

Re: March 17-18, 2021 Regents Meeting

Agenda Items No. F4 and F5 of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee on March 17, and the Full Board Meeting on March 18

March 6, 2021

Dear Regent,

UCSC needs your help. It's caught in a problem of its own making and needs your encouragement to modify the Student Housing West project so that it can move forward with much-needed new student housing.

Student Housing West was last on your agenda at the March 2019 Regents meeting. We urge you to review the video of the discussion of this item at that meeting: March 13, 2019, the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee, beginning at 2 hours 49 minutes.

Originally the previous UCSC administration planned for Student Housing West to be entirely on the west side of campus, a plan UCSC first described to you at your July 2016 meeting. At your March 2019 meeting the Regents were told by UCSC that they had changed plans in mid-stream (cutting the original site in half and adding the East Meadow near the main entrance to campus) for reasons of cost. That was not true. They had changed plans in midstream, but it was to avoid an estimated 6 month delay in the project schedule. However, the immediate consequence of that decision was to add 12 months to the schedule. Subsequently that decision to build in the East Meadow has added years of additional delay, and is currently on course to add yet more delay.

At your March 2019 meeting, several Regents expressed concerns about the controversy caused by the belated addition of the East Meadow. Some Regents urged that the project be approved except for the East Meadow portion of it. In response, the previous UCSC administration insisted that the East Meadow portion could not be separated from the rest of the project. That was not true. As the project was originally planned it did not develop the East Meadow at all. To separate the East Meadow from the rest of the project and approve the original project would have required a relatively low-level mitigation plan worked out with US Fish and Wildlife Service, a process estimated by UCSC's own expert staff to add 6 months to the project schedule. That option was never revealed to the Regents.

The result has been years of delay, large amounts of taxpayer money spent by UC on outside lawyers, and bitter controversy and disillusionment among UCSC's community of support.

How Did We Get Here?

UCSC began planning work on Student Housing West early in 2016, shortly after President Napolitano launched a housing initiative that allowed public-private partnerships for student housing. UCSC clearly needed, and still needs, additional on-campus student housing. The concept from the beginning was to develop the largest

housing project UCSC had ever attempted, entirely on the west side of campus, a site of approximately 26 acres. This concept was first described to the Regents at the July 2016 Regents meeting by UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal. We'll call this version of the project Student Housing West 1.0.

Planning, site studies, and preparation for environmental review, plus the selection of a private developer, were all based on this version and took about a year and a half. Although the site was known in this period to include a relatively low level of habitat for a federally listed species, any discussion of this issue with USFWS was put off until the end of the year and a half. When that discussion was belatedly begun (August 18, 2017), USFWS made it clear that they did not want to get in the way of the project, but they would need to issue a permit for it and that permit would need to provide some modest level of mitigation. (See Exhibit 1.)

When this type of permit involves high-quality habitat, the mitigation required is extensive, and the resulting delay can be considerable. But none of that was expected to be the case here. The habitat in question was neither breeding nor aquatic habitat, and was agreed to be merely "degraded upland and dispersal habitat." Mitigation could reasonably be expected to be modest, relatively easy, and nevertheless benefit the frog by improving more consequential habitat. UCSC had experience with this kind of permit and previously had provided mitigation for the successful Ranch View Terrace project. UCSC's expert staff estimated the entire process of getting the permit would add about 6 months to the project schedule. (See Exhibit 2.)

Nevertheless, in the span of one month (September 2017) the previous UCSC administration decided it would not work with USFWS to get a permit, would instead reduce the west side site by half in order to eliminate the need for such a permit, and would add 17 acres of East Meadow to the project. That 17 acres would house only 5% of the students housed in the entire project, and the remaining 13 acres on the west side would house 95% of the students. We'll call this version of the project Student Housing West 2.0. It is the project now before you.

The Consequences

The decision to switch from SHW 1.0 to SHW 2.0 was made in secret and did not become generally known, even to the Board of Trustees of the UCSC Foundation, for another 5 months. But when it did become generally known, the project instantly went from broadly supported to highly controversial. Many of the campus's greatest friends and supporters were strongly opposed. As Regent Makarechian said in the March 2019 Regents meeting, those opposing were "your who's who of your campus: alumni, foundation, students...."

Furthermore, the decision to avoid a 6 month delay quickly resulted in a 12 month delay. None of the planning and preparatory work that was done on the west side site had been done on the East Meadow site, resulting in a scramble to get a draft environmental document out. That document was made public on March 27, 2018, and the paucity of information provided for the newly hatched East Meadow site was glaring. Public comments quickly highlighted the degree of opposition and the inability of the environmental document to withstand scrutiny. UCSC then decided to

completely withdraw the document, vacate all public comments, and issue a revised environmental document.

That revised document was issued September 17, 2018. Still rushed, it remained a highly flawed document, particularly regarding the East Meadow portion of the project. The need to issue this revised document delayed UCSC's request for final approval until the March 2019 Regents meeting.

The delay and controversy caused by the decision to replace SHW 1.0 with SHW 2.0 did not stop there. Two lawsuits were filed by two different groups in April 2019. The legal bases of the two lawsuits, and the motivations behind them, are very different, but they are both focused on the East Meadow portion of the project. In one case the litigation goes away with respect to Student Housing West if the project is altered to no longer include the East Meadow. And in the other case (brought by the East Meadow Action Committee) the litigation can be resolved entirely if the project is altered to no longer include the East Meadow.

The first of those two cases is in the middle of its trial phase: the second has completed its trial phase and is just beginning its appellate phase. In the normal course of events you can assume that this project will be in litigation -- with all the delays, costs, and risks associated with litigation -- for years. Resolution is preferable to litigation.

The Cost Issue

The previous UCSC administration argued, at the March 2019 Regents meeting, that they chose their preferred project because all the alternatives were significantly more expensive than their proposed project – that in fact the cheapest alternative was \$90 million more expensive. However, UCSC failed to provide any supporting data for those conclusions.

Despite that lack of data, Regent Makarechian found a way to judge the methodology. He took that cheapest alternative, which was also the most similar to the proposed project, and the known direct cost of the 140 Family Student Housing units on the East Meadow as proposed, and showed that for the \$90 million conclusion to be correct, each 2 bedroom wood-construction apartment in the alternative would need to cost roughly a million dollars – an obviously absurd result. As Regent Makarechian put it, “I don't buy it....”

Several weeks after that Regents meeting, UCSC belatedly supplied its supporting data, and the source of the absurdity began to come into focus. Here are a few examples of where the \$90 million between the campus proposal and the cheapest alternative came from:

- In this alternative, nothing about the design of the 95% of the project on the west side of campus (the Heller site) would change, yet that unchanged part of the project was estimated to cost \$27.8 million more in the alternative than it was in the proposed project.
- In this alternative, all that changed was the location of the 5% of the project that is the 140 units of Family Student Housing. Yet UCSC's cost estimates assume their proposed project would not require family students to be housed

off campus for an extended period, but the alternative, though functionally identical, would. That loaded an extra \$20.6 million on the cost estimate for the alternative.

- By the time of the Regents meeting in March 2019, UCSC (and its private developer and various consultants) had already invested a year and a half of planning and related work in their proposed project, work valued by UCSC at \$5.4 million. Although this amount was incurred in developing the proposed project, in this cost estimate it was charged to each of the alternatives.

These three examples alone (and there are many more) account for \$53.8 million of the claimed \$90 million cost difference. And it is important to note that none of this is actual cost of materials or labor; it is all in the more subjective categories of non-construction costs (contingency, escalation, opportunity costs, etc.). The mis-estimation at work here is not the doing of AECOM – it results instead from the assumptions, project descriptions, and estimated schedules provided by UCSC to AECOM.

The reality is that non-construction costs (contingency, finance costs, escalation, opportunity costs, soft costs, etc) are what largely drive differences in the cost estimates. And these non-construction costs are largely driven by choices about the time dimension: when each option starts, and when it finishes. The way those choices were made in this instance does not give us apples-to-apples cost comparisons. As is the case in a horse race, the outcome is only fair when the horses all start in the same place and at the same time. That did not happen here.

Bottom line: This was not a case of the proposed project being chosen because it had lower estimated costs; it was a case of the proposed project having lower estimated costs because it was chosen.

What Should Be Done?

At this point the shorter and surer path forward for this project is to adopt a Student Housing West 3.0, one that no longer builds in the East Meadow. It quite likely would be similar to SHW 1.0, the version UCSC originally wanted to build. Getting the permit from USFWS would be a much shorter, cheaper, and lower-risk path than slogging through two litigations and all the accumulated controversy and bitterness. It would resolve all pending litigation against the project. UCSC would then do a limited environmental review (i.e. a Supplemental EIR) covering only those aspects of the previous document that need amendment and avoiding a reopening of the full range of issues. The path to construction would open. This path offers significantly less delay and less risk than continuing on UCSC's current path.

The goal should be to provide students with additional on-campus housing as soon as possible, a goal we support. The best way to do that would likely be to build the project UCSC originally wanted to build and has already done the preparatory work to build. UCSC needs an indication from the Regents that that better path would be, at the very least, acceptable.

The Regents are now asked to set aside prior approvals of SHW 2.0. We urge the Regents to do so. The Regents are also asked to then re-approve the same SHW 2.0

that has generated so much controversy and disillusionment among UCSC's community of support and that has resulted in years of money- and time-consuming litigation. We urge the Regents not to do so. Instead we ask you to encourage UCSC to further consider its options for this project and then bring back to the Regents a proposal of its choosing that can in fact move forward and that abates the conflict that SHW 2.0 has caused.

We believe the best course is for the current UCSC administration to consider how best to proceed in the much-changed world we now find ourselves in: post-pandemic but newly pandemic-vulnerable. We have little doubt that freed from a past mistake, they can modify this project for a more timely completion and a better future for the campus.

In Closing

We should be clear about the breadth of opposition to SHW 2.0. We are the East Meadow Action Committee (EMAC), an association of professors, alumni, students, and other supporters of UCSC. We are not a collection of neighbors opposed to UCSC expansion. We are in fact among UCSC's greatest supporters, grateful for what it has provided in the past and hopeful for what it can provide in the future. To us UCSC is like the beloved family member who in the recent past has taken a turn onto a self-destructive path, and we seek an intervention to prevent that self-destruction. Many of us have given to UCSC in the past and now, out of the same love for UCSC, give to EMAC instead.

But opposition to SHW 2.0 extends to many UCSC supporters who are not necessarily affiliated with EMAC. As one example, UCSC's own Design Advisory Board, comprised of accomplished California architects selected by the UCSC administration, voted unanimously in February 2018 and again in March 2018 to oppose siting any of this project in the East Meadow. As another example we urge you to review the signatures on the attached letter to Chancellor Larive. These are many of UCSC's biggest and most active supporters, a catalogue of UCSC's best friends. (See Exhibit 3.)

We all hope you can help UCSC by freeing it to create and propose to the Regents a better version of this needed project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Professor Christopher Connery
Professor Emeritus James Clifford
Professor Gail Hershatter
Professor Emerita Karen Bassi
Paul Schoellhamer
On behalf of the East Meadow Action Committee

Three exhibits attached

EXHIBIT 1

From: Jolie Kerns <kernsj@ucsc.edu>
To: 'Sarah Latham' <sclatham@ucsc.edu>
CC: 'Alisa Klaus' <aklaus@ucsc.edu>; 'Felix Ang' <felix@ucsc.edu>
Sent: 8/18/2017 3:18:53 PM
Subject: Update: USDFW Meeting

Hi Sarah,

We have both good and bad news from the meeting with USDFW. Generally speaking, they are a reasonable group and want to work with us to balance our campus requirements to deliver beds and support enrollment growth with critical habitat requirements. They have no interest in stopping the project.

They did convey that **ANY** take of critical habitat will require a permit. This means that in its current configuration, the project boundary for both the north and south sites would be affected. However, there are alternative options, one of which would avoid a take permit altogether. This option would require building **ONLY** on the developed portions of each site. On the south site, this means removing the strip of land between FSH and Heller Drive (some of this was already left open because of our setback requirements) and for the north site, building only on the parking lot. My guess is that we can still squeeze (and I'm using the word "squeeze" specifically here) 3,000 beds within these revised boundaries, but the increased density will need to be considered. Adjacencies between families and undergrads, eg. will be tight.

Other options will look at limited expansion beyond these developed areas. We'll have a better understanding of these implications by next week, and would like to evaluate these with you then. We plan to meet with USDFW in two weeks for their read on the alternative options under consideration.

The question of a campus wide Habitat Conservation Plan came up multiple times throughout the meeting. I assured them the campus is open to this in order to address the larger picture for the long term, rather than tackling this piecemeal with each project, but I kept focusing the meeting back on the immediate needs of the Student Housing West project.

Any questions let me know.

Thanks,
Jolie

Jolie M Kerns AIA LEED BD+C
Senior Architect and Interim Planning Director

University of California, Santa Cruz
Physical Planning and Construction
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

831 212 0196 phone
831 459 5517 fax
kernsj@ucsc.edu email

Exhibit 2

AR034166-AR035165.pdf

< Close

From: Jolie Kerns <kernsj@ucsc.edu>
To: ljakeson@ucsc.edu <ljakeson@ucsc.edu>; 'Alisa Klaus' <aklaus@ucsc.edu>
CC: 'Felix Ang' <felix@ucsc.edu>
Sent: 8/29/2017 9:06:49 AM
Subject: RE: Following up from yesterday

Hi Lisa,

Yes, we've at least had a week to absorb the implications -- I know yesterday was a bit of a bombshell. A few short responses are below -- happy to talk through any of this over the phone too.

Thanks,
 Jolie

From: Lisa Akeson [mailto:ljakeson@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 8:58 AM
To: 'Jolie Kerns'; 'Alisa Klaus'
Cc: 'Felix Ang'
Subject: Following up from yesterday

Hi Jolie and Alisa,

Thank you so much for yesterday's briefing -- what a lot to absorb! Your effort to make a matrix -- in such short order -- to help clarify the implications was terrific. Now that I've had an opportunity to digest, I have some questions, if you have time to get back to me:

- From USFWS' perspective, will roads into the development areas 'count' as development and require a take permit?

THIS IS UNCLEAR RIGHT NOW. IT'S ONE REASON WHY CLARIFYING THAT EASTERN STRETCH OF THE SITE COULD BE HELPFUL.

As it stands there is only one access to the S site, and solutions may benefit from other roads being constructed; if we were limited to the S site within the development area going forward, is that area even viable for development if no other roads could be built without a permit?

ON OUR LIST TO CLARIFY

- If we pursue a low-effect permit on the S site to allow development out toward the Heller setback, does that obviate redevelopment of the current FSH site until the permit is in hand, or would it be conceivable to initiate development within the FSH site while we are seeking the low effects permit for the undeveloped area?

MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT NO DEVELOPMENT COULD BE INITIATED UNTIL WE ARE FULLY PERMITTED. THIS IS WHY IF WE ARE EVEN CONSIDERING IT ON EITHER SITE, WE WOULD NEED TO CREATE TWO SEPARATE PROJECTS SO THE FIRST PROJECT COULD BEGIN WHILE THE SECOND WAITS FOR PERMITTING. AS TWO SEPARATE PROJECTS THEY WOULD NEED TO BE LOGISTICALLY INDEPENDENT.

- Timing: your table talks about starting construction in January of 2019. Can you walk me through how you arrived at that schedule?

IT IS 14 MOS MIN FOR A LOW EFFECT PERMIT. WE WOULD NEED TO CONFIRM THIS WITH USDFW. ALISA AND I ASSUMED THAT IF WE START WORK SEPT 15, THIS WOULD REPRESENT APPROX A 6 MOS DELAY TO CONSTRUCTION. DELAY COULD BE LONGER AS STARTING IN WINTER HAS DISADVANTAGES.

One way to look at it would be if we initiate the low effects permit essentially now (say Sept 15), we would have the permit by March (based on 6 months to get the permit), prior to the Regents approval and there would be no delay, so I'm trying to understand what the actual sequence would be.

- Can you send me the Critical Habitat map that was discussed yesterday? Felix kindly texted me a picture of the screen, but it would be so helpful to have the actual map (or a reference to it if it's in a document that I have access to).

THERE IS A MAP ON THE USDFW WEBSITE. WE ONLY HAVE A "ROUGH DRAFT" OF THE IMPLICATIONS FOR OUR CAMPUS; ONCE WE DEVELOP IT FURTHER WE CAN SEND IT OUT.

AR035044

Thanks again. This will certainly require us all to exercise our flexibility and creativity capabilities! YEP!

Lisa Akeson
Director, Real Estate Office
UCSC

US Mail:
1156 High Street
MS: REO
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
(831) 459-5379 (office)

Redacted
(831) 502-7111 (fax)
ljakeson@ucsc.edu

Overnight:
100 Enterprise Way, Ste E-100
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

EXHIBIT 3

To: Chancellor Larive

July 31, 2020

cc: Campus Provost and EVC Kletzer

We are long-time friends and supporters of UC Santa Cruz. We admire and are grateful beneficiaries of its achievements, believe in its even greater potential, and appreciate your good work to realize that potential. As long-time friends of the campus, we have been concerned about the Student Housing West project, a project that began with such promise and then, with the addition of the East Meadow component, turned onto what has been a more divisive path. Several of us wrote to and met with former Chancellor Blumenthal in April and May of 2018, regarding our concerns, and we and a larger group write you now with shared hope for a brighter future both for the project and for UC Santa Cruz overall.

When the Student Housing West project was first proposed, no new student housing buildings had been constructed on campus in a dozen years, years in which enrollment continued to increase. In the course of this project's planning, it was increasingly clear that on-campus housing supply was well-behind the fast-rising curve of on-campus housing demand. Under the pressure of that fact, the previous administration initially proposed the largest housing project ever attempted at UCSC, to be built entirely on the west side of campus. Then midway through the planning of that project the previous administration changed its direction by shifting 5% of that proposed housing to inefficiently occupy 57% of the total project land as pre-fabricated wood structures in the East Meadow, structures that could be built very quickly and could therefore speed up the entire project.

All that was in response to a rising sense of urgency driven by an ever-increasing gap between housing supply and housing demand. All decisions were driven by an effort to save time, to compress schedule, to play the fastest possible catch-up.

We now live in a very different world. You are now hard at work on the extremely difficult task of planning how the campus can best deal with the consequences of a pandemic that no one can predict with certainty and that tragically is now getting worse by the day. One consequence of that pandemic is that you, unlike your predecessor, need not be rushed into a housing decision driven by the need for speed. The pandemic has depressed and will for some time continue to depress the demand for on-campus housing, and quite likely will deny the project financing for some considerable time to come. The biggest near- and mid-term housing problem is empty beds, not excessive demand.

You therefore now have a longer period of time in which to make sure this project is done right, and done in a way that unifies the UC Santa Cruz community. You have the opportunity to decide based on what is best for the campus in all respects, not simply based on what is fastest.

There are alternatives. It is not that difficult to consider them and to choose from among them. People of goodwill are eager to help. Getting it right is actually the best way to get it done, ultimately with less delay than has been the case to date and with greater certainty.

The timing now allows more fulsome consideration of alternatives that may include:

- Go back to the project the administration originally wanted to build, entirely on the west side. It was dropped because it was estimated that devising a Habitat Conservation Plan with the US Fish and Wildlife Service would add 6 months to the project schedule. You now have considerably more than 6 months to spare, so this really would cost nothing on the timeline.
- Utilize the East Campus Infill site or the North Remote Parking site (close by Science Hill) or both, possibly as either temporary (to assist with phasing of the overall project) or permanent Family Student Housing. Both sites are marked for student housing in the 2020 LRDP, so are considered feasible and even desirable locations for student housing. And either or both could be developed in conjunction with new housing on the west side.
- If it is considered preferable simply to find a better location for Family Student Housing, there are a number of alternatives that, unlike the proposed East Meadow location, would not put Family Student Housing and the childcare facility immediately adjacent to the most heavily trafficked intersection on campus. These locations include sites just to the west and just to the east of the Historic District and just to the southwest of the Farm.

We are not advocating for any particular alternative, and we assume there are alternatives beyond those listed here that would be worthy of your consideration. Our point is simply that there are good alternatives, and you have the time interval in which to consider them and determine which is in the best interests of the campus.

For the good of the campus, we urge you to make it clear that you will not take this project back to the Regents for further action until you have a project that best serves the broad interests of the UC Santa Cruz community and can therefore win the broad support of that community. This project did enjoy broad support before it veered into the East Meadow, and can enjoy that again. We would be happy to be part of that broad support.

We believe that the person who can make all that happen is you, and we believe you now have the time interval in which to reset this project on a path to success. We stand ready to help in that endeavor.

Wishing you all the best in these difficult times,

The University affiliations of the following signatories are for descriptive purposes only and do not purport to reflect the views of any organization.

Kenneth A. Feingold
Regent Emeritus, University of California
Cowell Fellow
Cowell College 1971
J.D. University of San Francisco 1975

Paul J. Hall
Regent Emeritus, University of California
Past President and current Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Past President, UCSC Alumni Council
Past President, Berkeley Law Alumni Association
Merrill College 1972
J.D. UC Berkeley School of Law 1975
UCSC Parent (Lauren Hall, Stevenson College 2013)

Gary D. Novak
Regent Emeritus, University of California
Past President, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Past President, UCSC Alumni Council
Kresge College 1973
Ph.D. UC Davis 1977
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology, UC Davis School of Medicine

Alison Galloway
Former UCSC Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Isebill V. Gruhn
Professor of Politics, Emerita
Former Acting Social Science Dean and Academic Vice Chancellor

Faye Crosby
Professor of Psychology, Emerita
Provost of Cowell College, Emerita

John Laird
Former Mayor of Santa Cruz
Former State Assemblymember
California Secretary of Natural Resources 2011-2019
Stevenson College 1972

Professor Christopher C. Wilmers
UCSC Department of Environmental Studies
Faculty Co-Director, UCSC Center for Integrated Spatial Studies
Principal Investigator, Santa Cruz Puma Project

Marieke Rothschild
Cowell College 1993

Frank Zwart
UC Santa Cruz Campus Architect 1988-2010
Cowell College 1971

Richard F. Moss
Vice Chair of the UC Santa Cruz Foundation Board of Trustees
Stevenson College 1985
M.A. University of Chicago, 1986
J.D. Loyola Law School 1990

Alec J. Webster
Immediate Past Chair and current Trustee,
UC Santa Cruz Foundation Board of Trustees
Rachel Carson College 2002

Claudia L. Webster
Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Trustee, UC Santa Barbara Foundation
UC Santa Barbara 1975

Ken Doctor
Past President and current Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Past President, UCSC Alumni Council
Stevenson College 1971

Mary E. Doyle
Past Chair and current Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Porter College 1974
J.D. UC Berkeley School of Law, 1977

Michael A. Riepe
President, UCSC Alumni Council
Oakes College 1991
Ph.D. University of Michigan 1998

Charles Eadie
Principal, Eadie Consultants
Former UCSC Director of Campus and Community Planning
Past President, UCSC Alumni Council
Cowell College 1974

Donna Mekis
UC Santa Cruz Foundation Trustee
Past President, UC Santa Cruz Alumni Council
Rachel Carson College 1984
M.A. UC Santa Cruz, 1990

Loren Steck
UC Santa Cruz Foundation Trustee
Past President, UC Santa Cruz Alumni Council
Porter College 1973
Ph.D. UCLA 1982

Betsy Buchalter Adler
Former Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Cowell College 1970

Stephen Bruce
UC Santa Cruz Foundation Trustee
Cowell College 1979

Jonathan Franzen
Writer, Santa Cruz

Mark Headley
Former Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Stevenson College 1983

Walter Jarman
UC Santa Cruz Foundation Trustee
Rachel Carson College 1983,
UC Santa Cruz Ph.D. 1991

Peder Emmet Jones
Former Trustee, UC Santa Cruz Foundation
Stevenson College 1970

David Kadish
Cowell College 1973
M.A. Brandeis University 1974
J.D. Yale Law School, 1979

David Korduner
UC Santa Cruz Foundation
TrusteeMerrill College 1985
M.Sc. Urban and Regional Planning Studies, The London School of Economics and
Political Science 1987
J.D. UCLA School of Law 1992
UCSC Parent (Ben Korduner, Porter College 2021)

SB Master
UC Santa Cruz Foundation
TrusteeCowell College 1975

Linda S. Peterson
UC Santa Cruz Foundation
TrusteeStevenson College 1985
J.D. Boston University School of Law, 1976

Kathleen F. Rose
UC Santa Cruz Foundation
TrusteeCowell College 1971

Matthew Waxman
Porter College Councilor, UCSC Alumni Council
Porter College 2006
M.Arch. Harvard University 2012