

May 16, 2006

Dave Kliger, CPEVC
Chancellor's Office

Re: CPB Resolution on the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)

Dear Dave:

We write following conversations in the wake of the Senate meeting on April 26 and the passage of the CPB resolution concerning the LRDP. As you know, the resolution read:

resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to refrain from transmitting the LRDP/EIR to the University of California Regents for approval until the apparent errors and omissions cited in this resolution have been addressed;

resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to transmit the LRDP/EIR to the Regents no earlier than the November 2006 Regents meeting unless an earlier submission is endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee;

resolved that the Academic Senate calls upon the UCSC administration to provide to the Senate Executive Committee, at least two months in advance of the transmittal of the LRDP/EIR to the University of California Regents, a public written response to the apparent errors and omissions cited in this resolution;

resolved that the Academic Senate requests the Senate Executive Committee to determine, if possible, within two months after receiving such a response, whether the errors and omissions cited have been addressed satisfactorily and to make public its views in that regard.

We seek to work with you by being as clear and precise as possible about the process and timeline to be followed in responding to the resolution. To that end, we've provided a framework (below) for decision-making, focusing on procedures and timing. Please let us know, in the form of a written response within the week, whether there are any details about which you'd like more discussion or clarification.

Finally, we want to reiterate that SEC believes we all share the common goal of planned growth. For that reason, the Senate has accepted the current parallel processing in which academic planning is conducted in tandem with, rather than in advance of, physical planning. During this process, as the Divisional plans undergo review and final revision, and the academic plan for the campus is solidified, consultation with the Senate enhances the likelihood that growth will be well planned.

Timing

It would be consistent with the spirit and letter of the resolution for you to give SEC the appropriate documents by July 20. If at all possible, though, we would appreciate receiving the documents by our last meeting on June 6, leaving us to figure out how to continue the work over the summer. In either case, SEC is making arrangements to ensure that we have a group of faculty to work, with you, on our behalf, throughout the summer.

Procedure

To address your concern about the possibility of shifting standards, we seek to be clear about the kinds of responses and information we are requesting. We would like written answers to the traffic and housing problems cited in the materials attached to our resolution. You have made the point that financial matters are not part of the EIR. We have countered that the facts about housing inform assumptions about traffic and are thus a legitimate area of focus for an accurate EIR.

Following is an outline of the items in the CPB report, dated December 2, 2005, **Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005** (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/EIRfinalON.pdf>) to which we have asked you to respond, requesting corrections or additional information.

On traffic (counts, times): sections 2.1, 2.3, 2.8

On pedestrian traffic, intersections: 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7

On estimated costs for transportation and parking: section 2.4

On housing (number of units, costs, sites): sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

On housing (Scenario 2 in consultants' report): section 1.4

The above list details the information we request from the Administration, to be provided first to the SEC and then transmitted to the Regents, in ways that are legally appropriate, as part of the process of submitting the LRDP.

We see the revision of the EIR as a key stage in the process of a successful Senate-Administration collaboration. We look forward to working together on the options for planning growth on our campus.

Sincerely,



Faye J. Crosby, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

cc: SEC