus. A planning charrette is being planned for eastern access with the city.

**2. 2005 LRDP Background Studies**

- a. Alex Cooper and Bill MacIntosh of Cooper, Robertson & Partners presented background studies showing scenarios for how the LRDP program elements could be accommodated in various parts of the campus. (Slides posted to project web site). Studies include:
  - i. North Campus
    - Core Expansion
    - Employee Housing
    - Student Housing
    - Recreation areas
    - Circulation (roads, paths, trails)
  - ii. Infill housing at undergraduate colleges
  - iii. Graduate village at north end of Porter Meadow
  - iv. Redevelopment of Family Student Housing
  - v. Other site options for employee housing
    - CRP is recommending dropping Site Option E (former Inclusion Area E) as Campus Resource Land given high environmental constraints; and Site Option F (Hagar / Coolidge meadow) given view impacts.

Meeting Notes

---

- b. Jim Daisa of Kimley-Horn Associates presented a preliminary off-campus traffic assessment (Slides posted to project web site). The analysis is at an intersection level. It will be developed more during the EIR phase.
  
- c. Next steps
  - i. Public Workshop #4, October 20
  - ii. Deadline for comments from LRDP Committee on first draft: November 5
  - iii. LRDP Committee Meeting #12, November 15.
  - iv. Draft 2005 LRDP to be issued/beginning of environmental review: December

**3. Question and Answer**

a. Questions On Land-Use Presentation

- i. Karen Holl (KH) doesn't believe there is habitat continuity. Not realistic to consider creative crossing measure at loop road if funding is not there.
- ii. Emily Reilly (ER) asked if Maggie Fusari's campus natural reserve boundary issues been resolved? John Barnes noted the issue of how boundaries are defined on the map and on the ground is a complex question that is still being discussed at UCSC and with UCOP. The Regents do not want land-use areas surveyed as metes and bounds.
- iii. KH said the natural areas between proposed development in the north do not appear to be 300 feet wide. Most wildlife won't cross a playing field. The resulting plan is a checkerboard. Frank Zwart noted that Greg Gilbert has also asked if we need playing fields in the north. Perhaps this cleared area can be reduced with fields shifted to the east meadow. Planning team to consider.
- iv. Matt Waxman (MW) proposed including a principle to have a buffer for wildlife around developed areas.
- v. MW asked about the level of detail in placing roads - cultural & naturally significant features e.g., Tree 9. Bill MacIntosh noted that roads have been studied at a broad level and preliminary routes configured to avoid areas such as the Crown Meadow.
- vi. Larry Pageler (LP) in decommissioning roads, can Chinquapin become a ped + bike path with the north loop road serving as fire break? To be determined, by PP&C and fire chief.
- vii. KH asked how hydrological areas/seeps will be protected with development in north. BM noted that recharge of this area will need to be accounted for. This is in the physical planning principles and will be addressed in the EIR.
- viii. Jean Marie Scott noted that cost input on the various employee housing site options would be helpful.
- ix. MW noted that employee housing areas are all in Campus Resource Land. Why? To retain flexibility. Some CRL areas may be dropped and become Protected Landscape. Not all are viable or desirable for development.

Meeting Notes

---

- x. KH asked what housing at the Hagar Coolidge meadow would look like. CRP is preparing a study.
- xi. Why isn't faculty housing being considered in the corporation yard? JB noted this area is in the historic district, which is eligible for the National Register of historic places. This will limit the density of development and thus not be a large enough site for meeting the full housing need. Phasing would be very tricky.
- xii. The high cost of family student housing is a concern; it takes 62% of a graduate student salary for on-campus rent, and is less expensive to live off campus.
- xiii. ER asked for clarification of family student housing program goals and noted high cost for on-campus housing is an issue. Problematic to project housing on campus when it will be so expensive to build thus few would be able to live there. JMS noted UCSC will have to continue to look for ways to deliver housing less expensively without subsidies.

b. Questions On Off-Campus Traffic Presentation

- i. ER asked if the traffic modeling uses the new AMBAG model? Jim Daisa noted this is the current model. A new one is being developed, but is not yet released for use.
- ii. ER asked if AMBAG has accurate information on UCSC students? Larry Pageler says information has been provided, but he is not aware if this information is reflected in the current model.
- iii. Tamara B. asked if the intersection of Story and High is a LOS F. JD believes it is. The model will be checked to reflect this.
- iv. ER asked if the traffic model reflects students who drive to neighborhoods near the campus, park and take the bus. How does the city get this type of information so it can respond to it. JD: No. the number of students who do this is not known. Neighborhood parking restrictions/permits should help on this.

c. Plenary Discussion

- i. MW: how should comments on the studies be submitted? BM: to Campus Planning through the [lrdp-admin@ucsc](mailto:lrdp-admin@ucsc) email. Important to note these studies are not part of the LRDP, not in detail, and how things will necessarily happen. Purpose is to test feasibility and fit.
- ii. MW: consider counting trails, hiking, biking as recreation space also to reduce amount of new recreation fields in the plan. FZ: Unlikely all these fields would be made. Plan is not a mandate to do this. Will require a student vote and funding.
- iii. MW asked that the EIR comment period be changed from summer so students can have input. UCSC to consider along with other schedule issues.
- iv. MW: will there be a commitment to maintaining the camper park? JB: To be determined. JMS notes fire safety issues with the current community. The current site makes sense for housing expansion. Other sites do not preclude relocating the camper park or

Meeting Notes

---

- including alternative housing models. It is beneficial to keep it open and generic for the LRDP.
- v. Will the EIR evaluate development of all Campus Resource Land sites? JB: Goal is to see if some of these can be taken off the table.
  - vi. Are employee housing sites being evaluated without financial analysis? Meredith Michaels noted Mack 5 did a preliminary cost assessment of the overall plan. Tom Vani noted that LRDPs do not include financial analysis.
  - vii. Provost/EVC Delaney asked are we picking something we can do? Costs have been taken into account in an overall sense in choosing the development approach (expansion vs. compact) but not at a project level. Notes CRP has been taking area plan studies into account in LRDP.
  - viii. TV said LRDP's can be amended if needed if it turns out something does not fit.
  - ix. County Supervisor Wormhoudt said she is writing a formal letter to the Chancellor with her comments on the LRDP, and will provide written comments for the EIR. She noted that all discussion assumes growth to 21,000 students will happen and that the community can absorb this without impacts that cannot be mitigated. This growth she believes will cause great harm to the community. The original UCSC campus plan in 1964 to grow to 27,500 was based on a different era. She feels the Campus and Community Work Group's efforts have not been respected or reflected in the LRDP first draft. The plan is not a synthesis of the comments provided by the committee. There have been no acknowledgement of impacts to the county. The county has been ignored. Financing is important for the housing issue. She is concerned that UC mitigations are not enforceable. The LRDP will have a massive effect on the community. It cannot be accommodated consistent with the planning principles.
  - x. Will some employee housing site options be reconsidered? Possibly. These are still being reviewed.
  - xi. Tamara Belknap likes the housing infill studies. These are more sensitively done than earlier versions.
  - xii. Emily Reilly asked Alex Cooper the carrying capacity of campus and the community. It seems that Strategic Futures Committee came up with enrollment number based only on academic needs. There's never been a statement that this number is the carrying capacity for the campus, despite early assertions by the planners that this was the objective (to find a growth level that is sustainable for both the university and the community).
  - xiii. Alex Cooper noted the enrollment number was determined by academic need. It then goes through a series of screens, including factors like cost, housing, transportation, water. Alex's conclusions: for on-campus this enrollment level looks achievable. For off-campus, the EIR will determine feasibility and impacts. He noted that the LRDP Land-Use plan is an entitlement map. Everything on the map won't necessarily happen and may not happen in 15 years. The result of this process is that there's more awareness now of off campus issues. He's optimistic.

Meeting Notes

---

End

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair  
Emily Reilly  
Mardi Wormhoudt  
Mike Bolte  
Gail Heit  
Tamara Belknap  
Gary Glatzmaier  
Pamela Edwards  
Steve Kang  
Ilse Kolbus  
Patrick LeCuyer  
James Sheldon  
Francisco Hernandez  
Frank Zwart  
Matt Waxman  
Jean Marie Scott  
Wes Scott  
Christina Valentino  
Karen Holl  
Liz Irwin  
Fran Owens  
Peggy Delaney  
Ken Thomas

Members Not Present

Maggie Fusari  
Jim Dunne  
Greg Gilbert  
Donna Blitzer  
Bill Hyder  
Harriet Deck  
Robert Miller  
David Rinehart  
Leslie Sunell  
Jack Zimmermann  
Amy Everitt  
Carl Walsh  
Wlad Godrich  
Larry Merkley  
Ron Suduiko  
Gene Arner

Staff present:

John Barnes  
Dean Fitch  
Larry Pageler  
Teresa Buika  
Galen Jarvinen

Consultants present:

Alex Cooper  
Bill MacIntosh  
Marcia Tobin  
Jim Daisa