

- In 2009 the university cancelled a major on-campus housing project as it was about to begin construction. Known as the East Campus Infill project (ECI) and providing about 600 beds, it had gone through planning, design, environmental review, and Regent approval without controversy. Financing was available and initial bids had come in for the first phase of work at 19% below budget. And then the University cancelled the project on grounds that the recession, then its early stages, would depress enrollment and therefore demand for housing. In the event, the exact opposite happened. Demand for admission and for housing expanded more rapidly because of the recession, no further housing capacity was added on campus, and a housing crisis was born.
- In 2014 the University began a general study of possible student housing on the west side of campus. However, the state had recently put severe restrictions on the traditional source of campus housing financing (the state issuance of bonds), so there was no money available for a project.
- Jan 2016: UCOP and Regents launched a Housing Initiative, featuring use of private developers to finance, design, construct, and maintain student housing (P3). The traditional method of financing student housing was that the state would issue bonds, the university would contract with a construction company to build the housing, the university would manage and maintain it, and the bonds would be repaid over many years by student rents. In the new initiative, a private developer would issue bonds, contract with construction companies to build the housing, and manage and maintain the housing for the life of the bonds; the bonds would be repaid over many years by student rents.
- Spring 2016: The campus launched biological studies of the west campus site area, which was at that point defined as 50-55 acres. In 2016 UCSC consultant Biosearch did a California Red Legged Frog (CRLF) site assessment of the west side area under consideration, and specifically did a study of CRLF habitat conditions in May and June 2016.
- Fall 2016: UCOP issued and widely distributed an RFQ (request for qualifications) to those who wanted to be considered as private developers under the P3 process system-wide. UCOP subsequently narrows the respondents to 8 pre-qualified developers.
- March 2017: UCSC issued an initial RFP (request for proposal) to the 8 pre-qualified developers. At this point the campus informally shrank the available site to about 25 acres (all still on the west side), due to concerns about CRLF.
- April 10, 2017: UCSC issued an NOP (notice of preparation, outlining plans). It referenced only the west side and only the issue of an amendment of the 2005 LRDP for the west side, and said it would lead merely to a program level environmental review.
- May 31, 2017: UCSC issued a second stage RFP to the three remaining finalists they selected. These were Capstone, Balfour Beatty Campus Solutions, and EdR. The RFP set out a tight schedule of working group meetings (“charrettes”) with administration staff, leading to an August 21 deadline for final written proposals from the three finalists.
- Over the Summer of 2017 campus administration concerns about CRLF issues within the 25 acres increased. They has biological consultants LSA do further CRLF habitat studies at the site on May 2 and May 10 (RDEIR 4.3-17).
- August 18, 2017: UCSC’s project team had their first meeting with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The administration believed that the CRLF issues could be dealt with informally, by making minor adjustments to the proposed project. USFWS said that they were willing to work with the university, that they did not want to stand in the way of the project, but that since the project would

involve a taking of CRLF habitat, the university was required to get a takings permit from USFWS, and part of that process would include negotiation about what kind of mitigation would be necessary to offset whatever the degree of taking might be. This was the same process that the university completed in 2005 in order to successfully build its Ranch View Terrace housing project, so it should not have come as a surprise. But it did.

- August 21, 2017: All three finalist developers submitted their proposals. All three did so formally on the basis of a 50 acre site but in fact on the basis of an approximately 25 acre site, and none included any development in the East Meadow in their proposal. However, Capstone, in addition to its proposal, offered in an appendix to its proposal an alternative concept of building only on the 13 acres of the existing Family Student Housing (FSH) and putting FSH on the East Meadow in low-cost, pre-fab wood housing, a clear reference to bringing Katterra (a global construction firm) in for the East Meadow portion of the project. (RDEIR p 5.0-3) The site work and study for the west side had been underway for a year and a half, and this was the first moment there was any consideration of the East Meadow for student housing.
- August 28, 2017: There was a briefing/meeting for UCSC staff involved in the project. The content of the meeting is not yet clear, but it was described by one of the participants as “a bit of a bombshell.” (AR 035044)
- August 30-31, 2017: All three finalist developers made their presentations to VC Sarah Latham and others in support of their proposals. The campus had been under some pressure from the UCSC Foundation Board of Trustees wanting to be involved in/informed about the developer selection. Within the administration a Developer Selection Committee was created to hear final presentations by each of the three finalists on Aug 31, 2017. A representative of the Trustees (Randy Wedding) and a representative of the Alumni Council (David Hansen) attended by invitation, but were required to sign Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) with no certain end date. Each of the participants of the Developer Selection Committee was asked to prepare notes of their reactions to each of the finalists’ presentations, though neither the Committee as a whole nor its members individually were to make a recommendation as to which developer should be selected. Also on Aug 31 a revised NOP was issued, generally sticking with the same site and with no mention of development other than on the west side, but giving notice that this was now a prelude to a project level environmental review of the housing project itself and not just to an LRDP amendment for the west side.
- September 11, 2017: Latham emailed one or more members of the Developer Selection Committee (on this date or within a couple of days prior): "Vice Chancellor Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney and I are now doing a final assessment of all the feedback with the Office of the President and our external advisor. We will be making a recommendation to the Chancellor and EVC by Wednesday. The selected developer team will be announced on Friday. Once the developer is selected, we enter into negotiations. As soon as we have agreement, then we launch right into our work." It is clear that the real decision makers here were Latham and Delaney, and that signoff by the Chancellor was to be a quick step rather than a serious review.
- September 17, 2017: Capstone as officially selected as the private developer.
- September 18, 2017: At a scoping meeting the university stated that “it has further defined the project site boundaries and an amendment to the 2005 LRDP may not be required.” Translation: the decision had been made to do whatever it took to avoid needing a takings permit, and therefore there would be

no west side development on non-developed areas and no need for an LRDP amendment on the west side.

- October 2, 2017: Steve Houser, Director of Campus Housing and Educational Services, made an on-campus presentation on the status of SHW. His presentation made it clear that Capstone proposed on the basis of the westside site, and that since developer selection in mid-September campus administration has been scaling back the size of the site due to environmental complications (CRLF) that it increasingly believed would arise. It appeared that upon selection as the developer Capstone was told the campus is now shrinking the site due to its taking the position that it would not seek a takings permit and would modify the project as necessary to avoid a takings permit. In the face of these shifting constraints, Capstone was described in Houser's presentation as now proposing for the west side an Option A, which appeared to be about 15 acres, and an Option B, which appeared to be about 13 acres, also on the west side. Neither put the East Meadow on the table (at least in the Houser presentation version), but Option B raised the question: with the west side so reduced, where should we put FSH and Childcare? Next to that question was a map of the entire campus, with no part of the campus map marked to identify what the answer to that question might be. Whether as of this date they had not yet decided on the East Meadow as the answer, or whether they had decided but it was not yet being revealed what that answer was, is not clear.
- October 3, 2017: UCSC staff met with USFWS to determine whether options A and B (here referred to as Scheme A and Scheme B) would meet the campus objective of avoiding the need for a takings permit, on grounds that the only areas on the west side to be developed are those that are already developed. USFWS responded that if development can be kept within the boundaries described, no takings permit would be required. (AR035230)
- October 4, 2017: Meeting of administration staff involved in the project, Capstone, and Impact Science (contractor for environmental documentation). There was concern that in Scheme A it might be difficult to keep the development within the boundaries that had just been signed off by USFWS. Capstone wanted a decision made (AR035232). A decision was made to go with Scheme B, which is essentially the concept Capstone made in the appendix to its final proposal in August. The decision was made to develop the East Meadow without any site assessment of the East Meadow and without any serious comparison of the costs of various alternatives. Cost comparisons were devised much later in an attempt to justify this decision, and little additional site assessment work has ever been done.
- October 31 or November 1, 2017: UCSC issued a Second Revised NOP, stating for the first time in public that it planned to put part of the development in the East Meadow, and giving notice of the intent to amend the 2005 LRDP for the East Meadow rather than for the Westside. Few of the public were aware of this issuance. The UCSC-Capstone agreement included an "Initial Services Reimbursement" provision, committing the University to pay Capstone if Capstone's proposed project was not built. And in fact the university's comparative analysis of the costs of each of the alternatives in subsequent documents has included several million dollars per alternative to be paid by the university to Capstone for not building its proposed project if an alternative were to be adopted. The East Meadow portion of the project was thus locked in only a matter of weeks after it was first conceived.
- November 1, 2018: Houser delivered a second on-campus presentation, this time clearly laying out the proposed project as including the East Meadow. This and subsequent presentations were addressed to a limited audience of stakeholders (Faculty Housing neighbors, a student advisory group and Family Student Housing people). They presumed a fait accompli, with discussion focused on implementation details. On Oct 31 and Nov 7 the siting change was mentioned briefly on the University news page as

part of updates on “Student Housing West.” The location of the new development remained vague, with no mention of “meadow” or even “east.” Only the revised NOP, buried as a technical attachment to the Nov. 7 update, identified the site precisely. The East Meadow component of the project remained unknown to most people.

- February 3, 2018: At a regularly scheduled UCSC Foundation Board of Trustees meeting, Chancellor Blumenthal made a presentation on the state of the campus, including info about SHW. Inexplicably neither he nor any of the administrators with him mentioned anything about the decision to put some of SHW on the east campus. The Trustees left the meeting with no awareness of the decision to build in the Meadow.
- February 26, 2018: First presentation to UCSC’s Design Advisory Board (a committee of distinguished Bay area architects). The Board unanimously opposed the East Meadow site.
- March 26, 2018: Second Presentation to UCSC’s Design Advisory Board. The Board reiterated its unanimous opposition to the East Meadow portion of the project and stated that it was “still opposed to the selected site and felt the campus was ‘making a big mistake’.” It added that it “strongly urged for an analysis of alternative sites.”
- March 27, 2018: Draft EIR was issued.
- May 11, 2018: Public comment period on the DEIR was closed. Then on May 15 it was extended until June 27. The university had decided, based on the comments to the DEIR, that its DEIR was so weak and therefore the risks to the project were so great that it could no longer meet its desired goal of a construction start in late summer of 2018. Decision was to instead issue a Revised DEIR.
- September 17, 2018: Revised DEIR was issued.
- January 16, 2019: Project was discussed at Regents meeting
- February 2019: Final EIR was issued.
- March 12-14: Regents meeting debated the project and voted to approve conditionally, pending a subsequent meeting of an ad hoc committee of Regents to review more detailed cost comparisons of the preferred project to the alternatives.
- March 23, 2019: Campus issued its Supplementary Campus Report, providing additional cost data comparing alternatives to the approved project.
- March 27, 2019: An ad hoc committee of three Regents met in secret and gave final clearance to the project.
- March 29, 2019: The university issued Its Notice of Decision, stating that final approval had been granted.
- April 25, 2019: EMAC filed suit under the California Environmental Quality Act.