

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Report on the Long Range Development Plan**

**To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:**

CPB welcomes the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) draft as an opportunity to reflect on how growth may affect both the infrastructure and the exceptional environmental setting of UC Santa Cruz. We appreciate the efforts of the many people who have labored to produce this detailed, thoughtful document. The LRDP is a tool for aligning projects that accommodate growth, in part mandated by our mission to the state, with goals, means, and mutually desirable limits that have been determined internally during the LRDP process and through external consultation with the city of Santa Cruz. This planning document also contributes to the development of a new vision for UCSC that reaches well beyond the current campus perimeter.

CPB is very concerned that there are important issues associated with the LRDP that have not yet been addressed adequately. This report highlights the questions that CPB would like to see answered by the end of the LRDP process, either in the LRDP, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or outside the main LRDP documents. Furthermore, many determinations about future land use and infrastructural needs in the LRDP would benefit from the guidance of a more detailed, prioritized academic plan that establishes parameters and constraints for growth of existing and new departments and programs.

Here are our three main areas of concern:

**1. Faculty Housing:**

Adequate and affordable housing is critical for our efforts to attract the best faculty to UCSC. It is likely that we will have to hire about 600 tenure-track faculty over the next 15 years for the planned growth in student FTE and for replacement of retiring faculty. The administration took a welcome step to increase the availability of for-sale housing with the purchase of Laureate Court in 2003. The imminent construction of Ranch View Terrace will increase the housing stock available to Senate faculty from 80 to 180 units. More units will be needed in the future as median housing prices rise.

Our concerns with the draft LRDP with regard to housing are:

- a) The 27 acres designated for new employee housing in the LRDP draft may be inadequate.

According to the draft LRDP, we currently have 42 acres of housing (including Ranch View Terrace but excluding Laureate Court). This consists of 210 housing units. For 27 acres, the prorated result is 135 housing units, of which 80% at

present Housing Allocation Percentages would go to Senate faculty. The CFW's response to the first draft LRDP estimates that 375 units will be needed. The current draft LRDP aims at accommodating 300 new housing units. How well will 375 units fit on 27 acres? The land designated as Campus Resource Land (CRL) might be reassigned to employee housing, subject to an additional, certainly contested EIR, and some CRL land is off limits for development. As an outer envelope for future growth, the LRDP should set aside sufficient land for employee housing from the outset.

- b) The location of the 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).

- c) Even if employee housing does not have to bear infrastructural costs, it could still be too expensive.

Ranch View Terrace, which is presently being developed, is already at the higher end of what faculty can afford, and is 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. Concrete alternatives to this model should be developed as part of the LRDP process.

## **2. Parking and Traffic**

While the campus has been remarkably successful at developing a comprehensive approach to parking and traffic, vehicular traffic will inevitably increase with campus growth. Our concerns in this regard are stated below:

- a) Parking fees may have to increase substantially as new parking facilities are built.

New parking lots will be needed for the additional vehicles coming to campus and to replace existing parking lots that will be expropriated when buildings are constructed on them. CPB would also like greater clarity on whether expenditures that can be treated as part of the university's road and transportation infrastructure will be charged to the parking budget. Furthermore, without an analysis of what one could reasonably expect the increase in parking fees to be, we are unable to assess whether this would be a worthwhile price to pay for campus growth. CPB expects the EVC's plan to create a comprehensive list of projects, with an analysis of costs, repayment schedules, and the impact of fees on

debt capacity targets, which will provide the means for distinguishing parking from other costs. Perhaps it can also provide the overall estimate of parking costs.

- b) A clear calculation of traffic impacts inside and outside the campus due to proposed growth should be provided as part of the EIR.

It is reasonable to expect that the impact of increased traffic on Bay and High Streets will be severe, especially during peak travel times. While the number of exterior roads leading into campus remains constant, the internal campus road network is supposed to expand substantially under the LRDP. It is not clear that this will be sufficient.

### **3. Academic Space**

CPB is concerned about how much academic space we can realistically hope to add in the present budgetary climate. The available academic space at UCSC is projected to be approximately 80% of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) guidelines in Fall 2005. The University of California's average is about 90%. How feasible is the LRDP plan to bring us to 100% of CPEC guidelines for 21,000 students?

In summary, while it is undesirable, even impossible, to specify every detail of future growth, a sufficiently flexible LRDP and EIR should address the issues discussed in this report. The affordability of student housing should also be analyzed as part of long-term campus planning.

Therefore, CPB recommends the following:

1. With respect to housing, traffic, parking, and academic space, further analysis, clarification and exploration of the plans is needed; in some cases, alternatives should be considered.
  - a) Other models that ensure affordable housing options for entry-level faculty over the planning period need to be explored.
  - b) The administration should continue to analyze the programmatic requirements for campus infrastructure (including on-campus parking and transportation as well as on- and off-campus traffic impacts).
  - c) Finally, academic facilities need to be evaluated using the CPEC standards as a basic indicator of progress.
2. Assurances should be incorporated in the LRDP/EIR documents that, as implementation of the LRDP occurs, enrollment growth will be suspended if suitable predetermined criteria for each of the three items listed above cannot be met: for instance, if academic space falls below some fraction of CPEC guidelines. Including these assurances in the LRDP is consistent with the UCOP Facilities Manual, which suggests Implementation Guidelines as part of the LRDP (in addition to the Land Use Plan).
3. When decisions about growth are made annually during the lifetime of the LRDP,

they should take into consideration

- a) the available resources and
- b) the impact on fees etc., with regard to the items listed above.

Respectfully submitted,  
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Faye Crosby, ex officio  
Margaret Fitzsimmons  
Alison Galloway, ex officio  
Ray Gibbs  
Wentai Liu  
John Lynch  
Margaret Morse  
Onuttom Narayan  
Don Rothman  
Paul Koch, Chair

GSA: Marina Sarran

April 14, 2005