

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Annual Report, 2005-06

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) worked during the academic year as well as during the summer on issues of concern to the faculty and the entire campus community. Margaret A. Gibson served as chair of CFW in the fall, and Paul Ortiz served as chair in the winter and spring quarters. The committee was ably advised by Pamela Edwards who patiently and wisely guided CFW through transitions in chairs as well as committee members.

This year's committee benefited enormously from being able to draw on the expertise of prior CFW chairs as well as colleagues on other Senate committees. In addition, CFW maintained its longstanding practice of working and consulting with key administrative committees. CFW is especially grateful for the attention that Chancellor Denice Denton paid to our core concerns. Chancellor Denton met with us on several occasions during our tenure, and expressed a willingness to work with the Senate on an ongoing basis to address many of our core problems. We also acknowledge the work of Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor David Kliger who met with CFW members on various occasions in order to strategize on ways to improve the quality of faculty life. In particular, CP/EVC Kliger's initiative providing \$1,000,000 in faculty recruitment and retention funds represents an innovative way of thinking about the challenges faculty face at UCSC.

In the upcoming year we hope to build on our modest successes and more effectively deal with the erosion in the quality of life that faculty at UCSC have been facing over the past several years. The housing crisis, anemic cost-of-living-increases, declining salaries vis-à-vis other universities, high parking fees, and the shortage of childcare facilities on campus have contributed to this erosion.

In addition, CFW is particularly concerned that the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) seems determined to reinstitute employee contributions to our retirement plans. It is likely that the reinstitution of employee contributions will wipe out any gains made by this year's COLA, which was already too low to begin with. While the unions that represent UC lecturers and other employees have taken strong stances about the resumption of employee contributions Senate faculty have yet to decide where they stand on this issue. CFW urges the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate to take this matter into consideration.

In recent years, we have been reminded that the academic and public stature of UCSC has risen dramatically. The rise in our prestige is due in the main to the creativity and work of our faculty and staff. It's time that our salaries and benefits catch up with our stature.

CHILDCARE

Two years ago, in our spring 2004 meeting, the Academic Senate voted in support of a resolution regarding campus childcare. The resolution was based on an extensive survey that demonstrated serious concern about this issue among all sectors of campus—even those individuals who did not have children. The overall finding of this survey was that lack of affordable childcare options on campus was a serious problem for our campus community.

The resolution "urged the UCSC administration to move forward with speed to provide for additional childcare for the campus community, and in particular for the families of faculty and staff." This resolution passed unanimously. Since that time, UCSC has not been able to make satisfactory progress on this issue. Childcare is not an issue. It is a necessity for our colleagues on this campus. It has an impact on recruitment, retention, and quality of life for our faculty and staff.

Princeton President and Microbiologist Shirley Tilghman made a highly publicized speech in March 2005 suggesting that the scarcity of women faculty in the sciences was partly explainable by family-unfriendly policies and the lack of "daycare that is both accessible and affordable." Her *New York Times*-worthy sound bite: "It's daycare, stupid!" More recently, President Tilghman has turned words into action by convening a working group to plan for a significant expansion and improvement of child care at her University.

Our campus lags behind the other UC campuses in child care services. Total demand for campus child care is over 300% of capacity, and the need is especially pronounced for infant and toddler spaces. Currently, there are only two (out of six) infant spaces available for faculty/staff. Furthermore, only four toddler spaces are allocated for faculty/staff, out of a total of twelve available.

In addition to supporting faculty outside the classroom, an expanded child care center at UCSC can provide significant research opportunities for faculty and students.

There is a plan for a proposed new center that would add space for 100 additional children, helping to alleviate this critical need. As reported in CFW's final report for 2000-01, Chancellor MRC Greenwood and Executive Vice Chancellor John Simpson made commitments, for a total of \$1.5 million, and UCOP agreed to provide matching funds of \$1 million for this new center. Still no substantial progress has been made. It's time to ask ourselves why this is the case, and it is up to the campus to explain to faculty and staff why additional childcare slots are not forthcoming in the near future.

There is some positive work to report on in this area. The members of the Child Care Advisory Committee (CCAC) are a dedicated group and are to be highly commended for their continuing work to raise awareness of the issues related to child care. It was an honor and a pleasure to work with this extraordinary group of individuals. After a lengthy effort and much revision, the CCAC's pending Child Care Access Policy brings much

needed clarity to the existing admissions practice at UCSC child care facilities. The policy, however, is only an intermediary step. At present, faculty and staff access is still limited by existing funding and administrative structures. Some initial steps were explored during the academic year (seeking off-campus facilities) but did not come to fruition.

For the 2005-06 academic year faculty access increased modestly as there was less student demand. However, this increase did little to alleviate the critical need on the part of faculty and staff. Difficulty in getting access to a clear budgetary picture, a confusing wait-list process, and the fact that faculty child care issues (just as with housing) are administratively managed by Student Affairs created some obstacles that should be addressed if the campus is going to move forward on the issue of child care.

Given that faculty and staff child care is such a critical campus issue perhaps it is time to reassess its administrative home (Student Affairs) and the way in which it is currently funded. At present, the perception is that current faculty and staff child care access is subsidized by student funding. In fact the budget is much more complex as it includes state subsidies for low-income families (for which students receive priority over faculty and staff), some 19900 funding, and faculty and staff parent funds in addition to the student fee funds. Thus, a crucial question for this committee is whether there is a need, as part of the planning process on child care, to centrally fund and administer the campus Child Care Service in a way that addresses faculty and staff needs and concerns equally with the needs and concerns of students?

CFW, in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and CCAC, should take responsibility for the development of a structured faculty, lecturer, and post-doc wait list and procedures for selection; Staff Advisory Board should do the same for staff. Develop a plan whereby academic and administrative units are assigned "slots" which may be "sold" on a one-time basis to other units (it appears that the greatest need is among the "Sciences", followed by administrative staff, and then other academic units). This option would be especially useful for short duration post-doc situations.

A significant area of concern for academic and administrative families (i.e., faculty, post-docs, lecturers and staff) is that provisions should be made to financially support a family's access to seek off-campus child care facilities when campus facilities are at capacity (this could be a development project). Finally, the CCAC should re-assess current policy giving priority to students for governmental subsidies; we may want to expand opportunities for single parent household (faculty/staff/post doc etc) who fall into the "eligible" categories for governmental support (i.e., low-income housing, food and medical assistance, etc.) and thus may be eligible for child care grants.

Child Care should become a major campaign in the campus' academic fundraising efforts. When compared to the efforts of Cabrillo College, the University of California, Santa Cruz has failed extraordinarily its faculty and staff in this area. A move to joint Senate/Administrative oversight of both the Child Care unit and the Child Care Advisory Committee would be a welcome start in redressing the child care shortage on campus.

PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION

CFW is allotted two representatives who sit on UCSC's Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). From CFW's vantage point the structure of the parking system—as well as shared governance in this area—is broken. We are a campus with aging faculty and staff with steadily increasing mobility challenges and yet it appears that UCSC has decided to make core parking a thing of the distant past. We pay ever-increasing fees, now approaching \$800 per year, for fewer and fewer spaces. As one UCSC staff wit put it, "And for all that money, we don't get a parking permit, we get a hunting license -- the right to hunt for a space." We also absorbed an unannounced increase in bus pass fees this year.

TAPS staff are exceptionally professional, well prepared, and helpful, but they are burdened with solving problems that are essentially unsolvable. The issues over which the TAC has any democratic say are extremely limited, and the structure of TAC -- with undergraduate, graduate, staff, and faculty representatives voting --mitigates against faculty having any real influence over the parking issues that affect them.

This became clear in a series of TAC meetings this year during which the TAPS staff proposed issuing "B" permits at the same cost and offering the same access as the "A" permit. The CFW representative inquired as to what problem was being solved by this proposal. TAPS staff informed him that graduate students paid the same as faculty for parking permits but were not given the same access to parking lots. In response, the CFW rep made the following case.

UCSC faculty are usually fierce advocates for their graduate students' interests, and many if not most are also critical of hierarchical structures which privilege one group over others. That said, however, the most basic purpose of the university is to bring students into contact with faculty, and reducing faculty's ability to park conflicts with that purpose. The regents and taxpayers do not want their highest paid employees spending their time riding around looking for parking spaces. More importantly, faculty are on average twice as old as graduate students, with older bones, backs, and muscles. Faculty have far more infirmities and they teach more often than teaching assistants, which means they have a greater per capita need for parking. Therefore, the CFW rep moved, the ostensible unfairness created by charging graduate students the same high parking fees for a "B" permit as faculty and staff pay for an "A" permit should be solved by reducing the fees charged for a "B" permit rather than increasing grad student access to faculty/staff "A" lots. This argument was put in the form of a motion, graciously accepted by the graduate student representatives, and was voted for unanimously by the TAC.

In subsequent meetings, however, this decision came undone. It seems that TAPS staff informed the graduate representatives that they would only be able to reduce the price of a parking sticker by a small amount, so the grad reps rescinded their support for the CFW rep's motion. TAPS put the issue back on the TAC agenda and an alternate motion was

passed which allowed graduate students access to all "A" lots. In the end, then, what determined the fate of faculty parking was TAPS fiscal calculation of what *they* "needed" to charge for a "B" sticker -- not the merits of the case as argued by the CFW representative to TAPS. The extant policy for 2006-07 is to charge graduate students the same as faculty for parking, to allow them to park anywhere faculty can park, and to monitor the impact of this new policy. That the structure of the TAC and the apparently greater underlying power of TAPS led to this policy being passed over the initially persuasive arguments of the CFW representative was a source of deep frustration.

As the 2005-06 year ended, one CFW representative in a moment of frustration proposed that since we have no effective say over the parking policies that affect us, we should no longer participate in the TAC. CFW calls on the campus administration to explain to the Academic Senate why TAPS sets parking fees without broader, serious input (TAC doesn't seem to count). There seems to me to be an apparent conflict of interest insofar as TAPS in effect gets to set whatever fee structure it needs to fund its own budget. But if that budget consists of our fees, then we ought to know a great deal more about how TAPS spends that money -- e.g., salaries, travel, etc.

In addition, if there are UC systemwide policies or understandings that hamper our ability to achieve affordable parking fees at Santa Cruz then it is the responsibility of the administration and the Senate to examine such policies and to consider revisions if necessary in tandem with UCOP. It no longer suffices to blame old policies for current conundrums. Innovation in this area is a necessity.

SALARIES

Overall, UC faculty salaries significantly lag those at other public and private institutions with which we compete; according to the Mercer report, submitted to the UC Regents in fall 2005, salaries lag our comparison institutions by 15%. In addition our housing costs are for the most part far higher than in other parts of the country. A report prepared for the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and CFW by the administration also shows that faculty salaries at UC Santa Cruz are in many cases significantly lower than the salaries paid at our sister UC campuses to colleagues of comparable rank and step.

UCSC faculty successfully compete in the professional world with faculty from the most prestigious universities in the world. It is time that our salaries reflect this fact. The failure of the University of California to grant meaningful Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA's) to faculty over the past several years represents a *de facto* wage cut. CFW worked during the year to achieve a broad consensus that something significant must be done to bring the overall faculty salary scale into the twenty-first century. We heard from numerous departmental chairs as well as divisional deans that the current system of giving selected faculty off-scale salaries to offset our overall decline in earning power is costly and has damaged morale. The current dysfunctional salary system creates an incentive for faculty to "shop around" and solicit job offers from competing institutions. At the baseline, the administration as well as the Senate now appears to accept the proposition that faculty salaries need to be increased. However, UCSC must also consider

the impacts of the proposed changes in our retirement and health care plans that may erode salary increases.

HOUSING

The crisis in faculty housing remains acute. Many colleagues are living in over-crowded conditions, and cannot afford to purchase homes. CFW is frustrated at the slow progress (and expense) of the Ranch View Terrace (RVT) development. UCSC is increasingly losing potential faculty hires to housing costs vis-à-vis our competitors. The days when a potential faculty recruit would choose Santa Cruz over a competing institution due to the beauty of the Central Coast are long gone. And yet, we are still only just now catching up to the reality that the median price of housing in this area is well over \$700,000 dollars.

CFW was able to work with the Senate and the administration to make some modest progress in this area. In the past year, CFW has continued to work towards creating a viable housing plan for the campus. The successes we have had are the following:

- 1) RVT will start construction soon and we have established a fair method for housing lot allocations.
- 2) A new million-dollar program has been established to help faculty financially afford the high cost of housing in Santa Cruz.
- 3) A schedule for a Master Housing Plan has been established and the first step is almost complete, a detailed report of the current problem and possible solutions.
- 4) CFW has worked with the SEC and the administration in response to the Senate resolution to rectify the deficiencies of the campus EIR with respect to employee housing.

The challenges for the next year will focus primarily on utilizing the new housing report to establish a Master Housing Plan for UCSC. This will entail extensive discussions with the administration to determine which recommendations in the report will be applied to UCSC. A detailed timeline has already been established with CP/EVC Kliger and now we will need to implement it. Of special concern is the way in which site preparation costs are budgeted. Under the current model, these costs are ultimately passed on to potential buyers. Given the stagnation of faculty salaries this model is untenable, and reforms are necessary.

LRDP and EIR

CFW weighed in extensively over the year on issues surrounding the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as well as the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). We will attach here a copy of CFW's report on the EIR that was submitted in the winter quarter. (See Appendix One).

CFW looks forward to enhanced cooperation between the Academic Senate and the administration on quality of life issues, and we hope to work together to solve the many

challenges facing our campus. CFW calls on the administration and the Senate to place a special emphasis on examining and refining shared governance in all areas that impact our work lives particularly transportation and childcare. We also hope that the administration continues to move forward with improved plans to ensure that faculty and staff have access to affordable housing.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Ted Holman

Margo Hendricks

David Marriott

Craig Reinerman

Slawek Tulaczyk (W, S)

Hongyun Wang (F)

Manfred Warmuth (W, S)

Margaret A. Gibson, Chair (F)

Paul Ortiz, Chair (W, S)

November 2, 2006

Appendix One: CFW Response to the EIR

January 8, 2006

CFW Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005:

The members of the UC Santa Cruz Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) offer these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) of the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). The contact person for further consultation is Professor Paul Ortiz, CFW chair and member of the Community Studies Department, UCSC.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The Committee on Faculty Welfare concurs with the concerns and analysis of the EIR offered by the UC Santa Cruz Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget in its December 2, 2005 report titled "Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005."

CFW wants to especially amplify one of CPB's concluding points: UCSC must "Acknowledge that on-campus housing is a mitigation for growth, and provide commitments to build a specified amount of housing, with information on how housing will be phased relative to growth, and with criteria to indicate when on-campus housing construction would be suspended because of surplus housing in the off-campus market."

In common with CPB, the Committee on Faculty Welfare has serious concerns (and doubts) over the administration's current analyses of future potential traffic flows on campus. We believe that Section 4 of the EIR does not provide a remotely realistic appraisal of what the traffic flows on this campus will be like with proposed growth.

In the past several years, issues that are germane to the EIR such as housing, childcare, and transportation have been the subject of intense communication between CFW and the administration of UCSC. Our continuing inability to formulate a viable faculty and staff housing plan—and deliver adequate childcare facilities for children of UCSC faculty and staff—is a serious impediment to the future prospect of growth at UCSC.

If history serves as even a partial guide, the growth levels proposed by the administration will do nothing to help our campus "grow out" of the current quality of life problems faced by UCSC faculty members—especially junior faculty members. Simply put, growth without adequate planning has not benefited faculty in the past; nor will it help faculty recruitment or the campus in the future. It is critical that the current administration reformulate its growth plan in a manner that makes adequate provision for housing, childcare as well as transportation infrastructure.

CFW's comments on the EIR pertain to three major issues:

1. HOUSING

1.1 Housing on campus

The LRDP calls for 21,000 students by 2020, which is approximately 7,000 more than today or a 50% increase over what we have today (not counting a roughly 5-fold increase in summer session students). As stated in the LRDP and EIR, 50% of these additional students, along with 25% of graduate students and 25% of faculty, are expected to be housed on campus. The housing analysis assumes that 125 new employee units will be built in addition to the 84 units already approved but not yet built in the Ranch View Terrace Development. However, the plan offers no guarantee that the houses will be built or that they will be offered to faculty at a price that faculty can afford. As noted in the University's November 23, 2005, Employee Housing Report, the housing market in Santa Cruz is one of the least affordable in the nation and as a result many employees, including almost all new faculty members, "face significant economic challenges to purchasing a home in this market." Hence, should the EIR plan for more than 125 additional employee units? If they are made available at an affordable price, faculty will

choose to live in them. If they are not affordable, then faculty will not live in them, and the campus will be unable to attract and retain new faculty, unless there is adequate off-campus housing available.

While the EIR proposes to house 25% of the faculty on campus it makes no firm commitment to build this housing or to provide this housing at a cost that new faculty members can afford on their salaries. If on-campus housing is viewed as an environmental mitigation, then it is imperative that the EIR include a commitment to provide on-campus housing for 25% of the faculty at a cost that faculty members can afford. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "The generally accepted definition of affordability is for a household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing. Families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care" (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development <http://www.hud.gov/offices/hsg/omhar/index.cfm>). Since most of the new faculty will be hired at the Assistant Professor level, this means that for housing to be affordable, it should cost no more than 30% of an assistant professor's gross salary. The EIR needs to specify whether faculty housing will be built and will be affordable to new faculty hired at the assistant professor level. It also needs to specify when this housing will be available. What is the time schedule for building the new faculty housing? Will the new employee housing be dependent upon the building of the North Loop Road? When will this be built? Will new faculty housing be phased in, with some new units available each year, to accommodate the growth in faculty? If the University is not able to build affordable housing on campus that is available when new faculty members are recruited, then where will the new faculty live?

1.2 Housing off-campus. Even assuming that 25% of the new and replacement faculty will in fact be housed on campus, then 75% of the new and replacement will need to find housing off-campus, either in Santa Cruz County or elsewhere. What is the total number of new and replacement faculty who will need housing each year from now until 2020? How many of them are expected to live in the City of Santa Cruz? How many in the County? And how many will need to commute from outside of the county due to a lack of affordable housing within the County? Most importantly, given the lack of availability and affordability of housing in Santa Cruz County, is it realistic to assume that they will in fact find housing in Santa Cruz City or County? If not, where is it expected that they will live?

2. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

To reiterate: The LRDP calls for 21,000 students by 2020, which is approximately 7,000 more than today or a 50% increase over what we have today (not counting a roughly 5-fold increase in summer session students). The LRDP calls for 21,000 students by 2020, which is approximately 7,000 more or nearly a 50% increase over what we have today (not counting a roughly 5-fold increase in summer session students). Fifty percent of these additional students, along with 25% of graduate students and 25% of faculty, are

expected to be housed on campus. While the LRDP proposes that this growth occur gradually over the years, there is no way around the fact that it will require constant construction and disruption that will fundamentally change the campus as we know it, and the community of Santa Cruz as well. Moreover, this will be on top of the growth we have already had in the past decade, which we are still far from catching up with in terms of housing, classrooms, faculty hiring, etc.

With specific regard to traffic issues, the EIR analyzes the new roads, stop lights, bike lanes, bus runs, and 3,100 net new parking spaces proposed to mitigate the impact of the increased traffic expected (p. 4-28). The EIR analysis of current traffic counts (2003-04 data) indicates that existing levels of service (LOS) on streets and at intersections on and around campus are already marked by unacceptable congestion and delays. More to the point, the EIR concludes that even with the LRDP accommodations, the proposed growth will cause significant impacts at roughly half the key intersections leading to and from campus (e.g., p. 4-24, 4-40). Indeed, even if all the proposed improvements by the City of Santa Cruz were to be completed on time, the EIR estimates that levels of service at the four most crucial intersections leading on and off campus would still be unacceptable (E or F on their A-F scale; p. 4-47). With reduced funding coming from Sacramento to local governments, there is reason to doubt that the City will be able to put in place the many improvements called for (p. 4-14 -- 4-19) in a timely manner.

2.1. Commute time to campus.

The campus's ability to recruit and retain new faculty members depends not only on the availability of affordable and adequate housing but also on the time it will take faculty members to commute from their homes to campus. Although the EIR predicts that traffic will be slowed at many off-campus intersections, it offers no information on the overall increase in commute time for those living in the county, or the commute time for those who must live outside the county due to lack of affordable housing. For example, how much longer will it take to commute to and from campus at peak and off-peak hours as a result of the growth and increased congestion? The EIR could address this by providing overall commute times between two given points, for example, from (1) the intersection at Soquel and Ocean Street to the East Remote parking lot on campus and back, or from (2) Aptos Village to the East Remote parking lot and back, or (3) from downtown Watsonville to East Remote parking and back. Will a trip that now takes 30 minutes increase to 45 minutes? Or an hour?

2.2. Commute time on campus.

The LRDP calls for replacing close-in faculty and staff parking lots on campus with remote faculty and staff parking. Once faculty members reach campus, how much additional time will it take them to reach their offices from the remote parking lots? How frequently will there be shuttles? Will there be space on the shuttles in peak hours for faculty to reach their offices without delay? How much will parking fees increase to pay for the new parking lots and additional shuttles? In other words, will the on-campus parking be affordable? And will it be efficient in the sense that faculty members are not

greatly delayed in reaching their offices once they arrive on campus? Moreover, what provisions will be made for faculty to park close to their offices when they need to transport instructional and research materials to their offices, as many faculty members do on a regular (often daily) basis? Again, faculty well being is directly affected by these issues.

Using the most optimistic projections in the LRDP as evaluated by the EIR, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there will be substantially longer delays at most key intersections within two or more miles of campus for extended periods during both morning and afternoon peaks. Leaving aside the impact on neighbors, adding up the delays estimated by the EIR for the intersections along typical routes to campus indicates that commute times from within the City of Santa Cruz will increase dramatically and could easily double -- even with proposed mitigations.

Therefore, the Committee on Faculty Welfare is deeply concerned that the proposed growth will strain the community's carrying capacity to the breaking point, amplifying the resentments so many of UCSC's neighbors already feel. Faculty are members of the community as well as of the campus, and for all its very thoughtful and creative analyses, the EIR offers scant assurance that the impacts of the proposed growth will not be deeply deleterious.

3.3. CHILDCARE

The large majority of new and replacement faculty will be young and it is reasonable to assume that many if not most will have children. Yet the EIR makes no mention of expanded child care facilities on campus for faculty and staff. If faculty and staff members living on campus must leave campus to transport children to and from child care, this will increase the traffic congestion and needs to be calculated in the traffic models. More importantly, we view the availability of on-campus childcare facilities to be essential to the campus's ability to recruit and retain new faculty. The EIR needs to address what provisions will be made to provide adequate and affordable childcare facilities and services for faculty and staff, as well as students. Although the University has stated that childcare is a high campus priority, the EIR does not provide adequate details about the specific number of additional childcare spaces that will be provided through on-campus childcare to faculty and staff.

HISTORY AS A GUIDEPOST

At the time the 1988 LRDP was adopted, the University committed to attempting to reach a goal of housing 70 percent of its students on campus. While the 1988 LRDP did not deal with faculty and/or staff housing, it was also widely recognized at that time that the campus was confronting a crisis in faculty housing since housing prices were already beginning to reach unaffordable levels for assistant and associate professors and that future recruitment of junior faculty would be jeopardized as a result.

Since that time, the campus has not only never approached the 70 percent promise; it has never achieved 50 percent. Faculty and staff housing on campus has languished and market-priced housing is currently accessible only to full professors or junior faculty members who have substantial private resources. Student enrollments under the draft LRDP and EIR provide no guarantee that the campus has begun to confront what is already a genuine crisis. Not only will the experience of the past -- throwing more housing into the community with a concomitant pressure for housing price increases -- not resolve the student problem, it will continue to exacerbate the cost of housing, rental or purchase, for potential faculty. If the problems that were acknowledged in the 1988 LRDP are not finally confronted, then the current EIR and LRDP under review is headed for failure.

CONCLUSION

The Committee on Faculty Welfare looks forward to working with the administration in dealing candidly with these formidable issues. Our letter has raised serious concerns with the EIR. However, we believe that the current review process provides our community with an invaluable opportunity to address systemic problems that have hampered faculty and campus welfare in the past. The time to seriously address housing, childcare, and transportation is now. We would be remiss if we did not seize upon this opportunity to create a better campus for faculty, staff, and students as well as the larger Santa Cruz and Central Coast communities that we are all a part of.