

July 14, 2006

David Kliger, Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Charlotte Moreno, Assistant Provost

Dear Dave and Charlotte:

We write, as promised, concerning the LRDP process. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) is gratified at the progress that is being made. We trust that further progress will be made so that we can approve the transmittal of the EIR/LRDP to the Regents as early as September. To meet the particulars of the CPB resolution, SEC (or its delegates) would need to receive the appropriate materials two months in advance of consideration by the Regents. Thus, if you are still thinking of submission for the September 20 -21 Regents meeting, we would need your answers by July 20th or by the 26th if you note that July 26 is eight weeks before the meeting. In the particular case of housing, we recognize that the current process may be unlikely to generate all of the information we seek by July 26th. Thus, we are willing to evaluate information generated by the employee housing planning process that is produced within a time-window sufficient for the Senate to evaluate these materials, but prior to the submission of the LRDP.

Process

We two are the delegates of SEC. We will be calling on the expert help of Onuttom Narayan and Ted Holman. May I remind you that I leave for Europe on July 30? I hope that we can proceed as far as possible in this process before I leave. Please transmit all final materials to the two of us along and to Ted and Onuttom, making sure to copy the Senate office.

Traffic

Concerning traffic, we thank you for working with us and find that a few points still need to be clarified.

1. We need either a commitment from you that parking fees will not be used to fund traffic mitigations and infrastructure, or a clear statement about the types and magnitudes of projects that might be funded using this approach.
2. The response to comment OPA-1-9 notes that vehicular delays on campus due to increased pedestrian traffic might be mitigated in a variety of ways (LRDP Impact TRA-4), but it offers no analysis of the estimated length of such delays and no commitments to mitigate. We need the response to include either an analysis of expected delays to vehicles, or to include a commitment to mitigate once cumulative delays cross some threshold value. We note that such triggers are built in to other parts of the draft EIR, for example in the section on campus water use.
3. The response to comment OP-1-6 (about saturated intersections) should include an analysis of a few key impacted intersections (King and Mission and a few others) using Method B, a slightly more sophisticated approach than the one currently used that calculates delays over the entire period of over-saturation. We recognize that such an analysis is not legally required, but we believe that such an analysis would acknowledge what is intuitively obvious and would thus avoid any appearance that the campus is trying to underestimate the impact of growth. These results could be discussed in narrative fashion in the response to CPB's comment, they need not be incorporated into the body of the final EIR.

Employee Housing

Concerning the employee housing issues, we are cautiously optimistic about the particular consultants you have employed, but are anxious to ensure that the consultants' results make progress towards the Senate's concerns about employee housing. We understand that they will not have a final report ready until October 1, 2006, although a draft is likely to be available sooner. In order to sign off on the LRDP, we need to know some specifics, and see some products of the employee housing planning process.

- 1) We need a plan for how the Brailsford and Dunleavy Report, which we understand will involve strategic recommendations on employee housing, will be translated into an actual Action Plan on employee housing. We would like to understand how the space requirements for on-campus housing will be meaningfully assessed and an action plan produced for generating an adequate number of units. In particular, we need to know how *and when* different constituencies (and particularly the Senate) will have input into the process.
- 2) We need to know what sites the consultants are considering for possible employee housing development.
- 3) We need the administration's written commitment that, should the best opportunities for campus development of employee housing involve different sites than those laid out in the proposed LRDP, amendments to the LRDP will be pursued that would permit development of the most feasible employee housing opportunities.
- 4) We need the administration's written commitment that at least a preliminary analysis of different proposed sites and price-points associated with different proposed sites (and housing options) for faculty-housing (and/or financing techniques) will be available a reasonable amount of time before submission of the LRDP, which the SEC will then be able to evaluate. This timeframe appears to be in accord with that of the draft consultant's report. What do we mean by a preliminary analysis? We mean that you will provide at least two solutions of the form "we could build at site X, constructing Y units of A square feet, which we estimate would cost \$B in today's dollars," where X,Y, A and B are realistic values.

Please let us know at your earliest convenience how you would like to proceed. Thank you.

Sincerely

Faye J. Crosby
Chair

and Quentin Williams
Vice Chair

Cc: Acting Chancellor George Blumenthal
Senate Executive Committee members
Mary-Beth Harhen, Director
Professor Ted Holman
Professor Onuttom Narayan