

November 7, 2004

Interim CPEVC Peggy Delaney
Chancellors Office

Re: Senate Review of 2005 LRDP Documents

Dear Peggy,

Attached please find the responses of the Senate committees who chose to review the preliminary draft of the LRDP. As you can see, their letters are too extensive to compile into a single document. I will, however, attempt to provide an overview of some of the major issues presented.

Growth of the campus

The foremost concern in the growth of the campus is the choice of a 21,000 student enrollment envelope. The review of this number by the Senate was delayed due to the late issue of the final Strategic Futures Committee report, by which time it had already been incorporated into the LRDP decision-making. While we realize that this is the “envelope” for maximum growth, all too often “envelopes” become “targets” without further discussion. This is particularly true in times of changing leadership. The Senate expects and insists upon further discussions that will allow integration of future academic planning with the decisions to incrementally increase our student population.

One of the critical factors governing the growth of the campus population will be our ability to attract and retain faculty. Housing above that projected in the current draft is felt to be essential as are more defined child care facilities (see CFW, CAAD reports). The Senate has clearly stated that childcare facilities are absolutely necessary for our faculty. Furthermore such housing needs to be located near suitable facilities and be affordable to our staff and faculty.

On the academic front, the need for larger lecture halls was noted (CEP report). Often, in the actual design of new buildings, larger lecture halls are trimmed. However, with a larger campus and the continuing commitment by the faculty to maintain smaller courses wherever possible, large lectures become a necessary trade-off. Well-designed and equipped halls allow teaching without substantially affecting quality of the experience. These should also be made a priority.

The campus community itself is very diverse and has diverse needs. Many of the suggestions put forward by the draft LRDP do not acknowledge this diversity. The CAAD letter focuses on this issue and can usefully point to potential problems should this plan be implemented. I would add that the widespread nature of the campus as it is presently adversely affects certain segments of the community disproportionately. If this trend continues as promised by the draft LRDP, we stand to reach the breaking point.

The location and quantity of research space is a significant concern to faculty. One problem not addressed in the draft LRDP is the problem of power shutdowns (planned and unplanned) and

the negative consequences to scientific research. Additional information is needed as to how this will be rectified as the campus expands northward.

The nature of the Graduate College appears to have undergone an adjustment between the definitions of the SFC and the incorporation into the draft LRDP. More intensive Senate involvement in SFC allowed a better reflection of how the faculty envisioned this entity, as a combination of housing, academic support and spaces for smaller classes or gatherings. Why this was dropped has not been a matter for Senate consultation and should be.

The term Campus Resource Land (CRL) proved problematic for many committees. The current broad definition of potential uses of these areas as well as the locations of the sites themselves raised a number of red flags. Similarly the possibility of development of the Historic District appears permissible under the draft LRDP and was disputed. We believe that there is no substantial change in the campus natural reserve from prior planning documents.

Discrepancies between this document and other planning documents was noted, particularly in the ability to locate adequate square footage in the designated areas. In particular the report on the core capacity should be meshed with the draft LRDP.

Environmental and community impact

While it is recognized that many environmental impact and mitigation issues lie outside the arena of the LRDP, the Senate often found it difficult to assess the current document without any concept of how feasible the suggestions would be. Traffic management is seen as crucial and may actually prove to be a deciding factor over campus growth.

The use of off-campus locations to help alleviate some of the congestions is not addressed in this document. In particular, the absence of any discussion of 2300 Delaware (formerly known as the TI Building) was noted and felt to be a significant omission.

Financial considerations

Financial concerns about the possible implementation of this plan are highlighted by CPB's report. Essentially there is considerable doubt that the funding needed to build the infrastructure for the northern expansion will be forthcoming. There are two options if we continue on a northward expansion, obviously simplified. The first is to prioritize building in the core but this not only changes the quality of our campuses but also probably guarantees that no funding for expansion will be found. Second, we could prioritize building northward so that we could assess the willingness for additional money to be allocated. If it is not, then we may be unable to accept additional students.

Obviously, only certain units will be seen as attractions warranting investment in infrastructure by UCOP and the state. It is of deep concern to a number of committees that "self-supporting" units such as employee housing and childcare will be neglected despite growth because these are not seen as sufficient to earn money for the infrastructure needed to support them. CPB raises the possibility that other options for non-academic core building be explored.

Road construction itself is a major investment. Not only is the funding for the North Road in question, but even the Meyer extension, with two bridges, seems problematic. While this is needed to ease congestion and minimize the possibility of vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, the Meyer Road expansion is unconnected to an increase in academic core building that is not already possible under the current road configuration.

Transportation and parking also need careful consideration in terms of financing. Since currently parking structures and lots are financed by parking fees, the ability to build new spaces will depend on how much the market will bear in terms of increased parking fees. However, as people shift to other modes of transportation in response to higher parking fees, a major source of funding for these alternatives also declines.

A very similar situation arises with student housing. The construction of sufficient units to house 50% of the students also increases the cost per unit. As the margin between on- and off-campus housing increases, it will be increasingly difficult to fill the on-campus units. Alternative methods of financing housing or filling housing should be considered. Graduate student housing is also outpacing affordability and hinders the ability to construct a graduate college of any nature, let alone recruit new graduate students to the campus.

Overall, there was a commendation on this first draft of the LRDP and the opportunity to comment at this period was welcomed. The Senate raises a number of issues, some relatively minor and others foundational. We welcome the release of the next version.

Sincerely,



Alison Galloway, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: CAAD Chair Pandey
CAFA Chair Coe
CEP Chair Hughey
CFW Chair Anderson
COR Chair Aissen
CPB Chair Koch
COT Chair McDowell
GC Chair Schumm