

Committee on Planning and Budget
Resolution on the 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and its
Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Introduction:

Analysis by the Committee on Planning and Budget suggests that the LRDP/draft EIR analysis of the impact of growth to 21,000 students may have flaws in at least two areas: traffic and housing. CPB has not analyzed other aspects of the draft EIR, and therefore is not expressing an opinion about them. CPB's analysis is summarized in sections 1 and 2 below. Most of the points summarized are drawn from two CPB reports: "Report on the Long Range Development Plan"¹ <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/CPBLRDPPrpt1451.pdf> and "Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005".² <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/EIRfinalON.pdf>. Thus the administration has been aware of CPB's concerns about these issues for some time. Insofar as the EIR process is concerned, CPB's comments on the LRDP/draft EIR were made by the members of CPB acting in their individual capacities as members of the public. CPB believes this to be the appropriate time for the Academic Senate officially to consider the issues CPB has raised.

The resolution calls upon the administration to provide to the Senate Executive Committee an official written response to the issues summarized in the resolution before transmitting the LRDP/EIR to the Regents for approval and to make such a transmission no earlier than the November Regents meeting. In section 3 below, CPB suggests procedures to be followed if the Senate approves this resolution. As indicated in section 3, CPB suggests that the administration's written response be contained in a separate memo to the SEC as well as in the final EIR itself.

CPB wishes to emphasize that the current resolution is not opposed to campus growth. Growth could be beneficial for UCSC if planned in such a way as to bring resources to campus that create new opportunities for students and faculty and strengthen existing programs without degrading the quality of life. If poorly planned, however, growth can lead to inadequate facilities, long commuter delays, long lists of faculty and staff waiting for affordable housing, and degradation of the environment.

CPB also wishes to emphasize that it does not consider the LRDP/EIR a commitment or obligation for UCSC to grow. It is a plan that looks at the impact of *potential* growth. It creates a framework for action should a decision be made that growth to a particular size or in a particular direction would be beneficial. Even as a framework, however, the LRDP/EIR should provide a reasonably accurate and reasonably complete picture of the implications of growth for the campus and surrounding community.

The Senate has repeatedly been told that issues of finance are not within the purview of the LRDP process: the LRDP is a land-use plan and the EIR examines the environmental

¹ Committee on Planning and Budget "Spring 2005 LRDP" April 14, 2005. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/>

² Committee on Planning and Budget Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005 December 2, 2005. <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/>

implications thereof, without regard to the financial consequences of possible growth for individual faculty members or for UCSC as a whole.³ However, some of the parking (and other transportation improvements) and on-campus housing proposed in the LRDP should be considered essential for the proposed growth, not just an outer envelope of possibilities. Moreover, the costs of these will be borne by employees and students rather than the university. We also note that the feasibility or infeasibility of proposed on-campus housing has direct and indirect environmental impacts, and is therefore relevant for the EIR. Apart from the obvious impact on the off-campus housing market, traffic patterns will be affected if only a small portion of employees and students can live on campus. Conversely, maximal on campus housing could have deleterious effects on water consumption and waste production. Therefore, it is appropriate to ask now about the financial impact one might reasonably expect for housing and traffic.

1.0 Traffic

1.1 Traffic external to the university

As explained in the CPB report "Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report of 2005", <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/EIRfinalON.pdf> the draft EIR's analysis of vehicular traffic delays appears to be compromised by serious internal inconsistencies and misapplications of stated methodologies.⁴ It is clear nonetheless that delays at severely impacted street intersections will be much worse than predicted in the draft EIR. For example, in working with the data provided in the draft EIR, CPB found the delay at the King/Mission intersection at the end of one hour of rush hour traffic to be approximately twenty minutes. Quantitative analyses of other intersections are not possible at this stage because the exact methodology applied in draft EIR is obscured by inconsistencies in application and opaque notation.

1.2 Traffic internal to the university

The draft EIR fails to analyze expected delays for vehicles due to increased pedestrian traffic in 2020; only present conditions are given. Currently the key pedestrian crossings on campus are nearly saturated at peak load. The LRDP proposes increasing campus population by a factor of approximately 1.5. While the delay at each individual intersection may be tolerable, CPB believes that this factor should be calculated for multiple intersections and considered as a factor in the cumulative vehicular delay.

1.3 Cumulative traffic delays in a common commute

The draft EIR considers vehicular delays due to vehicular and pedestrian congestions at individual intersections. The document fails, however, to consider the cumulative delay that would be encountered at rush hour in a commute, for example, from the top of campus to downtown Santa Cruz. In the absence of accurate analyses of the delays at each intersection CPB is unable to provide a cumulative figure but regards such calculations as essential to a reasonable evaluation of the environmental impact of the proposed growth.

1.4 Financials for parking facilities

³ However, as noted by CPB earlier, even Long Range Development Plans are expected to usually include guidelines for implementation. <http://www.ucop.edu/facil/fmc/facilman/volume2/ch3.html>

⁴ There is a typographical error in item 2.1 of CPB's "Comments on the Draft EIR"; "intersection 10" should be replaced with "intersection 2".

Financial feasibility is not a required aspect of the environmental report and therefore no financial analysis is provided in the LRDP or draft EIR. In the absence of such analysis, however, and because parking and transit costs are paid for by student and user fees, CPB is seriously concerned that the parking structures projected in the LRDP and other costs could raise faculty and student parking fees beyond reason. This is despite the fact that parking will be moved to the periphery of campus, with close in parking substantially reduced by infill development. CPB's rough estimate suggests that parking fees could increase by more than 40% in today's dollars.⁵ CPB would like the administration to conduct a similar analysis to confirm or refute CPB's estimate.

2.0 Housing

2.1 Number of units needed on campus for employee housing

Section 4.11 of the draft EIR assumes that non-university people will not compete with university affiliates looking for off-campus housing. It also assumes that rents and sale prices will not increase relative to affordability levels for UCSC students and employees.⁶ Both these assumptions are offered in face of the fact that the demand for housing is predicted to significantly exceed the supply in Santa Cruz city and county.

CPB believes that a reasoned estimate of the numbers of UCSC students and employees who will be forced to live outside Santa Cruz county if the growth proposed in the LRDP occurs would show that the problem will be much worse than predicted in the draft EIR, and would support a case for more housing on campus than proposed in the draft EIR.

2.2 Adequacy of land set aside for employee housing

The LRDP proposes that 125 units be constructed on 27 acres designated for new employee housing. CPB estimates that the need for on-campus housing will be much greater. CPB's "Report on the Long Range Development Plan"

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/CPBLRDPrt1451.pdf> demonstrates that, given the currently proposed constraints on land and CPB's estimate of the number of housing units needed, the density of the newly proposed on-campus housing will be significantly higher than the density of existing employee housing on campus. The CPB "Report on the Long Range Development Plan" notes that, in the absence of an actual analysis, the designated 27 acres for new employee housing in the LRDP may in fact be inadequate. CPB is aware that some employee housing may be constructed or purchased off-campus, but CPB would like the administration to recommend alternate on-campus locations for additional faculty-staff housing units.

2.3 Affordability of proposed employee housing on campus

2.3a Infrastructure costs

⁵ There is a numerical error in CPB's "Comments on the Draft EIR" on this point. Our corrected estimate is 40%.

⁶ These assumptions are given in a document cited in Section 4.11 of the EIR: "*Bay Area Economics 2005 LRDP Housing Impact Analysis Memorandum*". This document provides the technical details of the housing analysis in the EIR. The assumptions are stated on pages 7, 16 and 17 of the memorandum. The analysis assumes that if 100 UCSC affiliates want to buy houses in a particular price range and 50 houses are available, all 50 will be bought by UCSC affiliates, who will never be outbid by non-university people, which is unrealistic. The number of university affiliates who will be unable to obtain housing will therefore be much higher than the EIR estimates. The memorandum claims that UCSC employees have a higher median household income than for the county overall, giving UCSC employees a competitive advantage in bidding for housing. This is a specious argument, since the memorandum divides the population into categories based on buying power and analyzes each category separately. Within a category, there is no competitive advantage for UCSC employees.

The location of planned employee housing in the proposed North Campus may make the houses unaffordable. As explained in CPB's response to the first draft of the LRDP, there is a strong possibility that no academic buildings will be built on the North Campus during the planning period, even though land will be set-aside for them. Thus most or all of the infrastructural costs for the North Campus are liable to be charged to housing projects (both student and employee housing).

2.3b Construction costs

Even if employee housing projected in the LRDP does not have to bear infrastructural costs, the proposed on-campus housing may still be too expensive. Ranch View Terrace, which is presently being developed, is already out of reach of most assistant professors. Reasonable projections of construction costs and faculty salaries suggest that this situation could grow worse. Thus our present model, in which the university builds and sells employee housing at below market rates, could soon become unworkable. Some basic analysis and planning is needed — not only for employee housing, but also for student housing — to determine how these problems might be overcome. CPB is encouraged that CPEVC Kliger has requested a study and plan for faculty/staff housing by September 2006, but notes that prior requests have yielded clear analyses of the problems and constraints, but no plans or solutions.

3.0 Procedures to follow if the Academic Senate approves the proposed resolution

The resolution calls upon the administration to provide to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) a written response to the issues summarized in the resolution before transmitting the LRDP/EIR to the Regents for approval. In order for SEC to proceed, in a reasoned fashion within the academic year, to examine the administration's response and to consider the implications of the mitigation measures that are ultimately proposed, we request that the LRDP/EIR not be transmitted for consideration by the Regents any earlier than the November 2006 meeting. Upon receipt of a response from the administration, whether contained in a memo to the SEC or in the final EIR, the SEC can determine whether the issues have been "addressed satisfactorily" as called for in the resolution. By "addressed satisfactorily", CPB means that the administration's response:

1. corrects potential errors in the draft EIR or convincingly argues that the errors were in CPB's analysis
2. provides the information requested in items 1.2, 1.3, and 2.2 of this report
3. provides the financial analyses of parking fees and housing costs requested above

3.0a Withdrawal of the resolution

If the SEC finds that the administration's response has "addressed satisfactorily" the issues raised in the resolution, CPB recommends that the SEC write a letter publicly acknowledging this fact.

3.0b Reassertion of the resolution

If the SEC determines that the administration's response has not "addressed satisfactorily" the issues raised in this resolution or if the administration fails to respond two months prior to submission of the LRDP/EIR to the Regents, CPB recommends that the SEC write a public letter to that effect, reassert the call for the administration to refrain from submitting the LRDP/EIR to the Regents for approval until these issues have been addressed, and take steps to ensure that the Office of the President and Regents are aware of the Santa Cruz Senate concerns.

Resolution:

Whereas a careful physical development and land use plan is essential for UCSC to realize the academic benefits of growth,

Whereas the Academic Senate's Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has found the analysis in the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of the impact of the draft 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) on traffic and housing may be flawed,

Whereas the CPB has found that the impact of growth under the LRDP on vehicular traffic delays may be significantly more severe than estimated in the draft EIR,

Whereas the administration has not analyzed the costs to be borne by student, staff, and faculty users of the parking facilities proposed in the draft EIR,

Whereas the CPB finds no analysis in the draft EIR to counter CPB's estimate that the land set aside for employee housing under the LRDP may be inadequate for the number of units needed,

Whereas the administration has not analyzed the factors affecting the affordability of proposed on-campus housing,

THEREFORE BE IT

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;

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.

This resolution has been endorsed by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Senate Executive Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Faye Crosby, *ex officio*

Ray Gibbs

Emily Honig

David Evan Jones

Wentai Liu

Onuttom Narayan

Ravi Rajan

Don Rothman

Quentin Williams, *ex officio*

Paul Koch, Chair

Marina Sarran, GSA Representative

Saurabh Mishra, SUA Representative

April 11, 2006