

# Campus Community Work Group White Paper

*Submitted on behalf of the Work Group by*

Emily Reilly, Member—Santa Cruz City Council, Co-chair  
Ron Suduiko, Vice Chancellor—University Relations, UCSC, Co-chair

April 2004

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Key Issues and Possible Approaches	
Housing .....	2
Traffic and transportation .....	6
Infrastructure .....	11
Economics.....	15
Recreation and open space .....	18
Overarching Issues.....	20
Process	
Work Group members .....	23
Members of the public who attended meetings .....	24
Staff/consultants who attended meetings .....	24
Meeting dates and locations.....	24

## **White Paper Campus/Community Work Group**

### **Introduction**

The Campus/Community Work Group was formed to provide comprehensive community input to the University's Long Range Development Plan, its consultants (Cooper, Robertson & Partners), and to the campus leadership on issues related to university growth. The Work Group identified five areas of particular concern on which to focus its discussions—selected because they represent resources that define key components of the City's "carrying capacity"—that is, its ability to accommodate growth and development.<sup>1</sup> These are:

- I. Housing;
- II. Traffic and transportation;
- III. Infrastructure;
- IV. Economics; and
- V. Recreation and open space.

Over the course of the discussions it also became clear that all five are related and thus solutions and possible approaches that optimize the benefit to all five areas should be explored. Thus a sixth category is outlined:

- VI. Overarching issues.

Common to each of these six areas are values and characteristics that exemplify the interdependencies and common interests of both the University and Community.

For each area, this white paper includes a discussion of key issues and principal areas of concern; a review of the approaches and goals in the University's 1988 LRDP—as well as a description of the current conditions and progress toward meeting those goals; and an inventory of possible approaches for addressing the issues raised in each of these six categories. The report was adopted by consensus of the Work Group members at their May 3, 2004 meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> In March 2004, the City of Santa Cruz Department of Planning and Community Development released a draft "2005-2020 General Plan and Local Coastal Program Background Report" that outlines major factors that have affected growth, the nature of development, and the quality of life in the City of Santa Cruz over the past decade—as well as projections concerning the direction of growth in the future and an inventory of major planning issues. In that the six topics deal with in that report (i.e., demographics, employment and the economy, housing, education, transportation, and city infrastructure and services) closely parallel the issues identified by the Campus/Community Work Group, information from that draft has informed (and therefore is cited throughout) this white paper.

## I. Housing

Housing affordability is not only a problem for Santa Cruz, but for the entire Bay Area—particularly for coastal communities. The City of Santa Cruz *2002-2007 Housing Element*<sup>2</sup> (of the City General Plan) articulates the primary challenge for the City—to accelerate its ability to develop housing to maintain the social and economic diversity in the Santa Cruz community today. In addressing those housing needs, the City must also balance competing goals such as protecting its environmental and cultural amenities and preserving natural open spaces.

The principal barrier to maintaining that diversity is a lack of affordable housing. Given the increases in housing costs and rental fees, only above moderate income households can afford to purchase town homes or single-family homes while moderate income households can only afford apartments. The net effect is that even “affordable housing” is becoming less so for many residents. Because of diminishing vacant land in Santa Cruz, one of the key housing element goals is to promote a sustainable and compact community within defined urban boundaries.

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed four primary concerns:

- Increased off-campus housing demand will reduce the residential holding capacity of the north central Santa Cruz housing market
  - if the campus does not meet its goals for housing, as articulated in the 1988 LRDP/EIR;
  - if the campus grows beyond 15,000 student FTE; and/or
  - if the updated 2005 LRDP/EIR should have adjusted/lower housing goals.
- Deterioration in the Santa Cruz quality of life (e.g., increased traffic) and increased competition for housing (e.g., groups of students renting moderately-priced dwellings) will result in a displacement of long-time residents.
- Acknowledging that the current<sup>3</sup> City General Plan assumed no new growth beyond 15,000 student FTE at the University—if the campus continues to grow (beyond 2005), then the combined housing needs of University faculty, staff, and students will exceed the City housing capacity as identified in the City General Plan EIR (i.e., 1,427 housing units accommodating 3,484 persons through 2005).
- In recent years there has been significant community support for high-density residential development (in order to preserve the social and economic diversity in Santa Cruz community by providing housing for those in low-wage jobs); if that high-density housing were to serve UCSC growth instead, the community goal (of economic diversity) would be compromised. How will the City *2005-2020 General Plan* create a balance of densities within the Santa Cruz community? How will that plan address issues related to the quality of neighborhood residential life?

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/pl/#he>

<sup>3</sup> Given the City/University agreement in 2003 to coordinate closely the update of the campus' LRDP with the update of the City's General Plan, this provides an opportunity to bring into sync the housing elements of each plan.

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** The 1988 LRDP addressed the issue of housing by requiring the University to plan and propose to The Regents for approval, housing projects which will accomplish the adopted housing goals (70% of undergraduate students, 50% of graduate students, 25% of faculty, and 50% of new staff recruited from outside of Santa Cruz County).

- Building on-campus housing (i) contributes to the overall Santa Cruz housing supply and (ii) may reduce the number of vehicle trips to/from campus (during peak class times).
- Building on-campus housing, however, is cost-effective (and affordable) only if there is sufficient demand. (This issue is discussed in some depth in the *Housing and Student Life* Work Group report.)

**Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:**

- City/county housing. The City estimates (using figures cited in the General Plan EIR) that there is a remaining housing capacity in the City of 1,427 units (or 3,484 persons—i.e., an average of 2.4 persons per unit) through 2005<sup>4</sup>; the County estimates that using traditional metrics (e.g., suburban residential units each require 1 to 5 acres per unit), the unincorporated areas have the potential to support an additional 7,367 housing units.<sup>5</sup>

The City has set a goal to produce 2,167 new housing units by 2007<sup>6</sup>; produce additional units through rehabilitation (584) and conservation (432)<sup>7</sup>; and to consider additional units as part of its 2005 General Plan Update. Targets by affordability levels assume the availability of public subsidies to achieve affordable housing goals. Historically, the number of new housing units produced has averaged 150 per year.<sup>8</sup>

- Projected housing demand. The most recent (1/9/2004) AMBAG projections suggest that between 2005 and 2020, Santa Cruz countywide housing demand will grow from 103,457 to 113,315 units—an increase of 9,858 housing units.<sup>9</sup> During that same period, countywide population is projected to grow by 25,536 and the number of jobs by 38,153.
- Housing affordability. As has been the case in most coastal (and other) communities like Santa Cruz, the cost of housing has increased faster than household income.<sup>10</sup> The following table indicates 2003 median home costs and

---

<sup>4</sup> See Laura Spidell re "Housing Capacity", 2/26/2004.

<sup>5</sup> See Andy Schiffrin re "County Housing Statistics—Existing Conditions", 3/9/2004.

<sup>6</sup> See Chart 6-1 of the *2002-2007 Housing Element* (<http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/pl/he/CruzHE-6.pdf#page=9>)

<sup>7</sup> See Chart 6-2 of the *2002-2007 Housing Element* (<http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/pl/he/CruzHE-6.pdf#page=10>)

<sup>8</sup> Per Laura Spidell of the Santa Cruz City Planning Department (her analysis was based upon information from the California Department of Finance), 5/10/2004.

<sup>9</sup> See Andy Schiffrin re "County Housing Statistics—Existing Conditions", 3/9/2004; and Laura Spidell re "Housing Capacity", 2/26/2004.

<sup>10</sup> The City *Background Report* (cited in footnote 1 on page 1) suggests that the desirability of Santa Cruz as a place to live, increased employment opportunities, and the lack of significant new dwelling units have all conspired to make the availability of housing very critical and the cost of housing very high. It also notes that this pressure on the housing market appears to occur independent of University growth and on-campus housing supply—referencing the period between 1990 and 1999 in which the University added a significant amount of on-campus housing and experienced only modest growth. None-the-less, the draft notes that neighborhoods in the west-side of the City have experienced continued impacts from groups of students renting single-family dwellings thereby displacing families and/or from off- and on-street parking.

the average rent for a two-bedroom apartment as well as the percentage of low-income<sup>11</sup> households paying over 30% of their income on housing in 2000.

	<u>Own Home</u>		<u>Rent Home/Apartment</u>	
	<u>House— Median Cost<sup>12</sup></u>	<u>% Low-Income Households</u>	<u>2 Bedroom— Average Rent</u>	<u>% Low-Income Households</u>
Santa Cruz	\$525,000	56.6%	\$1,075-\$1,850	41.2%
Santa Cruz County	\$482,000 <sup>13</sup>			

- UCSC housing. In 2002-03 (three-quarter average), the campus housed 6,093 individuals in University-affiliated housing:

<u>Cohort</u>	<u>Percent Housed</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Goal</u>
Undergraduate students	48.7%	5,751 beds	70%
Graduate students	14.4%	168 beds	50%
Faculty <sup>14</sup>	24.2%	125 beds	25%
Staff recruited from outside SC County <sup>14</sup>	18.1%	49 units	50%

In addition, the University has the following additional housing projects scheduled for completion:

- Infill apartments (652 student beds, fall 2004)
- Ranch View Terrace (83 faculty/staff units, winter 2006)

Since 1997, when enrollment growth resumed, UCSC has pursued student, faculty, and staff projects. Between 1996-97 and 2005-06, the campus will have added housing for 2,153 students<sup>15</sup> and 147 units for faculty and staff.<sup>16</sup> During the same period, however, student enrollment will have grown from around 9,850 to 14,500.

*Other variables influencing the campus' ability to achieve its overall LRDP goals.* The following additional factors (as documented in the 1988 LRDP/EIR) were taken into consideration in the construction of on-campus housing:

- Vacancy rate for the City of Santa Cruz: In 1990, the vacancy rate was 6.89%; otherwise it has been less than 6.5%.
- Between 1989 and today, the campus vacancy rate has fluctuated between 1% and 7%. Consistent with the provisions of the 1988 LRDP, a successful private sector proposal for faculty and staff housing on Inclusion Area D development was solicited and is under development.

---

The draft report suggests that as the University grows, not only will these impacts continue but that housing needs will change because the student population will grow at a faster rate than the City's non-student population.

<sup>11</sup> A low-income household's income is between 56.5% and 80.7% of the median income of all households.

<sup>12</sup> Data source for 2003 median home prices: California Association of Realtors (<http://www.car.org/>); Santa Cruz county-specific statistics are also available at <http://www.scaor.org/html/stats.htm>.

<sup>13</sup> February 2004 median home prices for Santa Cruz County increased to \$560,000.

<sup>14</sup> Laureate Court (64 units) is not included in this figure.

<sup>15</sup> I.e., completion of the Village, College 9 Apartments, Colleges 9 and 10 Residence Halls, housing at University Town Center and the UCSC Inn, and construction of in-fill apartments at Cowell, Stevenson, and Porter colleges.

<sup>16</sup> I.e., recent acquisition of Laureate Court and the completion of Ranch View Terrace in early 2006.

**Additional questions and issues:** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- *Should the University continue to work toward meeting its housing goals through off-campus projects?* A market analysis of student preferences indicates that the present composition of on-campus housing is attractive to only 50% of undergraduate students.
- Discussed were three drivers of housing demand: (i) “background” population growth in the region (i.e., growth that would occur with or without an increase in overall on-campus<sup>17</sup> UCSC student enrollment); (ii) the net increase in regional population directly attributable to a larger campus (i.e., the “direct” effects of UCSC growth—such as net increase in the number of enrolled students and net increase in the number of faculty from outside of the region required to teach those additional students); and (iii) the indirect effects of UCSC growth (i.e., new jobs generated within Santa Cruz as a result of additional regional economic activity due to campus growth). *To what extent does University growth and development result in this third category of faster-than-“background” population growth (and thus demand for housing)—also referred to within the Work Group as the “multiplier effect”?* How will that “multiplier effect”<sup>18</sup> be estimated?
  - To what extent are the City and County better able to accommodate the housing needs generated by University growth and development when that growth is gradual and constant over the period?
- *What is the housing capacity of Santa Cruz at “build out”?* The City’s current Housing Element projects supply only through 2007—furthermore, housing production has not met projections. Are there alternative housing models, policies, and/or infrastructure (e.g., transportation) improvements that could bring production more in line with projections?
- *What housing goals will be a part of the City’s 2005-2020 General Plan?* How will the City work to meet the housing goals of its *2002-2007 Housing Element* (of the General Plan)? Will the new 2005-2020 General Plan be updated to factor in the AMBAG population growth projections/housing need as well as projected University growth?
  - AMBAG projects that countywide population will grow by 25,536 and the number of jobs by 38,153—even without University growth.
- *How will the City 2005-2020 General Plan ensure a diversity of housing types?* How will that plan balance the concerns of existing neighborhoods (e.g., that single-family residential neighborhoods retain their character)?

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing housing—these ideas fell into three broad categories: those that involved restrictions on development; ways that the City/University might increase the supply of (or reduce the demand for) the relevant scarce resource (e.g., affordable housing, housing suitable for student renters, etc.); and alternative approaches or policies that might enable new ways of addressing the issue or concern.

- *Restrictions*
  - University growth beyond 15,000 student FTE should occur outside of Santa Cruz.

---

<sup>17</sup> I.e., excluding students enrolled at other sites (e.g., in the Education Abroad Program) or at other locations outside of Santa Cruz.

<sup>18</sup> The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the ways in which a project could be “growth-inducing” (see §15126.2(d), [http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env\\_law/ceqa/guidelines/art9.html](http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/art9.html)) be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); it does not specifically describe how to estimate that growth (e.g., whether to consider a “multiplier effect” or to use some other mechanism).

- Consider a goal of housing all new students (i.e., enrollments beyond 15,000 FTE) on campus and limit growth if housing goals are not met.
- *Increase supply or reduce demand*
  - Expand the development of mixed-use development/redevelopment (particularly private sector development that will also generate tax revenues for the City).
  - Increase housing density along boulevards and transit corridors (“corridor development”) by developing, for example, housing above retail space.<sup>19</sup>
  - Identify additional options for high-density housing development.
  - University and City jointly explore alternative shared housing delivery processes to increase supply of off-campus housing.
    - Consider City/University partnerships for off-campus housing that serve members of the campus community—structure partnerships so that the City still receives tax revenues in some way.
  - Consider ways of providing financial assistance to City to provide housing for incremental off-campus population generated by University growth.
- *Alternative policies and approaches*
  - Consider ways in which to lower the costs of on-campus (and perhaps off-campus) student housing.
    - *On-campus housing:* Pursue ways to subsidize housing (i.e., not require that it be fully self-supporting).
    - *Off-campus housing:* University/community jointly pursues with legislators possible State housing subsidies for University communities.
  - Explore alternative campus goals for housing various campus populations (e.g., reduce undergraduate housing goals, increase graduate and faculty housing goals, increase housing goals for staff, etc.).

## II. Traffic and transportation

All members in the community are affected by transportation in some form or another; much like a natural resource, the City’s transportation system is a limited resource.<sup>20</sup> Four main objectives emerged from the community participation process associated with the *Master Transportation Study*:<sup>21</sup> (i) expand and offer new travel choices for people who live, work, play and visit Santa Cruz; (ii) provide relief for citywide vehicle traffic congestion; (iii) enhance community livability; and (iv) achieve a sustainable transportation future.

The City *Background Report*<sup>22</sup> suggests that the most significant planning challenge facing the City is addressing the continuing trend of the rate of growth of automobile trips that is increasing faster than population growth.

Residents of the Westside neighborhoods are particularly concerned with neighborhood traffic resulting from trips to and from the campus.

---

<sup>19</sup> Recognizing the link between housing and transportation solutions, the *City Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) suggests that the City both consider options to maximize density in appropriate areas and that development should be linked with transportation policies.

<sup>20</sup> See the *City Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) for additional detail.

<sup>21</sup> See <http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/pw/MST2003/index.htm> for the final report dated 7/23/2003.

<sup>22</sup> See footnote 1 on page 1.

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed three primary concerns:

- While traffic countywide is expected to increase due to background growth, representatives were particularly concerned about the impact of University growth on key University access routes through the west side of Santa Cruz and on specific intersections near the University. The street capacity of those routes is limited—as well as their capacity for expansion—and their current state of maintenance is, in some cases, poor (i.e., repairs are part of a deferred maintenance backlog).
- While the University has an excellent TSM program, Santa Cruz Metro Transit District finances may deteriorate to the point where University service will be limited, resulting in additional use of single occupant vehicles.
  - What rate of student ridership growth can the METRO successfully absorb even with additional University-related revenues? To what extent is that capacity limited by access routes to the University (including the backlog of deferred maintenance for roads and sidewalks on existing access routes)?
  - Neighborhoods in the west-side of the City have experienced problems with student off- and on-street parking<sup>23</sup> (e.g., students park then use METRO alternatives to get to campus).
- To what extent are current levels of service (LOS) on west-side roads and intersections nearing (or already below) the thresholds defined by State standards?<sup>24</sup> Can these existing LOS conditions be mitigated?

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** The 1988 LRDP/EIR committed the University to a two-pronged approach to addressing traffic and transportation issues: TSM measures designed to reduce traffic to and from the campus and University Assistance Measures to help the City improve its infrastructure.<sup>25</sup>

- TSM measures included setting a goal of/implementing programs designed to direct at least 40% of all passenger trips to and from campus to alternatives to the single-occupant automobile and implementing parking management and enforcement strategies. These measures are detailed and progress-to-date evaluated in the *Transportation and Circulation Work Group* white paper.
- In addition, the 1988 LRDP included a number of additional measures that are detailed in the *LRDP Transportation and Circulation Work Group* white paper—including measures to reduce traffic and parking demand, parking management strategies, expanded transit services, and improvements to pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

---

<sup>23</sup> See footnote 10 on page 3.

<sup>24</sup> In a memorandum (Ron Marquez to Chris Schneider & Ken Thomas re “LRDP Community Committee Transportation Background” dated 4/15/2004) based upon information prepared by Fehr and Peers Transportation Consultants, four of the 26 intersections on the west side were operating at poor levels of service (i.e., “E” or “F”): Empire Grade (High Street) and Western Drive (PM delays at this two-way stop sign intersection averaged 76 seconds—LOS “F”); Bay Street and California Street (PM delays at this two-way stop sign intersection averaged 37 seconds—LOS “E”); Bay Street and Escalona Drive (AM delays at this two-way stop sign intersection averaged 73 seconds—LOS “F”; PM delays averaged 46 seconds—LOS “E”); and Mission Street and Chestnut Street (PM delays at this signalized intersection averaged 35 seconds—LOS “E”). *Note:* These statistics are more recent (November 2003) than those cited in the CLRDP associated with the UCSC Marine Sciences Campus.

<sup>25</sup> In addition, in 1999, the City and University partnered in the development of a transportation master plan, the goal of which was to “study feasible approaches to effectively manage the number of projected vehicle trips throughout the City, including, but certainly not limited to, UC Santa Cruz traffic.”

***Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:*** See *LRDP Transportation and Circulation Work Group* white paper for details of existing conditions and progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals.

- Eight University Assistance Measures related to traffic/transportation were included as part of the 1988 LRDP/EIR:

Completed:

- Assistance with Phase I Mission Street improvements (reimburse 50% of the local cost share to the City)
- Assistance with Bay Street (if City resurfaces Bay Street within two years of 1988 LRDP, UCSC will in 1997 perform/reimburse for resurfacing directly attributable to LRDP construction)
- Assistance with measures to improve traffic flow at major Mission Street intersections (reimburse pro-rata share)

Pending:

- Assistance with signalization of Coolidge/Hagar intersection (signalize or reimburse County for reasonable cost)—completion anticipated summer 2004

Not yet warranted:

- Assistance with signalization of Heller/Empire Grade intersection (reimburse County for reasonable pro-rata cost)
- Assistance with signalization of Western/Empire Grade and Laurel/King intersections (reimburse County for reasonable pro-rata cost)
- Assistance with Eastern Access—from Highway 1 to Coolidge Drive (reimburse 50% of the County costs not otherwise funded by CalTrans or other funding agencies)
- Assistance with potential local cost share of highway 1/9 intersection improvement (in the event that Eastern Access is constructed by the County, reimburse 1/3 of local share provided City/County contribute 2/3 of local share)

The *LRDP Transportation and Circulation Work Group* white paper details an extensive array of policies and measures designed to encourage transit usage and discourage the use of single-occupant automobile trips. However, one such policy (not permitting first and second year students to purchase permits to park on campus, except by appeal) results in some students using streets in residential neighborhoods along the transit routes as “park and ride” lots. The University has collaborated with City staff (and provided financial assistance to undertake field survey work) to identify areas where University-related impacts occur. Residential permit parking programs have been instituted in six neighborhoods to address this issue.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> The City of Santa Cruz has approved six residential permit parking programs (Beach Flats and Beach Hill; Downtown; Eastside; Lighthouse/Cowell; Seabright; and Westside neighborhoods) resulting in annual sale of 5,729 resident and guest permits. City staff are currently undertaking analysis for expansion of the West Side residential permit program and are working to resolve land use policy issues that could enable the use of local church parking lots along transit corridors as “park and ride” facilities. (For additional detail, please see memorandum, Matt Farrell to Chris Schreiber, Ken Thomas regarding “Westside and Downtown Residential Permit Parking Programs” dated 4/5/2004)

The following information<sup>27</sup> about daily vehicle commute trips in 1988 and today shows that while overall campus enrollment grew by 60%, traffic levels grew by 33%:

- In fall 1988, the average daily traffic (ADT) on a 24-hour weekday basis was 12,458 vehicle trips at the campus' main entrance and 6,861 vehicle trips at the campus' west entrance. These trips by students, faculty, staff, and campus visitors average 2.056 "trips per enrolled student."
- In fall 2003, ADT was 15,321 vehicle trips at the campus' main entrance and 9,592 at the campus' west entrance—an average of 1.703 "trips per enrolled student."

These traffic statistics about the vehicles entering/exiting the two campus entrances can also be displayed by travel modes:<sup>28</sup>

	1988 (percent)	2003 (percent)
Using "TSM" modes:		
Multi-occupant vehicles	26.8	27
SCMTD transit	22.6	20.4
Bicycles	2.65	2.85
Walking	.55	.23
Vanpools, campus shuttles, bike trailer	n/a	4.9
All "TSM" modes	52.6	55.4
Using single-occupancy vehicles	42.6	40.3

The following additional information will help inform community concern about Santa Cruz Metro Transit District finances:

- Transit District operating finances<sup>29</sup> include the local ½¢ sales tax (54%), passenger fares (22%), Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding (18%), and other local or Federal funds (6%). Of the 2002-03 passenger fares, UC Santa Cruz billings were \$1,477,377 (or 30.6% of total SCMTD fares of \$4,809,410). Next year, the Transit District faces a potential \$2.3 million shortfall—primarily due to lower sales tax revenue projections.
- In 2002-03, the Transit District logged 223,476 annual vehicle hours on all routes (except the Highway 17 route) with 6,136,352 passenger trips. According to a March 2004 Urbitran study, due to the high ridership on UC Santa Cruz routes,<sup>30</sup> those routes require the smallest per-passenger subsidy:<sup>31</sup>

	Passenger Trips	Annual Cost	Total Revenues	Total Subsidy	Subsidy per passenger
UCSC routes	1,927,950	\$ 3,321,101	\$1,796,483	\$1,524,618	\$ 0.79
All fixed routes (except UCSC routes)	4,208,402	\$23,149,631	\$3,012,927	\$20,136,704	\$ 4.78
Overall	6,136,352	\$26,470,732	\$4,809,410	\$21,661,322	\$ 3.53

<sup>27</sup> Based upon "hose count" data collected by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (<http://www.sccrtc.org/>).

<sup>28</sup> The modal mix study (in which observations were recorded about the type of vehicle and the number of passengers occupying each vehicle) was conducted only during daylight hours; percentages do not add to 100% because motorcycles (2% in 1988 and 1% in 2003) and service/construction vehicles (3% in 1988 and 3.5% in 2003) are not included in the table.

<sup>29</sup> See <http://www.scmtd.com/facts/finfacts.html> for an overview of SCMTD financing.

<sup>30</sup> Routes 10, 12A/B, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 22.

<sup>31</sup> Where the term "subsidy" is defined in the context of fully allocated costs—including fixed costs; in practice, only 22% of the Transit District budget is derived from fares.

**Additional questions and issues:** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- *To what extent does University growth and development result in faster-than-“background” population growth (and thus traffic congestion or the required METRO service levels)—also referred to as the “multiplier effect”?*<sup>32</sup> How will that “multiplier effect” be estimated?
  - As noted earlier, AMBAG projects that countywide population will grow by 25,536 and the number of jobs by 38,153 even without University growth. In what ways can City/University transportation approaches address the issues associated with such background population growth?
- *What is the capacity of Santa Cruz for traffic/transportation?* Additional statistics about current conditions and projected growth rates are needed to answer this question.<sup>33</sup>
- *What are the traffic effects of approved (or likely approved) projects and developments that should be incorporated into the University traffic analysis?* There is concern that projects already in the pipeline will use up much of the City’s transportation capacity.
- *How can the community ensure the viability of the METRO system?* There is potentially a positive impact that University growth may have on the financial viability of the area’s transit systems.
- *Is additional on-campus transportation infrastructure needed?*
  - *Is there sufficient on-campus parking?* (I.e., to what extent is the issue of off- and on-street parking in west-side neighborhoods a function of/related to the availability or the cost of on-campus parking? Related to the campus’ prohibition of freshman/sophomore cars?)
  - *Are students using the METRO for cross-campus travel?* To what extent will additional (more frequent) on-campus shuttles lighten the load on the METRO?
- *To what extent is additional infrastructure needed to support use of alternative modes of transportation?* E.g., is there sufficient capacity for “bussing” bikes to/from the campus (i.e., to mitigate the difficulties of terrain/campus topology)? Are there sufficient bike paths (and are roads wide enough) on access routes to campus?

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing traffic and transportation—these ideas fell into three broad categories: those that involved restrictions on development; ways that the City/University might increase the supply of public transit services (or reduce the demand for single-occupant vehicle trips both on- and off-campus); and alternative approaches or policies that might enable new ways of addressing traffic issues.

- *Restrictions*
  - Limit growth when traffic exceeds mutually agreed thresholds on selected intersections.
- *Increase supply or reduce demand*
  - Implement the strategies and recommendations outlined in the *Master Transportation Study*<sup>34</sup> that was jointly funded by the City and University.

---

<sup>32</sup> See footnote 18 page 5.

<sup>33</sup> The *UC Santa Cruz Marine Science Campus CLRDP Draft EIR* (January 2004) contains detailed “current conditions” information about many of the relevant roads and intersections. (This information was provided to the work group.) The projected growth rates, however, are restricted to impacts related to anticipated development at the Marine Science Campus.

- Continue to partner with City and Transit district—e.g., University participation in additional park and ride projects to reduce campus automobile trips and increase transit ridership.
- Creatively explore ways to improve access<sup>35</sup> to campus within the context of current City/University agreements—as well as explore new forms of mass transit and other transportation alternatives.
- Consider additional University Assistance Measures to contribute *pro rata* share of traffic improvements serving the University community.
- *Alternative policies and approaches*
  - Institute programs to ensure that increased enrollment growth causes no net increase in commuter trips to/from campus—thereby reducing both on- and off-campus traffic levels.
    - Institute programs/policies to ensure “no net increase in single occupancy vehicle trips.”
  - Explore additional ways to encourage alternate modes of transportation (e.g., bicycles).
  - Review campus transportation policies to ensure, for example, that restrictions (e.g., no on-campus parking permits for frosh students) do not have off-campus implications (e.g., increased parking in neighborhoods near campus, additional commute trips).
  - Review on-campus circulation patterns that might affect off-campus traffic (e.g., lack of a north loop road may increase shuttle traffic on High and Bay Streets).
  - Explore ways (e.g., partnerships with the private sector) to provide additional on-campus services (e.g., retail shops, etc.) designed to reduce traffic to and from the campus by on-campus residents.

### III. Infrastructure

The Campus/Community Work Group focused on the capacity of the City to provide municipal utilities (i.e., water, refuse/recycling, and sanitary sewer services) to the University—and, in particular, water. The City’s plans are documented in the *Integrated Water Plan*<sup>36</sup> (June 2003) that addresses the current/future drought-related crises as well as long-term water supply needs (through 2020) and in the *2000 Urban Water Management Plan*<sup>37</sup> that projects water supplies and demands and describes conservation measures.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> The *Master Transportation Study* (<http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/pw/MST2003/index.htm>) articulated a number of short-term initiatives and strategies for the City of Santa Cruz and the Transit district—including targets for the use of single- and multiple-occupant vehicles as well as alternative transportation modes by 2020; and made a number of key long-term recommendations requiring immediate planning and coordination by the City and the University.

<sup>35</sup> Some members of the community asked for a reference to their belief in the value of studying the feasibility of an additional access route to campus that would alleviate traffic in the upper Westside neighborhoods.

<sup>36</sup> See <http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/wt/IWP/IWP.pdf>

<sup>37</sup> See <http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/wt/wtcon/2000managementplan.html>

<sup>38</sup> These two documents describe how the City is pushing up against its water capacity limits if measured against the “expected peak-season shortage under worst historical hydrologic conditions” (i.e. those that occurred in 1977)—a key benchmark that is used to measure system reliability. Currently, this worst-year peak-season curtailment is expected to be about 45%. Thus, by 2030, there is a 90% likelihood of some level of curtailment.

According to the City *Background Report*<sup>39</sup>, the City's water supply system serving today's population is essentially the same as in 1960 (while the population in the service area is 190% percent greater). In normal and wet years when rainfall and runoff are abundant, the water supply system is capable of meeting the community's *current* annual water requirements. The system, however, is highly vulnerable to shortage in drought years. To satisfy demand suggested by AMBAG population projections for 2020, however, water usage will rise 25% over current levels.<sup>40</sup>

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed two primary concerns:

- Economic growth is constrained by limited housing and City infrastructure. With respect to infrastructure in general, community members would like to see such City resources (e.g., water capacity, traffic capacity, etc.) used broadly within the community to serve larger community goals not just to accommodate University growth.
- Focusing on the water infrastructure, the City anticipates both shortages in drought years but the possibility of shortages in normal years:
  - Due to "background" population growth alone (i.e., exclusive of University growth beyond 2005), the City is anticipating the possibility of water shortages in non-drought years unless new water sources are identified. The City's *Integrated Water Plan* does not yet plan for University growth beyond 15,000 FTE students.
  - To meet current (and projected) demand, new water resources (e.g., sources, storage, etc.) are needed. New water supplies are expensive and/or difficult to secure (e.g., desalination is expensive<sup>41</sup>) and their development has environmental consequences.

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** The 1988 LRDP/EIR committed the University to a two-pronged approach to addressing water issues: conservation measures designed to reduce water usage and University Assistance Measures to help the City improve its infrastructure.

- Water conservation measures are detailed and progress-to-date evaluated in the *Infrastructure and Technology Work Group* white paper.

---

<sup>39</sup> See footnote 1 on page 1.

<sup>40</sup> According to the City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1), total annual water demand varies between 4.0 and 4.5 billion gallons; by 2020, demand for water is anticipated to rise above 5 billion gallons per year.

<sup>41</sup> None-the-less, the City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) and the *Integrated Water Plan* identify seawater desalination as the only feasible alternative for a backup supply of drinking water in times of drought. Two variations are being considered: (i) a City-only project and (ii) a project that would involve partnering with the Soquel Creek Water District in which the District (in order to reduce its reliance on well water and avert the threat of seawater intrusion in local groundwater aquifers) would use some or all of the desalination plant capacity when the City doesn't need it.

City residents have recently received notice that their water bills will double over time. According to Water Department Director Bill Kocher, the cost of the construction/operation of the proposed desalination plant (which will not occur for a number of years) will account for less than a fourth of that increase; the remainder of the increase is primarily attributable to a long list of other major infrastructure upgrades to the water system.

**Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:** Since 1988, a range of on-campus water conservation measures have been implemented which have effectively contained campus water consumption.

- The *Integrated Water Plan* assumes University on-campus usage of 408 million gallons of water per year (for an average of 1,118,000 gallons/day) at 15,000 FTE students;<sup>42</sup> as part of the LRDP process, the campus will test this proposed supply against the demands anticipated by the Strategic Futures Committee initial working enrollment scenario (a three-quarter average of 21,000 FTE).<sup>43</sup>
- In calendar year 2003 UCSC's water usage was approximately 19% greater than it's usage in 1986-87—a period over which enrollment grew by 60%. Installation of computerized irrigation and timed drip systems have kept water used for irrigation of landscape at 12.5% or below the 1984-85 baseline excluding Agroecology which is used for teaching and research purposes. The following summarizes calendar 2003 water usage by application:

	<u>Average daily use</u>
Residential use (including kitchens, laundry, and residential-related uses)	208,000 gallons/day
Administrative offices and research labs	69,700 gallons/day
Metered irrigation	118,800 gallons/day
Other metered uses (e.g., Health Center, Student Center, etc.)	25,800 gallons/day
Other uses (e.g., non-metered uses, including system loss due to leakage)	157,700 gallons/day
Total	577,700 gallons/day

*Note:* Campus usage, however, would be greater had it achieved its on-campus housing goals.

- University Assistance Measures included:
  - Completed:
    - Assistance with Water Pump Number 4 (reimburse the reasonable upgrade cost)
    - Assistance with Water Pump Number 2 (reimburse the reasonable upgrade cost)
    - Assistance with Water Pump Number 6 (reimburse the reasonable upgrade cost)
  - Not yet warranted:<sup>44</sup>
    - Assistance with water improvements (help pay the marginal local cost of new water supplies dedicated to campus uses through user charges or other mechanisms)

<sup>42</sup> This water usage figure assumes that the campus reaches its undergraduate housing goal of 70% (as well as its faculty and staff housing goals), an enrollment of 15,000 FTE students (in 2010) with 12 colleges and new playing fields at College 12. (The *Integrated Water Plan* uses the year 2010, rather than 2005 cited in the 1988 LRDP, because AMBAG adjusted its projections of University growth based upon the slower rate of growth in the early 1990s.) These assumptions are noted in the accompanying document, *Water Demand Investigation, 1998*; this document also discusses impacts associated with not meeting housing goals and the water demand this places on the City supply.

<sup>43</sup> The City is contractually committed to provide, at its sole cost and expense, sufficient off-campus water service infrastructure to serve UCSC. UCSC, through its University Assistance Measures, will reimburse the City for its share of costs related to pump upgrades. If water resources prove to be inadequate, UCSC has agreed to provide financial assistance for development of increased water production—provided the City dedicates such marginal capacity to serve the on-campus need.

<sup>44</sup> More precisely, in the case of these water/sewer University Assistance Measures, the campus is awaiting completion of City master plans to determine need.

- Assistance with sewer main upgrades (help pay the marginal local cost of upgrading the capacity of the Arroyo Seco main and the Oxford Street main dedicated to campus uses through user charges or other mechanisms)
- Assistance with sewage treatment plant capacity upgrade (help pay the marginal local cost of upgrading the treatment capacity dedicated to campus uses through user charges or other mechanisms)

**Additional questions and issues:** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- How does the mix of on- and off-campus housing affect the overall demand for water?
- Is the capacity of creeks/streams that feed the City water infrastructure being affected by the change in land use at the University (e.g., what are impacts of “run off” due to campus development)?
- What are the projected water needs (and supplies) for water districts in the surrounding communities? Will UCSC growth (e.g., off-campus housing) affect the water needs in any of these communities?
- How will the loss of industrial users, such as Texas Instruments (whose west side facility used 500,000 gallons of water per day), affect the overall picture?
- To what extent is water “demand” (which involves both “need” and “desire” under current paradigms for usage) the appropriate metric when planning water infrastructure? When developing solutions, to what extent should alternative approaches be considered?

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing infrastructure issues—these ideas fell into two broad categories: those that involved restrictions on development; and ways that the City/University might increase water supplies (or reduce water usage) as well as increase the capacity of the City sewer and storm water infrastructure.

- *Restrictions*
  - Delay on-campus growth beyond 15,000 student FTE until revision of City's General Plan is completed (provided the plan is completed in less than three years).
    - Consider an additional University Assistance Measure to pay a *pro rata* share of the cost of revising City's General Plan and Integrated Water Plan to include proposed University growth.
  - Delay additional on-campus growth beyond 15,000 student FTE until additional City water supplies are developed.
  - With respect to water, understand how much growth Santa Cruz can sustain in non-drought years, define this as the City's “carrying capacity” with respect to water, and plan City and University growth accordingly.
- *Increase supply or reduce demand*
  - Consider alternate ways to decrease water usage when water demand exceeds supply (e.g., in years with severe drought conditions)—e.g., consider landscaping that is more tolerant to drought conditions should the City be forced to ask residents to allow their landscapes to “go brown.”
    - Continue to increase water conservation programs—including additional retrofitting of existing structures.

- Consider ways to increase water supplies:
  - Develop on-campus, packaged treatment plant to enable recycled water use for irrigation, cooling towers, and other non-potable uses.
  - Commence limited pumping from on-campus wells (accompanied by geophysical testing to determine aquifer parameters/effects on downstream supplies) in order to supplement City supplies.
  - City/University team jointly explores possibilities for locating a desalination unit, including options that may involve the use of University land.<sup>45</sup>
- Undertake an analysis that provides a better understanding of the primary and secondary effects of runoff from development on the underground hydrology.
- Consider an additional University Assistance Measure to pay the *pro rata* share of improvements to the City sewer and storm water capacity that is directly attributable to University growth.

## IV. Economics

City services are financed through seven major revenue categories: (i) sales tax (and other non-property taxes), (ii) property tax, (iii) interest on city funds and rents on city-owned properties, (iv) licenses and permits, (v) fines and forfeits, (vi) revenues from other agencies (e.g., state license monies, taxes, etc.), and (vii) fees for city services (e.g., parks and recreation, etc.).<sup>46</sup> University growth and development affects these revenues both directly (e.g., as a State agency, its property is tax exempt) and indirectly (as the largest employer in the County, the University generates about \$1 billion of the area's economic activity—which, in turn contributes to the City's revenue). While the University provides many of its own services (e.g., police, fire), it is also a consumer of City services (e.g., water and sewage treatment). The health of both the University and the City depends upon the ability of both entities to fund basic infrastructure and services.

A strong, diverse and expanding economy is essential to create a sustainable community; economic development is also key to sustaining high quality public services. Accordingly, the City *Background Report*<sup>47</sup> reports that an Economic Advisory Task Force will address the following issues to recommend an economic development strategic plan: (i) how to take advantage of the City's key competitive strengths (e.g., its highly educated work force); (ii) UC Santa Cruz as a key component of the City's economic future; (iii) how to address the economic downturn in the tourism sector; (iv) how the retail sector can be augmented through strategic planning; (v) how to address areas of competitive disadvantage (e.g., lack of affordable for-sale housing, traffic congestion, perceived obstacles in the City permitting process and its general support of the business community); (vi) the

---

<sup>45</sup> Three alternative locations are being considered where a desalination plant, if approved, could be located—as outlined in the City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1), one of these alternative areas is at the University Marine Sciences Campus at Terrace Point.

<sup>46</sup> See <http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/fn/fingov.html> for additional details. An overview published in November 2002 by Western City (League of California Cities), "A Primer on California City Finance" (<http://www.prcity.com/government/departments/citymanager/pdf/nov02primer.pdf>), also provides useful background information.

<sup>47</sup> See footnote 1 on page 1.

major economic development opportunities represented by the University's Marine Science Campus; and (vii) the preservation of lands designated for employment centers (e.g., lands zoned as commercial/industrial).

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed five primary concerns:

- As the University grows and develops (to fulfill its mission and to increase its stature among public research institutions), the students, faculty, and staff it attracts will look to services provided by the City (and County). These governmental agencies need to understand the desired services and to plan for them.
- In order to provide the services required by the community (including the University), the City needs to identify new sources of revenue. In particular, the City's economic base was not that diverse (with sales tax, utility tax, and property tax representing the primary sources of revenue—over half of the City's budget)—thus the City is very vulnerable to economic downturns.<sup>48</sup>
- How can University development contribute to increases in the number of new jobs for existing Santa Cruz citizens—particularly, in higher-paying fields?<sup>49</sup>
- City officials were particularly concerned about instances where the University's tax exempt status could result in a net loss in direct City tax revenue. Specifically—although UCSC is a net producer of wealth in the region, as a non-profit, the City doesn't necessarily realize the direct income that it would from a for-profit entity. As a result, all non-profits receive a "subsidy" in terms of City services; because of its relative size, this "subsidy" to UC Santa Cruz is viewed as significant.
- University programs located off-campus (and within the City of Santa Cruz) should be carefully analyzed with respect to the (positive and negative) fiscal and economic impacts on City and County government.

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** Although the 1988 LRDP did not directly address the potential for net loss of City tax revenue, it did classify the infusion of State and other funds (originating from outside of the region) into Santa Cruz—and the growth in employment potential due to the quality and diversity of jobs campus growth brings—as a significant beneficial impact of campus growth and development.

**Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:**

- The University is the largest single employer in Santa Cruz County and, during 2002-03, UCSC was responsible for more than a billion dollars of economic activity in Santa Cruz County through spending by its faculty, staff, students,

---

<sup>48</sup> The City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) projects that future trends in sales tax growth are modest (based on the fact that Santa Cruz is almost built out and the opportunity for new retail growth is limited). In the near term, the growth in hotel/motel transient occupancy tax is expected to be very modest at best and, although the trend in property tax is expected to be positive, it will not be sufficient to offset other major revenues losses since 2000 (e.g., "take-a-ways" by the State Legislature).

<sup>49</sup> The City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) suggests that the greatest changes in the City's economic health and employment base are: a weakening tourism industry, a dramatic drop in manufacturing production, and a loss of information technology jobs. One of the City's key competitive strengths is its highly educated labor force, which in turn is attracted to the community's ambiance and university/cultural background.

out-of-town visitors, and the University itself.<sup>50</sup> This level of economic activity has had a significant positive impact on City revenues.

- In University-owned facilities (on which no property taxes are paid to the City), the University provides many of the services the City provides to off-campus community members—including police and fire protection, infrastructure maintenance, recreation and open space, etc.
- The University also plays a significant role as an “economic anchor” within the city (e.g., the University funding levels—and thus local economic activity—remained stable during difficult times such as the economic downturn of the early 1990s or at the time of the Loma Prieta earthquake; the University also play a role as a catalyst during downtown reconstruction; etc.)
- Three recent actions by the University, however, have resulted in a revenue loss to the City:
  - Lease of the Holiday Inn (for use as student residences effective September 2001) meant that the City received reduced<sup>51</sup> transient occupancy tax (TOT) on this property (in the four years prior to the lease, TOT from this property ranged from \$306,316 to \$487,842).
  - Purchase of the Laureate Court Apartments removed these 64 units from the property tax rolls. In 2001, the year prior to the University acquisition, this amounted to \$54,000. However, when the on-campus Hagar Court units are sold, the buyers will be required to pay property taxes—the campus estimates that the county will actually realize an overall increase in property tax revenues related to these two projects.<sup>52</sup>
  - Potential acquisition of the Texas Instruments facility by the University will mean a loss of revenue in two categories (property taxes and fees for City services):
    - Property taxes (for 2003-04) of \$424,507—including tax on both the land and building (valued at \$18 million) as well as the specialized equipment and personal property (valued at \$20 million).
    - At the time Texas Instruments was in full operation, their facility used 500,000 gallons of water per day<sup>53</sup>; at \$1.81 per ccf, their annual water bill at full operation was approximately \$443,000.
- The recent State fiscal difficulties, the downturn of the economy, and the exodus of key businesses from Santa Cruz has required substantial cuts in the City budget (and thus in services).

***Additional questions and issues:*** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- *In what ways can University development contribute to changing the profile of the City's revenues?*
  - Given the City's “older economy” revenue profile, it could be beneficial to work with the University to develop “newer economy” revenue drivers. For example, spin-offs from UC San Diego research and development activity have produced additional revenue sources for that municipality. Similarly, UCSC grads have begun startups in the Santa Cruz that have brought

---

<sup>50</sup> See [http://www.ucsc.edu/about/economic\\_impact.asp](http://www.ucsc.edu/about/economic_impact.asp) for more information about the University's economic contribution to the local economy.

<sup>51</sup> The University continues to pay TOT on guest rooms rented to the public; in 2003, this amounted to \$83,000.

<sup>52</sup> The on-campus Ranch View Terrace development, when completed in early 2006, will also result in tax revenues to the City.

<sup>53</sup> By way of comparison, the University averages about 580,000 gallons of water per day.

- revenues into the area (and to the City). To what extent can the University help promote those jobs to local residents?
- Is the University doing enough to help strengthen the local economy and to help the City provide the needed local services?
- *What impact will University development have on off-campus commercial properties?* In order to develop new revenue sources, the City also needs to reserve commercial/industrial properties so that local entrepreneurs have a place to build.
- *In what ways can the University contribute to existing City programs that are experiencing financial difficulties—in particular to K-12 education?*<sup>54</sup> E.g., through volunteers and outreach to local K-12 schools.

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing the economic impacts associated with University growth—these ideas fell into two broad categories: avoid actions that reduce City/County revenues and explore ways that might increase (and diversify) such revenues.

- *Avoid actions that reduce City/County revenues*
  - Prior to actions that will result in a loss to City revenues, the City and University will work together to explore means of maintaining City revenue levels.
- *Explore ways to increase City/County revenues*
  - On an on-going basis, identify opportunities for City/University partnerships designed to encourage (or incubate) business activities that will increase City revenues (e.g., via taxes) and generate local employment.
    - When addressing the housing issues, give some preference to private (or joint public/private) development alternatives (that serve to increase the tax base).
  - Recognizing the potential impact on the viability of campus arts and lectures programs, explore mechanisms under which University entertainment functions (e.g., public performances) might generate revenues for the City (e.g., admissions tax on tickets sold to members of the public).
  - Seek reimbursement of tax revenues from the State for the City for lands it has already removed from the tax rolls.

## V. Recreation and open space

Integral to the health of a community is its provision of parks and recreation space for its citizens. As a tourist destination, Santa Cruz needs to be particularly careful to plan for sufficient capacity.

The desire to maintain open space lands around the City is an enduring concept; these lands help to define and protect the City's sense of place and environmental quality, and provide wild life habitat and recreational opportunities. The City

---

<sup>54</sup> The City *Background Report* (see footnote 1 on page 1) also suggests a link between the cost and availability of affordable housing and the continuing decrease in school enrollment (and thus its financial difficulties). As families look outside of the City to purchase a home, enrollments at City schools are shrinking causing the school district to face decisions about closing some schools. (Employees moving to surrounding communities and continuing to work in the City compound traffic congestion in the region.)

*Background Report*<sup>55</sup> reports that, while the City has substantially achieved the major goals of its 1990-2005 General Plan to provide permanent protection for these open space lands, the health of its finances could influence its objectives for parks and recreation services.

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed three primary concerns:

- The City has little or no land available to provide additional neighborhood park lands (and recreation facilities) for new residents.
- The City has inadequate funding to maintain and operate its existing park system at the levels expected by the public. These levels of service could be further impacted by University growth.
- Furthermore, revenue resources for the maintenance, protection, and enhancement of the City's 2000-acre open space greenbelt system are currently not adequate.

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** The 1988 LRDP recognized that campus development would increase demand for park and recreation facilities. Accordingly, it indicated that the City and County should continue to plan and develop new parkland to meet the needs of new residents and the campus agreed to

- Develop neighborhood park/recreation areas within inclusion area projects; and
- Continue to make campus recreational facilities available to the public and provide casual recreation amenities, such as walking paths and picnic tables, for public use.

**Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:** To appropriately evaluate existing conditions and progress toward articulated goals, the following additional information is needed:

- For the City:
  - Need statistics on how well the City is meeting neighborhood and community park standards.
  - Need statistics on maintenance and operating costs of City's parks.
  - Need statistics, if available, on the number of on-campus University students who use of City park facilities.
- For the University:
  - Need performance information about the recreation and open space included in the design of on-campus housing developments.
  - Need statistics, if available, on the number of visitors that use University recreational facilities.

**Additional questions and issues:** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- *Given the current deficiencies (including the financial health of these programs) in the City's neighborhood parks and recreation capacity, will University growth exacerbate these deficiencies?*
  - *What are the effects of a changing population (including University growth and development) on desired City recreational facilities? I.e., what are the*

---

<sup>55</sup> See footnote 1 on page 1.

- needs by population (e.g., small children, high school students, college students, older adults)?
- o While the City has no deficit of open space amenities (ranging from the area's natural resources such as the ocean to its green belt lands to its State parks), it does not have the financial capacity to provide services associated with those that require City maintenance or staffing. How will University growth affect this situation?
- *Is sufficient on-campus recreational space being planning as part of University development?*
- *When it is possible to make University recreational and open-space facilities available to the public, in what ways can the campus be more proactive about making those opportunities known?*
- *Are there additional ways that the University can help contribute to the cultural amenities available to the general population?*

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing recreation and open space—these ideas were focused on increasing available recreation facilities (or making better known on-campus recreational opportunities).

- *Increase supply*
  - o Consider ways in which to better advertise campus recreational activities and programs that are available to the general public.
  - o Continue to provide, as part of new on-campus residential development, additional recreational facilities appropriate to the populations that will be housed.
  - o Consider a University Assistance Measure to pay a *pro rata* share (based on University community's percent of future City growth) of the cost of acquisition, development, and maintenance of additional City parks.

## VI. Overarching Issues

As the Work Group discussions progressed, a number of overarching issues were raised.

The City's draft *2005-2020 General Plan and Local Coastal Program Background Report*<sup>56</sup>, for example, identifies a number of areas where the City and the University's futures are linked (e.g., employment; spending by students, faculty, staff, visitors, and the institution as a source of economic activity; research and related stimuli to private business creation; and as a potential force in the revitalization of blighted areas of the community). To address these common issues (and to provide opportunities that would help accommodate University growth and development), the draft recommends on-going collaboration in major planning efforts; and in specific partnerships in business incubation, entrepreneurship, and new business opportunities.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> See footnote 1 on page 1.

<sup>57</sup> The Marine Research and Education Center at Terrace Point is cited, for example, as a major economic development opportunity for the City—offering a unique opportunity to work collaboratively on a joint

Over the course of the discussions it also became clear that the five key issues identified by the Work Group are interrelated. For example, housing (and particularly the development of high-density housing) is integrally related to transportation (e.g., to minimize the growth in trips via single occupant vehicles and hence street congestion, these high-density developments should occur along the City's major transportation corridors) and to City infrastructure (e.g., water capacity). Thus as solutions and possible approaches are considered, ways to optimize the beneficial effects on all five key areas of concern should be explored.

**Key issues and principal areas of concern:** Representatives of the community expressed four primary concerns:

- As the University grows and develops (to fulfill its mission and to increase its stature among public research institutions), it must cooperate and partner with the City (and County) to optimize the beneficial impacts (and minimize the negative impacts) on the local community.
- How can the University become a more involved citizen? By working together to seek practical solutions to each challenge, the City and University together may be able to define a pathway by which growth and development creates a better future.
  - Are there strategies for economic development, infrastructure development or optimization, and services that if pursued jointly by the City and the University would have a greater probability of success?
  - In what ways can policy changes optimize the potential solutions/possible approaches? (E.g., are there changes to specific policies that the City and University can jointly pursue with State and Federal legislators?)
- How can the campus and community ensure there is sufficient coordination (and on-going communication) between the City/County and the University?
  - In particular, what are the processes and mechanisms to ensure that the City and County can provide adequate levels of infrastructure and an appropriate array of services to the community (including the University)?

**Approach/goals outlined in the 1988 LRDP:** The 1988 LRDP committed the University to a broad and on-going program of consultation and review with the City of Santa Cruz—as well as an extensive environmental review process that provides opportunities for community input and, where appropriate, an assessment of relevant issues such as housing, traffic, water use, sewage generation, and available mitigation measures. These include, for example,

- Annual meetings between the Chancellor and Mayor to ensure closer coordination in the planning processes of the University and the City; to provide an early opportunity for City input to University plans; to review the campus' capital program and discuss potential community effects of upcoming projects; and to review the schedule of achieved University mitigations.
- Preparation of focused EIRs on all major (i.e., where construction costs are greater than \$2 million in 1987 constant dollars) capital projects; and submission of preliminary drafts of sections of those EIRs to appropriate City departments for informal review, comment, and consultation.

---

economic development initiative to create high-quality, sustainable jobs and catalyze related research and development "spin-off" business ventures.

**Existing conditions/progress toward meeting 1988 LRDP goals:** Annual meetings have been held, as well as bi-monthly (and, more frequent, as necessary) meetings between the Chancellor and the Mayor. The 2003 meetings, for example, resulted in an agreement between the City and the University to coordinate closely the update of the campus' LRDP with the update of the City's General Plan; to work jointly to formulate economic development strategies in support of both the City's goals and the University's educational and research mission; and to support housing policies and strategies aimed at creating new housing stock appropriate to the expected population demographics—such as high density apartments and townhouses along transit corridors. To this end, a joint City/University Housing and Economic Development Task Force meets monthly.

**Additional questions and issues:** During the Work Group discussions, the following additional questions were raised.

- What Campus/City partnerships might serve the interests of both entities (e.g., the joint library project between SJSU and the City of San Jose is an example of a partnership that benefited both the campus and the community)?
- In what ways can the possible approaches simultaneously address concerns about housing, transportation (and traffic congestion), and City infrastructure (particularly water)?
- In what ways can University growth and development be gradual (and constant—to the extent possible) over the 2005-2020 in order to maximize the City's and County's ability absorb that growth?
  - In what ways can such gradual growth act as an economic stabilizer for City economy and services over the planning period?
- If the University is unable to undertake the mitigations (or achieve its goals) specified in its LRDP/EIR, the burden (or the impacts) is (are) shifted from the University to the community. Similarly, if the City and County are unable to fulfill their goals for services (or its agreements with the University), both the University and the community are affected.
  - How can both work cooperatively, so that each can meet its obligations? E.g., are there structural issues preventing success? Financial feasibility issues?
  - What near-term options should be pursued? E.g., those that can be accomplished by agreement between the University and the City.
  - What longer-term options should be investigated? E.g., those requiring changes in policy, State law, etc.? Are there models in other localities (or states) about which more information should be obtained?

**Possible approaches:** The Work Group discussed the following possible approaches for addressing the overarching issues—these ideas were focused on communication and relationship building, accountability, and a mutual willingness to analyze opportunities and challenges in a holistic way.

- *Communication and cooperation*
  - In that relationship building needs to occur on an on-going basis, a commitment to communication should be sustained during both good and bad times.
    - Ideally, meetings between the University and the City should occur early enough in each entity's decision process to inform and affect the outcomes of those decisions.

- Create on-going mechanisms to identify opportunities for City/University partnerships that address key issues.
  - For example, the City is currently experiencing difficulties funding K-12 education; the University desires to provide formal internship opportunities for its students—a possible mutually-beneficial solution would be credit-bearing student internships in local K-12 schools. Such solutions would be more likely if there were an on-going mechanism to identify/communicate these related issues and then to explore synergistic ways to solve each in ways that are mutually beneficial.
- *Reporting and accountability*
  - Explore mechanisms to ensure periodic reporting of and appropriate accountability for obligations of each entity to provide services or mitigations to the other (e.g., the University's mitigations under the terms of the LRDP/EIR and the City and County's obligations and agreements to provide services to the University).
    - Explore the use of legally binding agreements on key issues.
  - Explore mechanisms to regularly exchange information about and report to the broader community concerning
    - The priority issues, challenges, and concerns of importance to the University and to the City/County; and
    - The ways in which the University, City, and County are addressing these issues—highlighting, in particular, those efforts which have been successful thereby providing evidence that successful campus/community models can be sustained.
- *Comprehensive analysis*
  - Whenever considering new City/University partnerships or off-campus development by either entity, both the costs and benefits of such proposals or decisions should be reviewed holistically—sometimes what appears to be an opportunity can have unanticipated impacts and *visa versa*.

## **Work Group Process**

### ***Members of the Work Group***

Emily Reilly, Member—Santa Cruz City Council, Co-chair  
Ron Suduiko, Vice Chancellor—University Relations, UCSC, Co-chair  
Gene Arner, Planning Director—City of Santa Cruz  
Donna Blitzer, Director—Governmental & Community Relations, UCSC  
Neal Coonerty, Bookshop Santa Cruz  
Michael Cowan, Professor—American Studies, UCSC  
Harriet Deck, UCSC Foundation, Realtor  
Kaitilin Gaffney, Planning Commission, City of Santa Cruz  
Carl Walsh, Professor—Economics, UCSC  
Mardi Wormhoudt, Supervisor—Santa Cruz County

***Members of the public who attended one or more meetings***

John Aird, Resident (Westside Santa Cruz Neighbors Group)  
Deborah Elston, Resident (Westside Santa Cruz Neighbors Group), Public  
Works Commission  
Ron Lang, Resident/Homeowner  
Mark Primack, Member— Santa Cruz City Council  
David Rinehart, Design Advisory Board, UCSC  
Lynn Robinson, Resident (Westside Santa Cruz Neighbors Group)  
Reed Searle, Resident/Homeowner  
Peter Scott, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, Professor Emeritus—  
Physics, UCSC  
Russell Weisz, Resident/Westside Neighbor

***Staff/consultants who attended one or more meetings***

John Barnes, Director—Campus Planning, UCSC  
Alex Cooper, Cooper, Robertson & Partners  
Matt Farrell, Parking Programs Manager, Public Works Department  
Toby Goddard, Conservation Manager—Santa Cruz City Water Department  
Galen Jarvinen, Planning & Budget, UCSC  
Michelle King, City Planner, City of Santa Cruz  
Bill Kocher, Director—Santa Cruz City Water Department  
Ilse Kolbus, Director—Physical Plant, UCSC  
Elise Levinson, Director—Facilities & Asset Development Services, UCSC  
Ron Marquez, Traffic Consultant, City of Santa Cruz  
Hina Pendle, USPartners.com  
Andrew Schiffrin, County Supervisor's Analyst, Santa Cruz County  
Chris Schneider, Assistant Director—Public Works Department  
Laura Spidell, Senior Planner, Planning Department, City of Santa Cruz  
Jean-Marie Scott, Associate Vice Chancellor—Campus & University Housing  
Services, UCSC  
Wes Scott, Director—Transportation and Parking Services, UCSC  
Ken Thomas, Principal Planner, Planning Department, City of Santa Cruz  
Les White, General Manager—Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  
Dick Wilson, City Manager, City of Santa Cruz  
Frank Zwart, Associate Vice Chancellor—Physical Planning & Construction,  
UCSC

***Meeting dates and locations***

February 18, 2004 (University Town Center)  
February 25, 2004 (University Town Center)  
March 3, 2004 (City Hall)  
March 15, 2004 (City Hall)  
March 25, 2004 (City Hall)  
March 30, 2004 (City Hall)  
April 6, 2004 (City Hall)  
April 15, 2004 (City Hall)  
April 26, 2004 (City Hall)  
May 3, 2004 (City Hall)