

Meeting Notes			
Date	Project	Project number	
12/01/03	UCSC Long Range Development Plan	03055.00	
Meeting date	Subject	Meeting location	
11/24/03	LRDP Committee Meeting #2	University Center Alumni Rm	
By	Signed		
Jonie Fu			
Present/Copies to	Company	Copies to	Company
See below			

1. Welcome by Tom Vani, Chair LRDP Committee

2. Introduction of committee members and participants

3. Preliminary Land Utilization drawings

- a. Alex Cooper presented a first pass review of the UCSC main campus land, including:
 - i. Overview of land calculations but cautioned that it is early in the analysis stage
 - ii. Anticipation of enrollment scenarios from Strategic Futures Committee
 - iii. need to understand what changed since 1988
 - iv. A quick scan of available land
 - v. Projected numbers for early testing
 - vi. Identification of excluded areas in the current LRDP: Site Specific Research, Protected Landscape, and the Environmental Reserve
 - vii. Campus Resource Land zoned for future use
 - viii. Consideratio of land available for future development can be considered in two parts; area for infill and area for new development
 - ix. Areas that have not had an environmental assessment
 - x. 1988 LRDP limitation of building in areas with more than 20% slope, and how following this guideline would reduce land area available for new development
 - xi. Slope analysis for the campus

4. Possible Scenario of Building Program

Alex Cooper then presented a possible scenario of building program and its implications. He showed a graphic representation of the land area required for 20,000 FTE students. He acknowledged that this number was used purely for testing purposes and that they had not yet dealt with adjacency, land capacity, and other critical issues.

His suggested program was grouped into these categories:

Academic and support buildings:

The academic and support buildings included instructional and research facilities, laboratories, libraries, physical education facilities, student services, and operational facilities.

Housing:

The housing program included typical residential colleges with instructional and common facilities and dormitories or apartments.

Meeting Notes

Others: Other program elements included parking and athletic fields. Athletic fields were tested at a total of 10 acres but may be considered in smaller components. Parking was programmed to fulfill the unbuilt portion of the maximum allowable in the 1988 LRDP, approximately 3,200 additional spaces.

Alex showed a graphic representation of building footprints and their assumptions. Most buildings were assumed to be three stories, about the size of 75,000 gsf, similar to the new humanities building and the Science & Engineering Library.

5. Status of the Strategic Futures Committee (SFC) by Gary Griggs

- a. Gary Griggs described the work of the SFC including:
 - i. comprehensive review of campus programmatic needs and desires
 - ii. four approaches by subcommittees:
 - Demographics/Student Demand: projected student demand, contract with the state, how to provide the access and opportunity, graduate student projections, junior transfers, retaining good students, and relating to the California research environment.
 - Vision: how we envision ourselves in light of new technology, serving society, what we want to be collectively
 - Academic Planning: looking into the future under ideal conditions
 - New Academic and Research Opportunities: engineering school, digital arts, looking off-campus, federal and state programs
 - iii. looking to maximize opportunities in a non-constrained way

6. Discussion of White Papers

- a. Alex Cooper talked about the purpose and the process of the white papers
 - i. to define the key issues and the approaches for the four key subjects: land use/environment, housing/student life, transportation/circulation, and infrastructure/technology
 - ii. CRP prepared uniform outline in these four sections:
 - summary of 1988 LRDP
 - existing conditions
 - identify key issues
 - possible approaches to address the issues
 - iii. the White papers will be working documents, will continue to evolve during the LRDP process
 - iv. Draft in December, Final Draft in January
 - v. Cooper, Robertson intends to produce the final draft so that it is in a consistent voice
- b. Frank Zwart reported on the progress of the land use/environment subcommittee
 - i. Committee plans to meet and focus on
 - land use and adjacency
 - the need to have the network of all systems working together
- c. Wes Scott reported for the Transportation/Circulation subcommittee
 - i. Committee plans to meet and focus on identifying our current baseline conditions

Meeting Notes

- d. Jean Marie Scott reported for the Housing/Student Life subcommittee
 - i. Technical staff involved revealing and using new data
 - ii. Committee plans to meet and review all housing aspects of the colleges
- e. Ilse Kolbus reported for the Infrastructure/Technology subcommittee
 - i. committee met once
 - ii. main issue is to identify target usage of building types; housing, technology, wet labs, etc.
 - iii. also need to focus on "at capacity" and "at age" issues

7. Questions and Comments

Mardi Wormhoudt asked whether the Strategic Future's Committee and the land use planning efforts will inform and influence each other, when and how is that going to take place.

Alex Cooper said the two would work together in an iterative process. The starting point of the academic projection is pure and will be tested against the land use effort to understand the campus-wide systems.

Mardi Wormhoudt mentioned that in the 88 LRDP process, the discussion focused on the community preference for 12,000 enrollment, and 15,000 was considered the ultimate, at that time the campus was not anticipated to grow again. Off-campus development was mentioned as potential new growth then.

Charlie Eadie described projecting scenarios as a testing tool, he suggested alternatives are choices and we are not at the stage of considering alternatives

Jean Marie Scott asked if the SFC is considering the role of the college or the potential for new colleges?

Gary Griggs followed up by explaining that SFC will not so much review the philosophical aspect of the college, but more look at the college to accommodate the need of the students.

Bob Miller spoke of Vancouver and Seattle as two cities that grew tremendously, both have research universities, with major impact to the cities. The key aspect of the quality of life in those cities is to have a great university. He said a university would not be great, if it can't amass a critical mass of faculty and students. He suggested to stay the same size is not an option. He noted the kind of people that will be attracted to Santa Cruz will be influenced by what the community is.

Alex Cooper asked Mardi Wormhoudt, who sat on the 1988 LRDP committee, what she considered the trip wires during the LRDP discussion?

Mardi Wormhoudt said the ultimate enrollment number was debated, Oakes College was just completed, people debated passionately whether there should ever be buildings in the meadows, the music building and the Academic Resource Center (formerly the Student Center)

Meeting Notes

were controversial locations, internal transportation and east-west connections were also hot issues.

8. Next steps

- a. December 19th - preliminary reports from the topical subcommittee
- b. December 19th - preliminary enrollment scenarios from the SFC
- c. Meeting will be at Bay Tree, Conference Room D

Committee members present:

Tom Vani, Chair
Pamela Edwards
Emily Reilly
Maggie Fusari
Mardi Wormhoudt
Gene Arner
Larry Merkley
Charlie Eadie
Gary Griggs
Leslie Sunell
Gail Heit
Francisco Hernandez
Donna Blitzer
Ilse Kolbus
Robert Miller
James Sheldon
David Rinehart
Jean Marie Scott
Wes Scott
Christina Valentino
Matt Waxman
Frank Zwart
Peggy Delany

Members not present:

Fran Owens
Harriet Deck
Wlad Godzich
Amy Everitt
Liz Irwin
Steve Kang
Meredith Michaels
Beau Willis
Jack Zimmermann

Guests:

Ron Suduiko
(a couple of students - did not get their names)

Staff present:

John Barnes
Teresa Buika
Dean Fitch
Galen Jarvinen

Consultants present:

Alex Cooper, Cooper, Robertson & Partners
Jonie Fu, Cooper, Robertson & Partners