

February 9, 2004

Gary Griggs, Chair
LRDP Strategic Futures Committee

Dear Gary,

I am writing to you in your capacity as chair of the Strategic Futures Committee. I am on the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), on whose behalf I am writing. I primarily deal with issues regarding parking and transportation, and write this letter as CFW's parking "expert."

I understand that your committee and others are considering appropriate goals for enrollment growth at this campus. I am concerned that such goals should not be decoupled from a consideration of whether adequate state and private funds will be available for the accompanying expansion in infrastructure. Without such an analysis, I fear that once enrollment targets are set, they will be reached even if resources are not available, leading to a degradation of facilities on campus.

For transportation and parking, under the present system of financing, the larger population would be faced with the unhappy choice of one or more of

- a) building more parking lots (at current construction costs).
- b) more incentives to people to use alternative transportation, so that the demand for parking does not increase
- c) more signal lights, bigger bus stops, etc.

all of which would be paid from parking fees and student fees, and would increase them per user. (There would also be increased congestion on roads on and around campus, which are already close to saturation at rush hour.) Unless there is a change in the way these expenses are paid for, one would need to consider whether growth is desirable.

While the examples I have discussed naturally deal with transportation issues, the impact of growth will obviously be much broader.

Even if it is not feasible for a detailed analysis of budgetary requirements to be made at present, it might be reasonable to say something like "an enrolment increase of X would require infrastructure expansion A, B and C. If funds for this are not forthcoming from state or private sources, this enrolment increase would not be appropriate." For instance, X might depend on whether funds are provided for the creation of North Campus and all the changes this would entail. (At a recent presentation by transportation consultants Urbitran, future projections were based on a substantial number of students being housed in North Campus; there were no projections for what would happen if this scenario did not materialize.) At a more modest level, more people in the central campus region might require new pedestrian sidewalks and bike paths,

new signal lights and more shuttles to carry people around campus, for which funds would be necessary.

Perhaps this is something that you are already considering, in which case the comments above are (fortunately) superfluous. Perhaps this is not in your purview. If so, I hope that some committee --- with adequate faculty representation --- is considering this matter, and we do not end up with unconditional growth targets.

If you would like to discuss any of this further, please let me know.

Best wishes,

Onuttom Narayan
For the Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Alison Galloway, Senate Chair
Bob Meister, Committee on Planning and Budget Chair
Wes Scott, LRDP Transportation/Circulation Work Group Chair
Jean Marie Scott, LRDP Housing/Student Life Work Group Chair