

Meeting Notes

<i>Date</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Project number</i>	
11/18/04	UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan	03055.03	
<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Meeting location</i>	
11/15/04	LRDP Committee Meeting #12	University 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 (TV), Chair LRDP Committee. This is the last scheduled LRDP Committee meeting. Where we are stopping, other campuses usually start on the outreach process for a LRDP.
- b. Review of schedule, process: Frank Zwart
A proposal to change the EIR schedule is recommended to have the review of the Draft EIR during September and October 2005.
- c. TV asked how this would mesh with the City's General Plan schedule. Gene Arner replied that the city plan has not started yet due to funding constraints. They hope it will start soon. He noted the opportunity to do these in parallel has been lost.
- d. Mardi Wormhoudt (MW) noted the UCSC Academic Senate is considering a resolution November 19 on whether the 21,000 enrollment should be approved. Will the LRDP process halt if this passes? TV seriously doubts if this will halt the process. The 21,000 enrollment is an envelope for a land-use plan, not an academic plan. If a lower enrollment occurs, the LRDP can accommodate it.
- e. MW asked who decides the enrollment ultimately. TV: The chancellor will decide. Alison Galloway (AG) noted the Academic Senate is advisory to the chancellor. Their recommendation would not necessarily stop the LRDP. She does not see this happening.
- f. AG: The senate is concerned about milestones that need to be in place in order to take more students. Some faculty would like to stay at 15,000. Others even prefer 8,000 students.
- g. MW: with this being the last meeting, how will we know what happens from here? TV: the newspaper will report on the outcome of the Academic Senate resolution at the same time the LRDP Committee will know.

Meeting Notes

2. EIR Process

- a. Shabnam Barati (SB), senior project manager for URS Corporation gave an overview of the EIR process
 - i. After the Notice of Preparation, there will be an initial study to determine which issues to address, and a public scoping meeting.
 - ii. After publication of the DRAFT EIR, there will be a 60-day review period, including 2 public meetings.
 - iii. The Final Draft EIR will represent responses to comments. This will be published and submitted for the UC Regents to review. If the EIR meets their requirements, it will be certified and the LRDP approved. The Notice of Determination ends the process.
 - iv. Karen Holl (KH) asked if UC is its own enforcing agent. SB: Correct. UC is the lead agency.
 - v. KH. Ultimately The Regents will decide what is adequate? SB: no mitigations will be proposed that can't be enforced. KH notes she doesn't necessarily agree.
 - vi. KH: At what point would determination of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) happen? SB: this is not an implementation plan- it is a program for development, not a project for development- so the LRDP EIR would not trigger a HCP.
 - vii. Tamara Belknap: what is involved in a scoping meeting? SB: this invites public comments on the range of potential impacts to study.

3. Review of Comments on First Draft of 2005 LRDP

- a. John Barnes (JB) gave an overview of the 110 pages of comments received on the LRDP between 10/4 and 11/5.
- b. The comments were sorted into the following five categories, those relating to the:
 - i. LRDP related
 - ii. EIR related
 - iii. Academic programming (Strategic Futures Committee)
 - iv. Financial Feasibility
 - v. Concurrent planning activities (including off-campus issues, to be addressed by pre-existing committees)
- c. Off-campus issues will be addressed in the CEQA process. These also include the chancellor's initiatives, such as the eastern access feasibility charrette with the city, joint housing, transit, a possible business incubator at 2300 Delaware and university cooperation on a desalination plant.
- d. 663 comment postcards were sent from students to the chancellor.
- e. Main on-campus comments:
 - i. A recurring comment for both on and off campus was "why 21,000?". This cannot be addressed by the LRDP Committee since it is an academic planning issue.

Meeting Notes

- ii. Faculty have asked if the plan provide enough employee housing. They have suggested 375 units are needed by 2020. This has been studied (see below).
 - iii. How is the Campus Natural Reserve directly and indirectly affected? The EIR will address this.
 - iv. The future of the camper park. This raises important questions about diversity and affordability of housing and the culture of UC Santa Cruz. This is something that will need to be addressed.
 - v. The status of Porter Meadow.
 - vi. Sustainability on and off campus was noted in many comments. This is one area the plan does not address as clearly as it might.
- f. Off-campus comments
- i. The plan is light on community affects and the relationship of the university and the community- "long on intentions, short on commitment". JB notes in addition to the planning principles, the section on UCSC as part of a Regional Community, which outlines the main community issues including housing, traffic and water resources. CEQA will address off-campus impacts.
 - ii. Access. A number of comments pro and con on eastern access. Also concern about Western Drive.
 - iii. JB notes a number of parallel efforts to address access and traffic, including the chancellor's initiative to study eastern access with the city and study of an on-campus car share program.
 - iv. KH: what percentage of comments were from off-campus? JB. More came from off-campus.
 - v. KH: When will this be finished? JB: the next step is the Draft 2005 LRDP, then EIR review which will look at alternatives, including a "no project" alternative.
 - vi. What is the process for addressing comments? JB: staff will vet the technical comments and forward more complex comments to the Executive Committee. URS will address many comments in the EIR process. CRP will stay involved.
 - vii. JB notes a tension between the LRDP being general or specific. Other UC LRDPs tend to be very general. The UCSC LRDP is defining an envelope of opportunity, not a specific plan.

4. Proposed Revisions to First Draft Land-Use Map

- a. Bill MacIntosh reviewed changes made since the last meeting in response to comments
 - i. Campus resource land south of west remote lot (former Inclusion Area E) changed to Protected Landscape given high environmental constraints
 - ii. Habitat continuity zones widened in north campus to maintain 300-foot minimum width between development

Meeting Notes

- iii. North campus recreation area reduced in size from 14.6 to 8.9 acres in response to request to minimize tree clearance. Additional OPERS area added near College Eight and south of east remote
- iv. Minor boundary adjustments were made to add some area to CASFS in response to a workshop with CASFS and the Arboretum.
- v. Parking area identified north of Engineering to supplement capacity for the north core (within 3,100 spaces).
- vi. Off-campus properties were added to the map (Laureate Court and 2300 Delaware).

5. Background Studies

- a. Jim Daisa of Kimley-Horn & Associates (JD) reviewed traffic and access issues with proposed Cave Gulch entrance
 - i. There are no "fatal flaws" with the proposed Cave Gulch entrance. The entry would have good sight distance - several hundred feet.
 - ii. Empire Grade is well built, 12' lanes, 2' shoulder, limiting hillsides and tree on road edge, 40 mph with super elevation is good design. The pavement edge is uneven (may come up in EIR phase).
 - iii. This entrance may add between 1-3% of total campus traffic to this intersection going southbound. A much smaller number of cars are estimated to go north past the Cave Gulch neighborhood, toward Bonny Doon.
 - iv. There is the potential to add turn lanes on Empire Grade, such as at Heller Drive.
 - v. MW notes traffic counts seem high as identified up Empire Grade, only a couple thousand residents live there. JD: taken from actual hose counts, UC traffic is just an early projection - will need to be studied. Impacts from north development will focus on traffic
- b. Bill MacIntosh reviewed studies for how additional employee housing could be located for 375 additional units in response to comments from the Faculty Welfare Committee.
 - i. 375 units could be accommodated in the north campus using EH land and adjacent Campus Resource Land. 3 acres more would be needed to keep the density under 10 units per acre.
 - ii. Housing density comparables: Ranch View Terrace: 6 units/acre; Hagar Meadow: 8 units/acre; Laureate Court: 12.5
 - iii. Jonathan Giffard: Would adding 3 acres of CRL to housing require an LRDP amendment?
Bill MacIntosh: Yes
 - iv. Mardi Wormhoudt notes Bonny Doon/Cave Gulch is a rural area and outside urban service line - very low density.
County zoning is low density to preserve the agricultural area. Residents want to retain the rural nature and this potential development would be counter to that.
Concern that development that potentially could install wells will affect the Bonny Doon residents - they already have water problems

Meeting Notes

- v. Bill MacIntosh showed how Campus Resource Land west of Empire Grade (Site Option B) can accommodate 375 acres at a density of 10 units per acre, accounting for areas too steep to build. This is in the Coastal Zone.
 - vi. MW notes she is not sure everyone realizes how difficult that would be to develop. Requires county or Coastal Commission approval. SB notes would not require a CLRDP.
 - vii. Bill MacIntosh reviewed how 375 units could be accommodated at the lower east meadow, with a reconfigured Coolidge Drive. This would take 30 acres at 12.5 units/acre (very dense like Laureate Court) or 46 acres at 8 units/acre, extending halfway up the hill to the east remote lot.
 - viii. CRP does not recommend this site for employee housing given the impact on the meadow, the views and the arrival experience on campus. The committee appeared to concur with this recommendation.
- c. Bill MacIntosh reviewed updated core capacity studies, reflecting the Science Hill and Arts Area Plans.
- i. An option with all infill is possible but would reduce available building sites in the core for opportunities beyond 2020.
 - ii. Alternatives for core expansion to the north were shown, including one with academic space near Colleges 11 and 12.
 - iii. Alison Galloway noted the importance of having academic space near the new colleges.
 - iv. Additional capacity remains along the north loop road for academic and research buildings beyond 2020.

6. Conclusion

- a. Alex Cooper gave an overview of the plan.
 - i. There are 21 principles. The 1988 LRDP had 4.
 - ii. The plan adds up to 2.5 million gsf of academic space and 1.7 million gsf of housing, almost double the existing development, with space remaining for the future.
 - iii. At the beginning, it was not clear if this would be possible. Could the original paradigm of the campus in the 1963 plan be extended farther, or would it need to change? It is significant that the paradigm still holds.
 - iv. The plan restricts development on 53% of the campus- more than the 1988 LRDP for less development. The plan honors the earlier commitment to preserve natural lands as much as possible and reflects a sustainable approach of minimizing sprawl and promoting a walkable core, served by transit. The plan does not go into the far north or the great meadow.
 - v. The re-design and simplification of the land-use plan is a significant accomplishment.
 - vi. The plan gives priority to the pedestrian over the car in the core and enhances the two north-south spines connecting the campus. Optimizing transportation strategies is absolutely critical to the plan, including extending Meyer Drive, the north loop road, and new parking facilities at the periphery of the core.

Meeting Notes

- vii. Reassigning parts of the corp yard and enhancing this part of the south campus is a sign of a maturing campus.
- viii. Why is this a good plan?
- it really honors the place.
 - it involved input from many people
 - it acknowledges issues with the community to address
 - it is flexible. You will not build in all these places.
 - It is a contextual plan that responds to this place, not a radical plan
 - It builds on earlier planning work
 - It is clear and simple enough to inform future decision makers and to be sustained
- xi. Alex Cooper thanked the committee and Frank, John, Dean and Tom, along with Mardi Wormhoudt, Emily Reilly and Gene Arner for representing the community.
- b. Tom Vani thanked the Committee for its work and the consultant team for its efforts.
- c. Karen Holl asked that the committee be informed of the outcome of the senate resolution.
- d. Tom Vani asked if the LRDP Committee would like to reconvene during the EIR process. The committee members indicated yes.

End

Meeting Notes

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Francisco Hernandez
Mardi Wormhoudt
Mike Bolte
Gary Glatzmaier
Tamara Belknap
Jack Zimmerman
Pamela Edwards
Karen Holl
Ilse Kolbus
Liz Irwin
Harriet Deck
Allison Galloway
Larry Merkley
Jonathan Giffard
Gene Arner
Frank Zwart
Wes Scott
Matt Waxman
Jean Marie Scott

Members Not Present

Maggie Fusari
Amy Everitt
Greg Gilbert
Gail Heit
Bill Hyder
Patrick LeCuyer
Robert Miller
David Rinehart
Leslie Sunell
Carl Walsh
Wlad Godrich
Emily Reilly
Donna Blitzer
Fran Owens
Christina Valentino

Staff present:

Galen Jarvinen
John Barnes
Dean Fitch
Larry Pageler
Teresa Buika
Alisa Klaus

Consultants present:

Alex Cooper
Bill MacIntosh
Jim Daisa
Shabnam Barati