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1990 LRDP
Executive Summary
Executive Summary

This Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the University of California at Berkeley is based upon a new vision of academic goals, student needs and conservation premises to guide capital development at the campus to the year 2005-06. The LRDP replaces the previous LRDP, approved by The Regents in 1962 and amended in the ensuing years in response to changing campus needs.

The LRDP consists of two primary elements: first, a space assessment identifying existing and anticipated needs for new and expanded facilities; and second, a campus map identifying land use priorities to guide the siting of these facilities on the campus. The LRDP is accompanied by a comprehensive, programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and was subject to a formal public review process in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The LRDP and its accompanying environmental analysis were approved by The Regents in May 1990.

This LRDP is intended to serve as a general plan to guide physical development at the campus, and not a commitment to any specific project, construction schedule or funding priority. Each specific development project will continue to be approved individually and will be accompanied by a tiered environmental analysis and a public review process in accordance with CEQA. The LRDP does, however, provide both the campus and the community with a broad vision of the total amount and general nature of development proposed to occur during the planning horizon of 2005-06, as well as an understanding of the environmental impacts associated with this development. While specific development projects are identified as illustrations of how the LRDP could be implemented based on a current assessment of specific facility needs, it is anticipated that future development projects will differ from the illustrative project list in response to changes in academic needs and other factors. Total development, however, as measured in assignable square feet (ASF), will not be exceeded without amending the LRDP in accordance with CEQA.

The LRDP is a comprehensive plan covering both the central campus area and campus property located elsewhere in Berkeley. The campus is currently conducting planning and feasibility studies for two large campus facilities, the Richmond Field Station (used primarily for non-instructional research activities) and the Albany and Harrison Street

---

1ASF is a measure of space within a building that can be assigned to a use, such as “Instruction and Research.” It does not include hallways, stairways, or custodial space.
properties (including University Village used primarily for family student housing). Since master plans, accompanied by environmental analysis and public review pursuant to CEQA, will be prepared for these facilities, planning for these locations is not included in this LRDP. The cumulative environmental impacts of the LRDP and the Albany and Harrison Street properties and the Richmond Field Station are addressed in the LRDP EIR.

**Major LRDP Concepts**

*Planning Premises*

The LRDP is based upon an assessment of the new capital development needed to achieve the academic mission and needs of the campus through the year 2005-06. The LRDP proposes new building space and land use priorities designed to meet these needs. Thus the LRDP includes proposed expansions to existing buildings, but does not address the remodeling or maintenance of existing buildings not proposed for expansion. Planning premises for the LRDP include: continuing to achieve “excellence with diversity” by providing the highest quality academic programs for an increasingly diverse student body, faculty and staff; reinforcing the role of the University in the City; conserving and managing open space resources; organizing campus land uses by precincts corresponding to related academic disciplines; and establishing a “Selective Densities” development concept of buildings in a Central Campus Park.

*Academic Context and Space Needs*

The LRDP supports the mission of the campus, which includes undergraduate and graduate education, research, and public service. While major changes in academic programs are not anticipated at Berkeley during the remainder of this century, academic needs and goals are changing to keep pace with new technological developments and more comprehensive understanding of human surroundings. Changes in student mix, in academic disciplines, and in new teaching methods and research techniques contribute to the need for new and larger physical facilities. Within this complex academic and institutional framework, the LRDP presents existing, previously approved, and proposed capital development. In addition, the campus recognizes that creative solutions to campus needs may be more desirable than traditional forms of direct campus development. A summary of development categories appears in the table on the opposite page.

*Campus Enrollment*

A number of factors support the conclusion that the campus is currently oversubscribed, including: an analysis of the existing history, program requirements, and enrollment demand at the campus, as well as the appropriate mix of graduate, undergraduate and health science students, the physical resources of the campus, faculty recruitment needs, housing needs, community and State interests, and environmental factors. Thus, even with the proposed new development, the LRDP acknowledges that the campus will only support an optimal student enrollment of 29,450 (two-semester headcount average), a reduction of 1,126 students from the 1988-89 enrollment levels. The optimal undergraduate enrollment level should be reduced to 20,000 (a reduction of 2,018 students), while the graduate ranks should increase by approximately 900; the health sciences numbers should remain roughly the same.
### Summary of Existing, Approved and Proposed Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing and Approved Development</th>
<th>Assignable Square Feet¹ (ASF)</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet² (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Development</td>
<td>7,425,000</td>
<td>12,679,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Development³</td>
<td>498,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,923,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,499,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed Development             |                               |                          |
|----------------------------------|                               |                          |
| Proposed Net Additional Space to Meet Needs to 2005 (other than Housing)⁴ | 440,000                      | 723,000                  |
| Proposed Net Additional Space for Student Housing to 2005⁴                 | 541,000-785,000              | 715,000-1,152,000        |
| **Subtotal Net Additional Space**                                        | **981,000-1,225,000**        | **1,438,000-1,875,000**  |

**TOTAL EXISTING, APPROVED AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

| Proposed Development             |                               |                          |
|----------------------------------|                               |                          |
| Possible Retail Space Associated with Housing and University Health Service Development | 53,000                      | 70,000                   |
| Potential Joint Development Projects Net Additional Space⁵ | 147,000                     | 244,000                  |
| **Subtotal**                     | **200,000**                   | **314,000**              |

**TOTAL EXISTING, APPROVED, PROPOSED, AND RETAIL AND JOINT DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¹&quot;Assignable square feet&quot; is a measure of space within a building that can be assigned to a use, such as &quot;instruction and research.&quot; It does not include hallways, stairways, or custodial space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²&quot;Gross square feet&quot; is the sum of all areas on all floors of a building included within the outside face of the building envelope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>³Approved development includes projects for which design and environmental review have been approved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⁴Net additional space takes into account use of existing space, proposed replacement and removal of existing facilities, and proposed new and expanded facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⁵The amount of space that would be used by the University within these potential joint development projects is unknown at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This overall reduction in enrollment would approach what the Berkeley campus has identified as its optimal enrollment level and would achieve a graduate/undergraduate ratio fitted to the character and balance of its academic program. This acknowledged need for the reduction, despite unprecedented enrollment demand, is intended to permit the campus to maintain its resource base and its programmatic capability to provide the range and quality of teaching, research, and public service for which it is internationally renowned, while easing population-based pressures that are taxing both the campus and its host community. The impacts of both existing and optimal enrollment levels were discussed in detail in the accompanying EIR. Approval of the LRDP and the EIR constitutes a commitment to reaching these optimal enrollment levels by the end
of the planning horizon. Although it is impossible to precisely predict the number of students who would actually enroll from year to year through the planning horizon, any planned increase in the enrollment targeted for the year 2005-06 would require further environmental review and an amendment of this LRDP.

**Student Housing**

In addition to the academic and administrative facility needs of the campus, the LRDP acknowledges the importance of student housing and the significant housing shortage that has arisen during recent years. The shortage in student housing can be attributed to a variety of factors beyond the control of the campus, and while the campus has responded by constructing new student housing, the shortage continues to be significant. Because of the variety of factors affecting the need for and financial feasibility of student housing, it is not possible to predict with certainty the precise number of beds that will be needed during the planning horizon. Accordingly, by 2005-06 the LRDP proposes the addition of approximately 2,350 to 3,410 new beds for single students, despite the fact that reducing enrollment to optimal levels will result in a decrease of the total number of single students by approximately 1,000.

Several factors guided the planning for identifying new housing sites, including: locating housing near the campus (enabling students to take better advantage of campus facilities and activities, to travel safely between their housing and the campus after dark, and to reduce the traffic and circulation congestion); making housing available to promote the recruitment and retention of minority students, outstanding scholars, and students with special needs; providing freshmen with affordable housing including a high-level of orientation and counseling services as well as centralized campus dining facilities; and promoting continuity in housing to encourage students to develop long-term relationships with their peers and avoid the need for annual changes in living quarters.

To meet these needs, new housing for single lower division, upper division and graduate students is proposed for several locations. In order to provide good campus access and increase the likelihood that the proposed housing will be financially feasible, the LRDP proposes meeting these housing needs by maximum use of existing campus property and centralized dining facilities. Because the campus does not own enough land to meet housing needs through the year 2005-06, the LRDP also identifies preferred areas for the acquisition or joint development of new student housing. The campus will explore the potential availability of opportunity sites in these areas, but the acquisition and development of any particular site would require separate environmental and public review pursuant to CEQA.

The LRDP proposes the addition of 1,450 to 1,930 beds in the Telegraph Avenue area of Southside at a combination of existing campus properties and any potential "opportunity sites" that may become available during the LRDP planning period. In order to analyze the environmental impacts of meeting the campus housing goal for the Telegraph area, the LRDP EIR assumed that all 1,930 beds are constructed in this area on campus-owned sites, identified opportunity sites, or other potential opportunity sites. More specific analysis of future housing and opportunity sites will be conducted in the context of project-specific CEQA review.
The LRDP also identifies the South Shattuck Avenue corridor as a preferred area for potential opportunity site housing development. This area is particularly desirable for upper division and graduate apartment-style housing because of its accessibility, its current underdeveloped and non-residential uses, and its compatibility with the City's plans, which identify the area for new residential development. The campus goal is to seek direct or joint venture opportunities for student apartment development in this area to accommodate 775 to 1,275 students. Although no specific opportunity sites have been identified, the LRDP EIR assumed that 1,275 beds are constructed in this area, and specific opportunity sites that become available will be subject to tiered environmental and public review under CEQA.

Housing development is also proposed to occur on other campus properties, including an addition to the International House and a small new facility in the Northside area of the campus.

In total, the LRDP proposes the construction of a range from 2,350 to 3,410 new beds to be located on either specific identified sites or potential opportunity sites in designated areas. Because the Master Plan for Higher Education directs that University of California housing (as well as other auxiliary enterprises such as dining and recreational facilities) must be self-supporting, and this financial feasibility requirement will turn on a number of factors beyond the control of the campus, the campus is unable to commit to achieving its housing goals. Accordingly, the LRDP EIR analyzed both a "worst case" housing scenario—no new housing beyond what is currently existing or previously approved—and a "best case" scenario—construction of all housing proposed in the LRDP.

Community Planning

The different missions of the University of California at Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, the size and location of the campus in relation to the City, and the exemption of the campus from city property taxes, assessments and land use and building controls are continuing issues requiring discussion and coordination.

The campus is committed to continuing an ongoing dialogue about issues described in the LRDP and on planning issues in general with local communities. Campus representatives participate in the City's planning process, providing input about plans for campus properties. City representatives provide information to the campus and input on individual projects and long range planning. The campus will continue to collaborate with the City of Berkeley and will maintain liaison with interested neighborhood groups, institutions, officials of neighboring cities, and with other public and private agencies to provide information on campus projects and discuss physical development issues of mutual concern.

University in the City

The LRDP recognizes that the campus relates to the City in terms of: its urban location; its public service programs; the significance of its faculty, staff and students as residents and their contributions to the local economy; and the use of the Central Campus Park that serves as a major regional open space with natural and cultural resources for the community.
Central Campus Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
Long Range Development Plan

The LRDP is divided by campus areas: the Campus Environ, which includes the Central Campus Area, Northside, Westside/Downtown, Southside and South Shattuck; and the Hill Area. Each area is discussed separately in the LRDP, and each discussion addresses land use priorities, and proposed development plans, including an illustration of specific development projects reflecting the current vision of LRDP implementation.

Central Campus Area Land Use and Development

The Central Campus Area includes the Central Campus Park (bounded by Hearst Avenue, Gayley Road/Piedmont Avenue, Bancroft Way, and Oxford/Fulton Streets) and immediately adjacent campus properties.

The fundamental planning premises for land use and new development in the Central Campus Area are: 1) the preservation and enhancement of the open space and historical resources in the Central Campus Park; 2) the organization of the campus into precincts of related academic disciplines; 3) the establishment of priorities for allocating scarce Central Campus space and new development sites; and 4) the relocation of non-priority uses not requiring Central Campus Area locations to the peripheral Campus Environ and to other properties.

To encourage academic exchanges and the use of shared facilities, and because related departments have historically been located close together, the Central Campus Area has been divided into seven precincts for planning purposes, generally corresponding to related academic disciplines. These are: 1) Engineering and Earth Sciences; 2) Mathematics and Physical Sciences; 3) Art, Music and Professions; 4) Humanities and Social Sciences; 5) Agriculture and Life Sciences; 6) Library and Administration; and 7) Student Services and Recreation.
The priority uses for the Central Campus Area are: instruction, research directly related to instruction, and research, administrative and support services requiring proximity to instruction programs, such as student services. Units which will be considered for relocation to peripheral and outlying sites include: research units with limited teaching functions, new research activities not requiring a Central Campus Area location; research activities with special equipment, space, or other requirements that cannot be effectively accommodated in the Central Campus Park; and administrative and support services not requiring a Central Campus location.

The “Selective Densities” concept concentrates appropriate new development in existing urbanized areas of the campus and preserves the park areas of the campus as natural and open space settings. The maintenance and enhancement of the park-like setting of the Central Campus is important not only for aesthetic reasons, but also as a living educational resource. The LRDP designates three natural areas—the Wicksun, Goodspeed, and Grinnell Natural Areas—to be preserved as important resources for teaching, research, and wildlife habitat. The LRDP also identifies other open space conservation areas.

**Campus Environs Land Use and Development**

The Campus Environs includes the Northside, Westside/Downtown, and Southside neighborhoods surrounding the Central Campus Park. The LRDP relates campus development to existing residential neighborhoods and retail areas, and relates support activities to the Central Campus Park uses they serve.

**Northside**

For the Northside the LRDP proposes limited residential development, with some instruction and research uses adjacent to the Central Campus Park. The amount of proposed campus development is influenced by the limited amount of developable campus property and the predominantly residential character of the neighborhood.

**Westside/Downtown**

The Westside serves as a transition area between the campus and the City’s major commercial and civic center area. Campus properties in the Westside together with underdeveloped properties owned privately or by the City provide potential opportunities
Southside Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
for direct or joint development of office, commercial, research, housing, and visitor-service facilities. These uses were selected to be consistent with the City's Draft Downtown Plan.

One potential opportunity site is 2151 Berkeley Way, currently used by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) for laboratory and office space. Although DHS has indicated a preference for relocating these functions and vacating 2151 Berkeley Way, and the potential acquisition of this facility by The Regents for use by the University and/or the Berkeley campus has been discussed, neither the DHS relocation, nor the potential future uses of 2151 Berkeley Way has been approved or funded. The LRDP does not propose the acquisition of, nor rely on the availability of, 2151 Berkeley Way. Should this site be made available to The Regents and to the campus, further planning would be necessary to determine appropriate uses. Given the relatively large size of the DHS facility (approximately 110,000 ASF) and its existing science-oriented uses, its acquisition and use by the campus would require an amendment to the LRDP as well as project-specific CEQA review.

In addition, the campus is in preliminary discussions regarding the potential for mixed-use and/or joint development or opportunity site projects with the YMCA and with other property owners such as the Sisters of the Presentation. These types of projects that will involve reuse of existing tax-exempt properties or joint development/housing projects will be explored consistent with the LRDP.

Southside
Approximately 8,700 students live in the Southside, the area generally bounded by Bancroft Way, Dwight Way, Ellsworth Street, and Prospect Street. This represents about 85 percent of the resident population. Excluding commercial properties, the campus and its affiliates (fraternities, sororities, and cooperative housing) own about two-thirds of the land. In addition to student housing and recreational facilities, campus land is also used by Organized Research Units, support services, and parking. The LRDP includes a vision for Southside student housing to help meet housing needs, enhance the educational experience for students, and make the area a safer, more attractive place for both students and the community. The retention of open space on People's Park together with recreation improvements and new student housing locations would be planned to improve safety and provide open space. A new dining facility, in conjunction with the existing centralized dining facilities, and related student services are also proposed. Much of the new housing is planned to be constructed over parking structures to replace existing surface parking.

South Shattuck Area
The South Shattuck Area offers the opportunity for potential additional student housing development which could also help to achieve City objectives for development in this area. The LRDP proposes housing development in this area as a complement to the development of existing campus-owned properties in the Southside area.

Hill Area Land Use and Development
The overall planning objective for the campus Hill Area property is to designate most of the area as a conservation land resource with limited areas proposed for development. The boundaries of the Ecological Study Area are expanded in the LRDP, with other areas designated as potential development sites for future compatible research facilities. Additional surface parking is planned to serve Campus Environ users and units located in the Hill Area. Recreational facility improvements are also planned.
Hill Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
Parking and Circulation

The LRDP also addresses land use designations necessary to meet the circulation and parking needs of the campus during the planning period. In particular, the LRDP recognizes that the current supply of parking located on or adjacent to the Central Campus Park is expected to decrease by the year 2005-06. Surface parking lots in this area are among the few remaining building sites available for new construction and, in some areas, for preservation as open space or for circulation improvements. Surface parking is also planned to be relocated for new development in the Southside, primarily to provide sites associated with the development of new student housing.

The gradual removal of surface parking from a portion of the Central Campus Park would permit the creation of an "Auto Free Zone" to minimize noise and conflicts with pedestrians. The LRDP circulation and parking land use designations will continue to provide adequate vehicle access and parking sites for disabled persons, departmental vehicles, official visitors, emergency services and other priority needs.

Existing parking removed from the Campus Environ to provide sites for new development and other improvements is planned to be replaced by reallocating existing nearby parking facilities (including the University Hall parking facilities), and by constructing new parking facilities within walking distance to campus and at satellite locations.

The environmental impacts of land use changes affecting circulation and parking were addressed in the LRDP EIR, as were traffic and parking mitigation measures.
Introduction
Academic Context
Space Needs
Campus Population
Housing
Community Planning
This Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and its accompanying Environmental Impact Report (EIR) represent a significant step in the planning and development of the Berkeley campus. The Plan’s foremost purpose is to support and maintain academic excellence while meeting the needs of Berkeley’s faculty and diverse student population. To achieve the University’s tripartite goals of teaching, research, and public service, there must be a high quality environmental setting for students, faculty, researchers, and staff—places where they can interact as a community of scholars. At the same time, the campus community must interact with the adjoining neighborhoods and the city in ways which are mutually beneficial.

The LRDP is a siting and land use plan to provide the kind of facilities required to maintain academic excellence. It includes recommendations for the use of Central Campus building sites and for campus development not requiring a Central Campus location, and it involves balancing different and competing institutional needs, as well as relating to community needs. The LRDP also includes a comprehensive circulation and parking framework to provide convenient access for campus users while minimizing travel impacts on the community.

This Plan will guide campus physical development to the year 2005-06, while maintaining, to the maximum degree feasible, flexibility to accommodate unforeseen academic and support needs within this period and into the 21st century.

The Plan will be reviewed periodically to monitor its continuing effectiveness in meeting campus goals, and revisions will be made as required to ensure its capability to meet changing academic and research needs. Adoption of the LRDP indicates only an approval in principle for development with no commitment to specific projects, construction schedules or funding priority. Each project must be approved individually. The LRDP was the subject of an accompanying EIR and public review process, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Planning Process

The two and a half-year planning process for this LRDP included participation by the campus and the community. A Long Range Development Plan Advisory Committee,
chaired by a faculty member and including representatives of the faculty, students, staff, the City of Berkeley, and the Office of the President, advised the Campus Planning Office and its consultants during development of the Plan. Special presentations and reviews were also conducted for the faculty, ASUC Senate, the Chancellor’s Staff Advisory Committee, the Academic Planning Committee of the Academic Senate, various student and campus groups, the City of Berkeley’s City-University Planning Committee and the Berkeley City Council. In addition to these reviews, a series of public meetings and planning workshops was held during day and evening hours for both the campus and community during the two-

year planning period preceding publication of the first Draft LRDP and its accompanying Draft EIR in April 1989. A 90-day comment period, including a public hearing, on the Draft LRDP and Draft EIR was conducted beginning in April 1989 and concluding in July 1989. In response to comments received from the community, the campus decided to revise the Draft LRDP and Draft EIR. Following another public hearing and comment period on the revised Draft LRDP and Draft EIR, the campus prepared a Final EIR responding to comments raised during the hearing and comment period. The Regents approved the LRDP and its Draft and Final EIR in May 1990.
The Long Range Development Plan proposes physical development for the period 1990 to 2005 that supports the academic mission of the University of California at Berkeley. The Master Plan for Higher Education 1960-1975 specifies that the mission of the University of California includes undergraduate and graduate education, research and public service. Academic planning at Berkeley is based on the mandate the State has given the University of California to assume responsibility for the most advanced levels of teaching and research in extant areas of knowledge and to exercise leadership in discerning and developing new areas. Academic planning at Berkeley is designed to facilitate development of the conditions appropriate for advanced-level teaching and research and encouragement of new areas of scholarship. This Long Range Development Plan incorporates physical planning proposals needed to maintain and enhance the excellence of Berkeley's teaching and research programs. Faculty balance among the academic disciplines is to be maintained, although the number of students and faculty may vary somewhat among programs and disciplines. The Long Range Development Plan seeks to provide those physical facilities that will enhance development of a scholastically and ethnically diverse student body. The new buildings and modifications of existing buildings are being proposed to address these goals.

This statement of the academic context for the 1990-2005 Long Range Development Plan articulates the academic considerations which guided the proposals for facilities development described in the plan. The purpose of the academic context is to indicate that this physical development should occur in the specified time frame to permit the faculty at the University of California at Berkeley to carry out its teaching and research mission and to provide the necessary leadership in discerning and developing new fields. The Long Range Development Plan is primarily a document that describes the physical facilities necessary to achieve the academic goals.

Academic planning at Berkeley is a dynamic process. The process allows faculty to provide academic excellence in teaching and research as well as leadership in setting new directions. The needs of changing generations of students, changing needs in education, developments in new interrelationships among the academic disciplines, and impacts of technological developments may be accommodated only in a dynamic academic planning process. The potential inherent in Berkeley's academic
programs for seeking new relationships among traditional disciplines must be strengthened and the seeds of emerging research areas must be nurtured. Enhancement of embryonic efforts are to be encouraged. These dynamic processes are at the heart of maintenance of Berkeley's academic excellence.

In the planning process that led to proposals in the Long Range Development Plan, faculty assessed their own disciplines and sought to document the need for those facilities necessary to sustain academic excellence and promote development of new interdisciplinary relationships and new directions in teaching and research. The faculty in many academic disciplines made clear the need for new physical facilities to enable them to maintain excellence in their fields and to continue pioneering efforts. In addition, the campus surveyed space needs of all academic and service units to identify current and long range space needs. Sufficient space has been incorporated in the Long Range Development Plan to meet needs identified in the campus space surveys.

Documentation of faculty discussion of the academic issues and programs is described in the "Academic Planning Statement for the 1990-2005 Long Range Development Plan." (See Appendix A.) Additional background information concerning faculty considerations is in individual project proposals, Project Planning Guides, and departmental records for each project described. The Academic Planning Statement includes a proposal for expanding the planning process to formalize cooperation between the Administration and the Berkeley Academic Senate in analyzing the academic effects of proposed development.

This statement of the academic context includes consideration of space for teaching and research appropriate to the requirements of not only extant but also developing academic disciplines. Specifically, careful consideration has been given to classrooms and libraries, for these are vital to all academic concerns. The physical facilities proposed include space requisite to allow classrooms to be functional for instruction in current and emerging subjects. The physical planning process has included new and modified extant space to enhance libraries used by a myriad of academic disciplines. Physical facilities planning has included an awareness that technological developments have a continuing impact on methods to enhance teaching and research.

Academic considerations and policies that enable Berkeley faculty to carry out their mandate necessitate appropriate physical facilities. The physical facilities must be flexible enough in design to permit growth and change inherent in teaching and research as it is conducted at Berkeley. Accordingly, certain specified projects, derived from discussions of academic programs among faculty and consultations with physical facilities planners, are proposed in the Long Range Development Plan. Although comprehensive, the Long Range Development Plan is not exhaustive of all projects and physical plant developments that may be required to meet teaching and research needs in the 1990-2005 period. The current plan includes only those projects that have come to fruition in terms of academic planning and physical site consultation at the present time.

A number of factors indicate needs for additional space and the necessity for flexibility in the use and allocation of campus facilities. These include:

- General use of computers and other electronic equipment in every aspect of education, including administration, has expanded enormously in recent years to create new demands for more space.
• The technological developments of the past decade require more space to maintain academic excellence. For example, faculty and students in the Social Sciences now use computers to analyze their data, and they require archival collections to be at hand in their daily teaching as well as research. These space-using developments were not anticipated only a few years ago when space was assigned to the Social Sciences departments.

• Classrooms are vital to teaching and learning. To promote these functions, it is essential that classrooms have adequate seating, air circulation, lighting and other amenities. Classrooms in a wide range of sizes and with a variety of capabilities for present and future instructional techniques should be available.

• Student enrollment demand in certain academic disciplines has rendered their facilities functionally inadequate to meet contemporary teaching and research requirements.

• New teaching and research approaches to traditional subjects commonly lead to new organized research and related teaching organizations. These newly-emergent organizations, often multidisciplinary in nature, create new demands for additional space.

• Libraries and museums containing archival materials must have space to accommodate additions to their collections. Without addition of new materials, the archival units lose their ability to support teaching and research. Furthermore, as archival collections grow in size, so too does use of the materials in the collections. The increased use generates yet more need for additional space.

• New academic departments and reorganization of existing departments, as has taken place among the life and physical sciences, have created new space requirements. Meeting these requirements will allow Berkeley faculty to carry out their academic mandate.

• Student Services units assist students in meeting their academic and life goals. These units have operated for years in inadequate facilities. Services to students require appropriate space to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population.

• A significant amount of new student housing is required to meet current shortages and to enable more students to live close to the campus and in an environment that enhances their college experience.

• As disciplines in the humanities and social sciences evolve, it is anticipated that space needs in these academic areas will change. The emergence of new departments may create a need for space in which to accommodate such fields. As described in the Academic Planning Statement (see Appendix A), some space needs in the Humanities and Social Sciences will be met by reallocation of space vacated when faculty move to new buildings.

• As the number of faculty emeriti is expected to increase significantly in the next decade, limited space, when available, for those faculty who remain active professionally after retirement will need to be provided.

The increase in new space required to permit Berkeley faculty to carry out their academic mission contained in the Long Range Development Plan demonstrates the dynamism inherent in academic planning. Facilities must be provided to accommodate appropriate instruction and research in the light of changing academic and research
objectives and an ethnically and scholastically changing student population. Accordingly, meeting Berkeley's academic mandate and enhancing Berkeley's leadership in addressing societal needs and goals are at the heart of the 1990-2005 Long Range Development Plan.
Space Needs

In order to translate the goals of the campus during the planning period into a proposed development program and land use map, the campus conducted a comprehensive study of existing and previously approved development. The overall development strategy is to meet currently unmet and changing physical requirements through a strategy that balances development of new facilities with expansion and redevelopment of existing campus properties. This strategy includes relocating administrative and support activities to the periphery of the campus and to other properties, consolidating related units that are currently scattered, and expanding existing buildings. This renewal process will lead to a more efficient use of campus facilities while preserving the park-like qualities of the campus.

Existing and Approved Development

Berkeley campus facilities include 569 buildings that provide space totaling approximately 7.4 million assignable square feet (ASF).1 This figure includes leased space. The Central Campus Park (bounded on the perimeter by Hearst Avenue, Gayley Road/Piedmont Avenue, Bancroft Way, and Oxford/Fulton Streets) contains 116 buildings with approximately 4.6 million ASF. Peripheral and outlying properties include residential, research, and support facilities. The 170 residential buildings (including residence halls, theme houses, and University Village in Albany) total approximately 1.4 million ASF. Research and support facilities, located in the Hill Area, elsewhere in Berkeley, at the Gill Tract in Albany, and at the Richmond Field Station, total 283 buildings, including numerous small structures, with approximately 1.4 million ASF.

In addition to this existing development, several current projects have already been approved (in accordance with CEQA), and include a net of 297,844 ASF for academic and support uses and 200,196 ASF for student housing, totaling a net 498,040 ASF of additional space. These approved projects (designated as Category I) are identified in Table 1.

Existing facilities and approved development together total approximately 7.9 million ASF and are described below by user category.

Humanities and Social Sciences

The College of Letters and Science includes over 30 instruction and research departments in Psychology, Social Sciences, Arts, Letters, Area Studies, and Foreign Languages. An additional 20 organized research and organized activity units are associated with these disciplines. The Humanities and Social

---

1"Assignable square feet" is a measure of space within a building that can be assigned to a use, such as "instruction and research." It does not include hallways, stairways, or custodial space.
TABLE 1
Category 1: Approved Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Development Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genetics and Plant Biology Building (including Northwest Parking Facility) (under construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Animal Facility (under construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics and Plant Biology Greenhouse (completed construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Chemistry Unit III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Student Housing and associated parking (under construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shattuck/Channing Student Housing (under construction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Building Renovation (includes central court infill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latimer Hall Roof Laboratory Addition (completed construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hall and University Hall Parking Structure Reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Improvement Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Gate Open Space Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design and environmental review have been approved for the projects listed below. The assignable square feet (ASF) and gross square feet (GSF) (and for housing, the number of beds) for these projects are listed in Table 7 in the Appendix.

Physical and Life Sciences

The College of Letters and Science, the College of Natural Resources, and the College of Chemistry include approximately 25 instruction and research departments in the Biological Sciences, the Agricultural Sciences, Mathematics, the Physical Sciences, and Chemical Engineering, and over 15 organized research and organized activity units. In addition to 1,746,031 ASF in existing facilities, the Physical and Life Sciences will gain a net 181,014 ASF from approved projects, including the Genetics and Plant Biology Building, the Northwest Animal Facility, the Genetics and Plant Biology Greenhouse, the Life Sciences Building Renovation, the College of Chemistry Unit III building, and the Latimer Hall Roof Laboratory Addition, resulting in a total of 1,927,035 ASF.

Professional Schools and Colleges

Professional programs in Engineering, Business Administration, Education, Environmental Design, Law, Social Welfare, Journalism, Public Policy, and Library and Information Studies, as well as ten associated organized research and organized activity units, currently use 1,064,155 ASF.

Health Sciences

The School of Public Health, the School of Optometry, and the Optometry Clinic are currently assigned 109,619 ASF. Reuse of University Hall for Health Science office space will increase this net space to 119,058 ASF.

Library and Classroom Space

Campus facilities currently provide 241,064 ASF for general classrooms and assembly and 625,103 ASF for libraries. Approved proj-
ects, including the Genetics and Plant Biology Building, the Life Sciences Building Renovation, the Chemistry Unit III building, and the California Hall renovation will provide an additional 27,802 ASF for classrooms and libraries, resulting in a total of 893,969 ASF.

**Student Services**

Student services programs include Learning Resources, Career Planning and Placement, University Health, Recreation, Academic Advising, Counseling, Student Activities, Financial Aid, and the Associated Students, and currently use 465,224 ASF.

**Housing and Food Services**

Residence halls, theme houses, student family housing at University Village in Albany and at Smythe-Fernwold, and food services currently use 1,629,372 ASF. The Foothill Student Housing and Shattuck/Channing Student Housing projects will provide an additional 189,996 ASF for housing (the Shattuck/Channing project also includes 10,200 ASF of retail space). The Genetics and Plant Biology Building will provide an additional 2,079 ASF for food service. The resulting total is 1,831,647 ASF.

**Administrative Space**

Administrative activities, including Academic Administration, Information Systems and Technology, Environment, Health and Safety, Transportation, Communications, Physical Resources, Financial Services, Alumni Services, Public Services and Museums, and other administrative functions, currently use 889,365 ASF. The California Hall renovation and the reuse of University Hall will result in a net increase of administrative space to 966,875 ASF.

**Space Needs Assessment**

In addition to the space needs to be satisfied by currently approved projects, recent space surveys have identified further requirements by the year 2005-06. These include: a) instruction and research facilities; b) administrative and support facilities; c) student housing; and d) space improvements for consolidation of functions and relocations.

The estimated net additional space needed to meet the goals of the campus during the LRDP planning period includes approximately 440,000 ASF for academic and support uses and 541,000 to 785,000 ASF for student housing, for a total of 981,000 to 1,225,000 ASF. In addition, approximately 53,000 ASF for possible retail space is proposed to be developed in conjunction with housing and other projects. Finally, the LRDP proposes 147,000 ASF of net additional space for potential joint development projects which may be used to meet housing, student services, and other space needs. While the current vision of LRDP implementation projects does not rely upon the availability or eventual use of any joint development sites, future economic or other factors may make such projects desirable or more feasible than the future projects identified in Table 7.

In assessing existing and anticipated space needs, a vision emerged of the specific development projects that would satisfy the current assessment of space needs, and this project list is identified (by user category) as an illustration of LRDP implementation. Evolving academic needs and other factors during the planning period will result in the need to modify this illustrative project list. The space needs assessment thus represents an aggregate ASF development envelope, within which project configurations may vary, but the aggregate of which may not be exceeded without amending the LRDP in accordance with CEQA.

The amount of proposed new square footage listed below for each user category is the net new space, which takes into account replacement and removal of facilities, expansion of facilities, use of released space, changes in leased space, and construction of additional facilities. The space categories listed below do not directly correspond to the project space estimates for the potential new development projects listed in Table 7. This is because: 1) the physical precincts identified in Table 7 do not correspond directly to the user group categories identified below; 2) individual projects may serve a variety of users; 3) the net increase in space within a user category may be smaller than
the newly constructed space if existing space is proposed to be assigned to another user; and 4) the amount of leased space may change. However, the net new space for all potential academic and administrative projects listed in Table 7 is included in the total amount of proposed development (440,000 ASF) listed in Table 3, and the impacts of this total amount of proposed new development were studied in the EIR. The current vision of specific projects which respond to these needs is identified in italics for each precinct. Changes to the size, specific location, or ultimate necessity of each identified project are expected during the planning period.

Humanities and Social Sciences

New and expanded facilities, resulting in a net increase of approximately 60,000 ASF, are needed for Music, the Humanities, and other programs. Major changes in the study of music, including the emergence of new fields and technological applications, have led to the need for additional space for the Department of Music. In the Humanities, space is needed for many crowded departments and to provide facilities for computing and other technological needs. Exhibit space in Kroeger Hall is too small to enable display and access to the Lowe Museum's major collection, and additional space is needed. Space is also needed to replace existing temporary facilities and consolidate programs for ROTC.

The Morrison-Hertz Addition, Dwinelle Hall Attic Expansion project, Kroeger Hall South Addition (Lowe Museum), and ROTC Facility are new construction projects proposed to help meet the above needs for the Humanities and Social Sciences, along with reassignment of existing space.

Physical and Life Sciences

New and expanded facilities, resulting in a net increase of approximately 80,000 ASF, are needed to consolidate dispersed units, replace temporary facilities, alleviate overcrowding, and respond to changes in research techniques. Replacement of temporary facilities and relief from overcrowding are needed for the Lawrence Hall of Science, Silver Laboratory, and the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in the Hill Area.

The additions proposed for the Lawrence Hall of Science (Steps 1 and 2), the Silver Laboratory, and the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, and the Oxford Tract Development (Southern Portion) are planned to meet the needs of the Physical and Life Sciences.

Library and Classroom Space

A net increase of approximately 160,000 ASF is needed to provide new collections space for the main library complex, expanded space for the Music, Business Administration, and East Asian Libraries, and additional classrooms. More stack space for the growing central collection in the Main Library complex is needed. A new facility is needed to consolidate and meet the current needs and projected growth of the East Asian Library collection, currently the most overcrowded branch library on the campus.

The Doe and Moffitt Libraries Addition, the Doe Library Infill project, and the East Asian Library, as well as the Business Administration Building and Morrison-Hertz Addition, are proposed to meet the needs of the libraries. Additional campus classroom needs are planned to be met by inclusion of classrooms in the new or expanded academic buildings described for each academic discipline area. Existing library space serving Business Administration is proposed to be reassigned for other uses, and space in the existing Doe Library stack is
anticipated to be reduced as a result of proposed seismic improvements.

Health Sciences

New facilities, resulting in a net increase of approximately 10,000 ASF, are needed for the Health Sciences. This includes space for the School of Public Health, and the replacement of space currently assigned to the School of Optometry in Cowell Hospital, which is proposed to be removed to permit reuse of the site for a Business Administration Building.

The proposed Minor Hall Expansion project and reassignment of existing space are planned to meet space needs of the Health Sciences.

Professional Schools and Colleges

A net increase of approximately 90,000 ASF is needed, primarily to provide expanded space for the School of Business Administration, new space for research and increased demand for instruction in Computer Science, and additional research facilities for the College of Engineering. Modest increases in space for Law, Environmental Design, and several other professional programs are also needed to alleviate overcrowding.

The proposed Business Administration Building, Computer Science Building, College of Engineering Expansion project, and Wurster Hall and Law Building additions are planned to meet space needs of the Professional Schools and Colleges. Concurrently, a significant amount of space presently assigned to Computer Science and Business Administration would be reassigned to meet the needs of other disciplines.

Administrative Space

A net increase of approximately 10,000 ASF is needed to replace existing facilities and relieve overcrowding in a number of units, primarily at off-campus locations. For example, more space is needed for the Housing and Dining Services Office, the Alumni House, and Environment, Health and Safety. In addition, where joint development or other opportunities will permit, existing administrative activities in leased space would be relocated into campus-owned space.

The proposed Gas and Chemical Storage Facility, Environment, Health and Safety Facility, and Alumni House Addition are planned to meet campus needs for administrative space. Some existing administrative space would be reassigned to meet the needs of other programs.

Student Services

A net increase of approximately 30,000 ASF for student services is needed to relieve overcrowding and to provide for some expansion in programs. Temporary outmoded facilities need to be replaced and space provided to achieve efficiencies and integrate student services more fully with academic programs on campus. A University Health Service facility is needed to replace existing space in Cowell Hospital. The facility might also include approximately 6,000 ASF of retail space. A modest amount of additional space is also needed for Intercollegiate Athletics.

The proposed University Health Service Facility, Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities project (Step 2), and Student Services Building, which will replace temporary buildings in the Central Glade, are planned to meet space needs for Student Services.

Housing

Approximately 541,000 to 785,000 ASF of space is needed for student housing, which is more fully described in the Housing section. Some of the housing, such as in the
The estimated ASF and GSF for these projects are listed in Table 7 in the Appendix.

### New Development Projects
- Business Administration Building
- Computer Science Building
- East Asian Library
- Additional Student Housing
- Oxford Tract Development, Southern Portion

### Replacement Projects
- University Health Service Facility
- Minor Hall Expansion
- Parking Facilities
- Student Services Building to replace T-Buildings
- Environment, Health and Safety Facility
- ROTC Facility
- Silver Laboratory Addition
- Doe Library Infill
- Gas and Chemical Storage Facility
- Botanical Garden Improvements

### Potential Joint Development Sites
- UC Garage Joint Development Site
- UC Printing Plant Joint Development Site

### Additions or Relocation Projects
- Doe and Moffitt Libraries Addition
- Lawrence Hall of Science Additions and Alterations, Steps 1 and 2
- Wurster Hall Fourth Floor Link Addition
- Law Building Addition
- Dwinelle Hall Attic Expansion
- University Hall Parking Structure Addition
- Alumni House Addition
- Morrison-Hertz Addition
- Kroeber Hall South Addition (Lowie Museum)
- Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Addition
- College of Engineering Expansion
- Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities, Step 2

### Open Space Improvement Projects
- Welman Courtyard Restoration
- Central Glade Restoration

South Shattuck corridor or other opportunity sites, might include approximately 47,000 ASF of retail space.

Additional student housing projects, primarily in the Southside area, are proposed to meet housing needs. These could include the Bowditch, Anna Head, Channing/Bowditch, Dwight, Haste/Channing, and Ridge/La Loma Residence Halls; International House Addition; and possible Opportunity Sites in Southside, South Shattuck Avenue, and other sites in Berkeley.

### Illustration of LRDP Implementation
As noted above, space for these additional needs may be provided by implementing the LRDP with the specific projects (designated Category 2) listed in Table 2. Table 3 summarizes all existing, approved and proposed development.

### Potential Joint Development
The UC Garage and the UC Printing Plant (currently under the jurisdiction of the Office of the President) are two sites with potential for joint development with the private sector or the City. Use of these sites could help to provide space for campus uses, while also incorporating private or public uses. The estimated development on these sites could result in a net increase of 147,000 ASF. It is unknown at this time what portions of this development might be for University or non-University uses.

### Other Possible Future Development Beyond the Year 2005
Additional development to meet possible needs within the LRDP planning period is not reasonably foreseeable at this time. Development beyond the year 2005 may occur in relation to any campus activity depending on future events and decisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing and Approved Development</th>
<th>Assignable Square Feet&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (ASF)</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Development</td>
<td>7,425,000</td>
<td>12,679,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Development&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>498,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,923,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,499,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Net Additional Space to Meet Needs to 2005 (other than Housing)&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>723,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Net Additional Space for Student Housing to 2005&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>541,000-785,000</td>
<td>715,000-1,152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Net Additional Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>981,000-1,225,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,438,000-1,875,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL EXISTING, APPROVED AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT** | **8,904,000-9,148,000** | **14,937,000-15,374,000** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail and Joint Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible Retail Space Associated with Housing and University Health Service Development</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Joint Development Projects Net Additional Space&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>314,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL EXISTING, APPROVED, PROPOSED, AND RETAIL AND JOINT DEVELOPMENT** | **9,104,000-9,348,000** | **15,251,000-15,688,000** |

---

<sup>1</sup> Assignable square feet is a measure of space within a building that can be assigned to a use, such as instruction and research. It does not include hallways, stairways, or custodial space.

<sup>2</sup> Gross square feet is the sum of all areas on all floors of a building included within the outside face of the building envelope.

<sup>3</sup> Approved development includes projects for which design and environmental review have been approved.

<sup>4</sup> Net additional space takes into account use of existing space, proposed replacement and removal of existing facilities, and proposed new and expanded facilities.

<sup>5</sup> The amount of space that would be used by the University within these potential joint development projects is unknown at this time.
Relationship To 1962 LRDP

Following legislative approval of the 1960-1975 State Master Plan for Higher Education, which directed the University of California system to admit the top 12.5 percent of the annual high school graduating class, Berkeley’s optimal enrollment projection was proposed for 27,500 students, and this projection was approved by The Regents in the Berkeley Campus 1962 LRDP. This figure was originally conceived as being the maximum number of students to be accommodated in the fall term. Progressively down the years, however, the method for counting students has changed as part of the State’s budget process, and as the University has sought to sustain its traditional commitment to accommodate all eligible California students who seek admission.

First, the method for counting students was changed from a fall to a year-average ceiling (which requires a total enrollment between 500 to 600 larger in the fall because of traditionally lower spring enrollments). Then, it was changed to an FTE-student figure (which makes the year-average enrollment dependent on average student unit credit workloads). For a variety of reasons, student unit loads declined steadily between 1972 and 1984, forcing the required year-average headcount on the Central Campus up to 30,600 (and the fall figure to 31,200). The pressures of student demand, particularly at the freshman level, forced the actual fall 1988 headcount enrollment up to 31,612. With 248 of Berkeley’s students studying in a downtown San Francisco MBA program, the actual on-campus headcount enrollment for fall 1988 was 31,364 (or an overall two-semester headcount enrollment of 30,576).

Optimal Level of Student Enrollment

A number of factors support the conclusion that the campus is currently oversubscribed, including: an analysis of the existing history, program requirements, and enrollment demand at the campus, as well as the appropriate mix of graduate, undergraduate and health science students, the physical resources of the campus, faculty recruitment needs, housing needs, community and State interests, and environmental factors. Thus, even with the proposed new development, the LRDP acknowledges that the campus will only support an optimal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>Campus Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Fall 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students</td>
<td>31,364&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty and Other Teaching Staff&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Academic (non-teaching)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Visitors and Vendors</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,903</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The Estimated Daily Peak Attendance is derived from the estimated total headcount population reduced by the combined effect of adjustment factors such as vacation, sick leave, and other than full-time work and study schedules. Attendance at special events is not included.

<sup>2</sup>The fall headcount enrolments relate to overall (two-semester headcount average) enrollments in 1988-89 of 30,576, and in 2005-06 of 29,450. The Fall 1989 headcount was estimated at 30,380 and the 1989-90 two-semester average at 30,270, a reduction of 306 from the 1988-89 average.

<sup>3</sup>Students employed as assistants and staff are not included, since they are included in the student enrollment figures.

<sup>4</sup>The population numbers do not include individuals taking classes held by University Extension and Vista College in Berkeley campus facilities. It is estimated that approximately 4,300 University Extension students and 2,200 Vista College students attend classes in Berkeley campus facilities in the Fall during off-peak hours at night and on weekends. In addition, approximately 500 students attend a freshman Fall Extension program in leased space at the Baptist Seminary (2515 Hillegass Avenue). The majority of these 500 students enroll at Berkeley as regular full-time students in the Spring semester, which offsets the high attrition of freshmen during the Fall semester.

The student enrollment of 29,450 (two-semester headcount average), a reduction of 1,126 students from the 1988-89 enrollment levels. The optimal undergraduate enrollment level should be reduced to 20,000 (a reduction of 2,018 students), while the graduate ranks should increase by approximately 900; the health sciences numbers should remain roughly the same.

This overall reduction in enrollment would approach what the Berkeley campus has historically sought as its optimal enrollment level and would achieve a graduate/undergraduate ratio fitted to the character and balance of its academic program. This acknowledged need for the reduction, despite unprecedented enrollment demand, is intended to permit the campus to maintain its resource base and its programmatic capability to provide the range and quality of teaching, research, and public service for which it is internationally renowned, while easing population-based pressures that are taxing both the campus and its host community. The impacts of both existing and optimal enrollment levels were discussed in detail in the accompanying EIR. Approval of the LRDP and the EIR constitutes a commitment to reaching these optimal enrollment levels by the end of the planning horizon. Although it is impossible to precisely predict the number of students who would actually enroll from year to year through the planning horizon, any planned increase in the enrollment targeted for the year 2005-06 would require further environmental review and an amendment of this LRDP.
Relationship of Student Enrollment to Total Campus Population

In order to maintain the status of a preeminent public research university, it is necessary to maintain the highest quality graduate and post-doctoral programs. This commitment to graduate education is particularly critical to maintain in view of the increasing national need for college and university professors. Maintenance of highest quality graduate instruction and research programs, as well as enhancing the quality of undergraduate education, requires adequate levels of faculty and staff.

Faculty and Other Academic Population

Faculty and other teaching staff (including part-time staff) at the Berkeley campus are expected to remain at the present size of approximately 1,890 headcount for the foreseeable future, subject only to minor fluctuations from year to year. Other academic (non-teaching) personnel are expected to increase from approximately 1,665 to 1,780 (about 7 percent) by the year 2005. Based on the most recent trends and best estimates of growth indicators, the number of post-doctorals (post-docs) and visiting scholars are estimated to grow from approximately 1,975 to 2,600 headcount (about 32 percent). Growth in these areas reflects the anticipated increase in federal and other extramural funding for research in the future.

Staff Population

A modest increase in staff (including part-time) is projected from approximately 6,809 to 7,241 headcount (about 6 percent), reflecting decreasing enrollments and budget constraints, balanced with increased research needs, additional housing staff, and other support and staff requirements related to the completion of proposed new facilities by the year 2005.

Total Campus Population

As summarized in Table 4, the total estimated daily peak population for the campus is estimated to decrease slightly from approximately 31,255 to 31,088 by the year 2005.
The Need for Student Housing

Housing for campus students is an important adjunct to their educational experience—housing that provides opportunities to meet and interact with other students, is close enough to campus to permit access to evening as well as daytime education, cultural and recreational events and facilities, and is affordable, safe and habitable. Appropriate housing is also a critical component of the campus' goals of meeting the needs of disabled students, underrepresented minorities and scholars with special needs.

The Student Housing Shortage in Berkeley

Between 1979 and 1988, approximately 3,900 private housing units—apartments and houses—were removed from the student housing market and are now used for non-student housing. The campus has responded by adding over 1,000 new student beds over the same period, but has not been able to keep pace with the loss of private housing. Waiting lists for campus and affiliate housing are discouragingly long; currently, an estimated 38 percent of all students must find housing outside of Berkeley—up from only 25 percent just nine years ago. Currently, the campus houses approximately 6,000 students and the affiliates another 3,600 students, in a range of facilities detailed in Table 8 in Appendix B.

Housing Needs by the Year 2005

By the year 2005, between 2,100 and 4,600 new campus-operated bed spaces for single students will be needed, as shown on Table 5. These additional beds are needed despite the fact that the optimal number of single students that will be accommodated as of 2005 will decrease by approximately 1,000. The need is based on the assumptions that affiliates will maintain their level of supply and that the attrition of private housing will slow or stabilize.

Approximately 40 percent of the needed housing is for lower division students who require access to dining hall facilities and health, counseling, tutorial and other student services. About 50 percent of the needed housing is for students who can only afford low or moderate rent levels. A more detailed projection of housing needs by division level and affordability requirements is found in Tables 9 and 10 in Appendix B. One of the major housing objectives, which is reflected in these tables, is the housing of all freshmen in campus housing, other than those who reside at home.

The amount of housing that can be actually developed by the campus will be a function not only of demand and need, but of the cost of new development, the ability of the campus to finance housing and how
### TABLE 5
Supply and Demand
Single Student Housing in Berkeley: Year 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-75% of Single Students&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18,500-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (existing and planned)</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6,000-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional University Housing Needed</strong></td>
<td>15,400-16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,100-4,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>In 1988, 68% of all single students lived in Berkeley, down from 80% in 1979. During the same period, there was a reduction of approximately 3,900 private dwelling units occupied by single students in Berkeley. The estimated ongoing demand for close-in single student housing to the year 2005 is 70-75%. The percentage of single students residing in Berkeley averaged 72.5% between 1978 and 1988.

Competitive the private market in nearby communities becomes.

**Planning Premises for Housing**

A number of premises have guided the planning for housing needs anticipated by the year 2005.

**Proximity to Campus**

An important premise is to increase the amount of housing available to students within walking or biking distance of campus, so that: a) students who live within walking distance can take better advantage of campus facilities and activities; b) students can safely travel between their housing and campus after dark; and c) traffic and parking congestion is reduced.

**Improved Recruitment and Retention of Minorities and Scholars**

The campus has objectives regarding the recruitment and retention of minority students and, particularly at the graduate level, academically outstanding students. The availability of housing, and its related support services, affects recruitment and retention of such students.

**Freshmen Housing**

Many freshmen need a high level of orientation and counseling services as well as centralized food services which the campus can provide. Some of the younger students are the least able to find appropriate and affordable housing in the private marketplace.

**Family Student Housing**

The campus has supplied a substantial amount of low priced family housing since the end of World War II, when the campus' University Village family housing project in Albany was developed. Currently, approximately 30 percent of married and single parent student households live in the 1,022 apartments provided by the campus. Ninety percent of these students are graduates, many of whom work as Research and Teaching Assistants. Access to affordable, quality housing is an important factor in the ability of these students to attend the University, as well as in the recruitment of high calibre Research Assistants (RA's) and Teaching Assistants (TA's). A separate master planning effort is under way to investigate the feasibility of upgrading University Village housing. No development will occur at University Village until this master planning effort (and accompanying environmental and public review) is complete.

**Affordability**

Affordable housing helps achieve an objective of the State of California, which is to provide affordable higher education to its citizens. As rents in campus housing must cover all housing costs, new housing devel-
Development must be constructed economically and result in rent levels that students can afford.

Guaranteed Housing and Housing Continuity
The provision of security and continuity of housing is important so that students can develop long-term relationships with their peers and do not have to be concerned about finding new living quarters each year. A complementary objective is the formation of strong and supportive academic and social groupings, which frequently center on housing arrangements.

Design and Density
There is a general consensus among campus and community leaders, as well as many residents, that the existing nine-story residence halls in the Southside are too large and that they unduly concentrate students. Although many residents of the units find their design attractive and functional, future housing is planned to be designed at lower heights and densities in order to respond to these concerns and be more in keeping with the scale of other development in the community.

Variety and Alternatives in Housing
Plans for new housing should recognize that there are a variety of housing tastes and needs, especially among older students. For some, privacy is paramount, and for others, the communal experience is important.

Housing for Lower Division Students
In order to assure good access and affordability, the plan includes maximum use of existing campus land and existing centralized dining facilities to meet the needs of lower division students. Housing for lower division students is proposed to be built on several sites, in some cases over parking.

Upper Division and Graduate Housing
New housing for single upper division and graduate students is proposed for several locations. Some of these students will choose to live in new Southside residence halls even though they will be designed primarily for lower division students. For others, apartment style housing will be preferred. The south Shattuck Avenue corridor and the downtown areas are particularly desirable for campus housing because of their accessibility, and are desirable to the city, which identifies the areas for a new residential neighborhood in its recent planning. The campus plans to seek direct or joint venture opportunities for student apartment development in this area. Additional housing is proposed as an addition to International House, and at other scattered locations that may become available as the housing development efforts of the campus proceed. Theme houses will continue to be provided for some of these students, as an adjunct to their academic and cultural interests.

Relation to City Development Policies
To the extent reasonable and feasible, new housing will be planned to relate to the existing context and/or city policies regarding downtown and neighborhood development. Specific city regulations regarding density, height, parking requirements, etc. will be balanced with sensitivity to the scale of existing development and campus objectives that include the affordability of housing for students.

Competing interests and needs will be evaluated and worked out, including use of opportunity sites not now in University ownership that are desirable for student housing and that may be considered for other purposes by the City.

The Plan proposes 1,450 to 1,930 beds in the Telegraph area of Southside at various sites, including potential opportunity sites that may become available in this area.
### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Locations</th>
<th>Number of Single Student Beds&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowditch Residence Hall</td>
<td>475-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Head Residence Hall</td>
<td>150-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing/Bowditch Residence Hall</td>
<td>185-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Residence Hall</td>
<td>90-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Sites in Southside</td>
<td>425-740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastie/Channing Residence Hall</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International House Addition</td>
<td>75-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge/La Loma Residence Hall</td>
<td>50-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shattuck Avenue and Other Opportunity Sites in Berkeley</td>
<td>775-1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,350-3,410&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>In addition to current approved Foothill Housing and Shattuck/Channing Housing Projects.<br><sup>2</sup>Assignable square feet (ASF) and gross square feet (GSF) for each housing location are listed on Table 7 in Appendix B.<br><sup>3</sup>The totals (2,350 to 3,410 beds) bracket the 3,350 bed midpoint of the year 2005 single-student housing need, which ranges from 2,100 to 4,600 beds. It should be understood that all the sites listed on this table may not be available and that the number of beds suggested for each site is an estimate. The exact numbers will emerge as each site is studied in detail.

---

**Working with the Private Sector**

The campus cannot, by itself, meet the year 2005 housing need. The attrition of private housing available to students must be slowed down and private development of student housing must be encouraged. The campus plans to work cooperatively with private property owners, developers, and the City to reduce regulatory barriers to the development of new housing and to devise incentives for owners to rent their units to students. The campus also plans to work with developers on direct or joint venture opportunities if desirable sites are identified.

**Faculty Housing**

A reserve site is identified in the Hill Area for a possible limited amount of future faculty housing. In addition to this site, which is not expected to be developed within the time period of the LRDP, opportunity sites would be considered as they may arise as possible locations for affordable housing for faculty close to the campus. One such possible opportunity site is the former Presentation High School site at California and Addison Streets.

---

**Campus Housing Program**

The campus housing development program is outlined in Table 6, indicating the proposed distribution of new and replaced beds to meet anticipated need to the year 2005. As reflected in Table 6, between 41 and 49 percent of proposed new housing would be built on land currently owned by the University. This development is also described in the following LRDP chapters.
Community Planning

University and City Missions

The University of California’s mission of teaching, research and public service has been established to serve the needs of the State of California. As a premier public research university, it also serves the higher education needs of the nation. As a constitutionally established State institution, the University is exempt from regulation by local government.

Local government serves the needs of the population within its boundaries, providing services of public health and safety, public works, community development and land use controls. The different missions of the University of California at Berkeley and the City of Berkeley create the potential for conflict. As a relatively dense and developed older city, Berkeley experiences impacts from campus activity, and changes in the City impact the campus. The size of the campus in relation to the City, the location of the campus in the midst of the City, and the exemption of the campus from City property taxes, assessments and land use and building controls are continuing points for stress. In the cities of Albany, Richmond and Oakland, campus properties have a lesser impact.

Compatibility of Development and Review

Some community members and City officials have expressed concerns with campus development in terms of appropriate uses, scale and character. Where possible, the campus works within City policies to achieve common goals with the community. However, academic needs, development economics, housing affordability, land use compatibility, building scale, parking and traffic, housing policies, historic landmark preservation, and project review procedures are some of the areas where campus needs cannot always be met within the policies of local communities, which are established to relate primarily to private-sector development.

Financial Impact

While the campus is a major generator of economic activity in the City of Berkeley, the financial impact of campus development on City services is of concern to the local community. Because the campus is exempt from local assessments and property taxes, the burden of paying for services for campus properties is distributed throughout the community. The impact of campus land acquisition and the removal of property from city tax rolls may present a financial problem to the City. The City and community are often concerned with the potential for loss of city tax revenue and displacement of residential and commercial tenants resulting from University acquisition and development. The University attempts to limit property acquisition to key parcels particularly well located for campus functions. On off-campus sites, the displacement of tax-paying uses is minimized by incorporating some tax-paying uses (such as retail services) into the new project where possible. The campus assists the City in many ways, with police services, service payments for...
new off-campus housing, and other direct and indirect payments.

**Ongoing Coordination**

In some areas, the campus and the City of Berkeley have begun to address mutual goals. The campus supports City policies that encourage locating new housing in the Downtown and along the entry corridors, and the housing needs of students are being addressed through renovation and new construction of housing facilities. The campus also supports City policies to encourage appropriate economic development to serve the community, with the emphasis on retail development and mixed-use projects in the Downtown. Planning for campus properties in the Southside, Northside, Westside and the Downtown, as well as Northwest Berkeley and Albany, will consider the City’s policies as well as campus needs and compatibility with the existing land uses. The overall circulation and parking plan is sensitive to community concerns and would reduce traffic and congestion in the Campus Environ.

The Berkeley campus is committed to continuing an ongoing dialogue about these land use and development issues with local communities. Campus representatives participate in the City’s planning process, providing input about plans for campus properties. City representatives provide information to the campus and input on individual projects and long range planning. The Mayor and the Chancellor discuss issues of mutual concern. The Berkeley campus will continue to collaborate with the City of Berkeley to keep current on City plans and policies and to inform the City about campus projects, and will keep interested neighborhood groups and institutions informed of changes on the campus. Continuing liaison will be maintained with officials of neighboring cities and with other public and private agencies to help resolve physical development issues of mutual concern.
Long Range Development Plan
University In The City

The Berkeley campus is the oldest in the University of California system and one of the most urban of the major campuses. This urban context contributes to much of the character and vitality of the campus community, while the campus has in turn contributed to the City of Berkeley, providing a large market for nearby retail businesses, restaurants, offices, and housing from among its students, faculty and staff.

Since it was established by the College of California in 1860, the campus has evolved a complex of diverse physical facilities to support its mission. These physical facilities comprise an extensive network of activities that constitute the “University in the City” (see Figure 1). Individually, these facilities are concentrated on the Central Campus but are also distributed in the surrounding Campus Environments as well, including the Berkeley
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neighborhoods to the Southside, Westside, and Northside, as well as the Hill Area to the east.

The University is guardian of an extraordinary legacy—a "Central Campus Park"—that provides a major regional open space with natural and cultural resources. The park-like character extends from the ridgelines of the regional open space system of the East Bay hills down through Strawberry Canyon to embrace the historic core of campus academic buildings, and continues to the edge of the City's downtown area. This significant landscape preserve provides an idyllic setting for the campus community as well as a welcome contrast with the urban qualities of the surrounding Berkeley neighborhoods and downtown commercial district. These open spaces, public buildings, and recreational facilities serve a community extending far beyond Berkeley campus students, faculty, and staff.

Physical Planning Premises

The primary physical planning premises for the Berkeley campus include meeting current and future academic, institutional and student needs, while preserving the park-like character of the Central Campus and enhancing the quality of life both on campus and in the community. Realization of these premises requires the respect and reinforcement of those resources which give the campus and the community their special qualities. These resources include:

- **Academic Resources**, including preservation of the campus as a setting for scholars and students to interact, discover, and learn; facilities for teaching and research; places which are safe, quiet, convenient, and attractive for both private contemplation and meeting colleagues; and places for inspiration and expression.

- **Natural and Landscape Resources**, encompassing the park-like setting, topographical landforms, creeks, groves, meadows, glades, plantings, natural reserves, open spaces, courtyards and plazas, and the pedestrian scale and character of the campus.

- **Historic and Architectural Resources**, encompassing the classical Beaux-Arts core, important axes and vistas, spatial compositions, historic buildings and features, and the form, massing and details of campus architecture.

- **Community Resources**, including enhancement of the quality of life of the community and recognition that the social and physical context of the campus is the community.

To retain its unique character and qualities, the LRDP recognizes that the "Central Campus Park" (bounded on the perimeter by Hearst Avenue, Gayley Road/Piedmont Avenue, Bancroft Way, and Oxford/Fulton Streets) can accommodate only limited additional development. The LRDP is designed to protect the Central Campus Park resources by identifying building sites and building renovation strategies that result in "selective densities" appropriate for each Central Campus area based upon its environmental context.

To achieve the Central Campus Park concept, other adjacent Berkeley campus properties—including the Hill Area and the properties in the surrounding campus neighborhoods that comprise the Campus Environments—must be carefully planned and appropriately utilized. The use of these and other outlying campus resources will become increasingly important in relation to future academic needs, support activities, housing, circulation and parking.
Central Campus Area
Land Use and Development

The Central Campus Area includes the Central Campus Park and immediately adjacent blocks containing instruction and research uses and support activities.

Central Campus Area Planning Premises

The fundamental planning premises for land use and space allocation in the Central Campus Area are: 1) the conservation and enhancement of the open space, architectural and historical resources in the Central Campus Park; 2) the organization of the campus into precincts of related academic disciplines; 3) the establishment of priorities for allocating scarce Central Campus space and new development sites; and 4) the relocation of uses not falling within these land use priorities to the peripheral Campus Environ and to other properties.

Central Campus Park Conservation

The campus has a strong image and unique identity that sets it apart from other campuses and unifies its disparate buildings and diversified academic functions. In the tradition of other memorable campuses in the United States, such as the University of Virginia, comprised of symmetrical open spaces and Georgian buildings, the University of Chicago, notable for its yards enclosed by high towers and gateways, or Stanford University, which is characterized by quads and arcaded buildings, the Berkeley campus also has its own special "sense of place." It is the density of building and open space, and the use of that open space, which dominates and establishes the image for the Central Campus as a park.

Originally built on an expansive landscape of rolling hills shaped by two forks of Strawberry Creek, the Central Campus has developed landscape and architectural resources of unmatched quality. Over the years, two themes have emerged to describe the interplay between building and landscape. The first theme, laid out originally in the Frederick Law Olmsted plan, emphasized the natural order of the complex topography as a setting for clusters of informal buildings. The second theme, pursued in the John Galen Howard plan, sought to overlay on top of the natural landscape a formal organization of buildings that unified the entire campus. This Beaux-Arts
composition produced a series of classical buildings along a major axis aligned with the Golden Gate. The nature of the historic campus of the University of California at Berkeley results from the tension created by these two themes, the natural and the formal.

A major premise of this LRDP is the maintenance and enhancement of the park-like setting of the campus, not only in aesthetic terms, but as a living system and educational resource which needs to be managed as it changes over time.

The following planning premises are established to guide future conservation and development efforts to meet existing and future academic requirements while protecting and enhancing the landscape and architectural qualities of the “Central Campus Park.”

**Designated Natural Areas**

Three natural areas on the Central Campus Park—the Wickson, Goodspeed, and Grinnell Natural Areas—were designated as Ecological Study Areas (ESAs) and permanently established in 1969. A portion of Observatory Hill was also recommended for preservation and enhancement. The three areas primarily follow the forks of Strawberry Creek and are characterized by native vegetation and naturalized species forming dense woodlands. They are identified in Figure 3. This LRDP continues to recognize the value of these designated Natural Areas, and no buildings or other changes in use are proposed for these areas.

**Central Campus Park Architectural and Historic Resources**

Complementing the major open space areas of the campus are corresponding patterns of building design and character, which together contribute to the unique character of the campus. The center of the campus is characterized by classical buildings arranged along a series of axes in traditional Beaux-Arts manner in accordance with Howard’s plan. These formal symmetrical buildings, with their uniformly light color, classical ornament, and red tile roofs, lend a strong sense of unity and order to the heart of the campus. Along the two forks of Strawberry Creek, a very different building style is found, consisting of rustic, informal buildings with irregular massing, often with redwood exteriors. The edges of campus abutting
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the surrounding neighborhoods have yet another, more urban, character. Aligned with the city street grid, many are modern structures in concrete or steel which are taller than the older campus buildings. The wide variation in building styles in these newer areas establishes an eclectic architectural environment in contrast to the unity and order of the central core, which the older buildings define.

The Berkeley campus contains a large number of historic structures and landmarks concentrated in the classical core, with most of the rest consisting of rustic creekside buildings. Among them are many buildings on the National Register of Historic Places. These resources include: Bowles Hall, California Hall, Doe Library, Durant Hall, Faculty Club, First Unitarian Church, Founder's Rock, Giannini, Hilgard and Wellman Halls, Haviland Hall, Hearst Gymnasium, Hearst Greek Theater, Hearst Mining Building, Naval Architecture, North Gate Hall, Sather Gate and Bridge, Sather Tower, Senior Hall, South Hall, University House, and Wheeler Hall. These resources should be preserved by relating building additions and new development to the materials, proportions, form and style of existing buildings.

Selective Densities Development

The park-like qualities of the Central Campus are valuable open space resources for the campus and city, and should be preserved and enhanced to maintain a balance between conservation and development areas. The “Selective Densities” concept to guide the location of future building sites in the Central Campus Park, illustrated in Figure 4, concentrates development in selective urbanized areas of the campus, and suggests how the park areas of the campus can be maintained as natural and open space settings. This concept is the basis for the land use designations and the building sites selected for the illustrative project list in this LRDP. This “Selective Densities” concept provides an important framework to guide the siting of future development on the Central Campus.

Central Campus Park Open Space Concept

The LRDP includes the preservation of the major open space elements that contribute to the unique character of the campus. The Open Space Concept (Figure 5) illustrates the spatial structure of the campus open space. The figure includes linkages and connections, building foreground spaces, playfields, plazas and esplanades, as well as all of the other major open spaces which contribute in a significant way to the perceived quality of the campus. The Open Space Concept complements the “Selective Densities” concept by providing an overall open space framework to guide the siting of future development on the Central Campus.

Organization into Precincts

Convenient access is required between Central Campus Area instruction and research activities and essential support services. To facilitate contact between related departments and provide shared libraries, research facilities and meeting areas, and to address similar requirements in the types of spaces needed, related departments should continue to be grouped into precincts. This precinct organization can be strengthened through assignment of existing space and
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Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
through the allocation of new building sites for development projects.

These seven precincts, indicated in Figure 7, are:

1. Engineering and Earth Sciences,
2. Mathematics and Physical Sciences,
3. Art, Music and Professions,
4. Humanities and Social Sciences,
5. Agriculture and Life Sciences,
6. Library and Administration, and
7. Student Services and Recreation.

Relocation to Off-Campus Sites

Units which should be considered for redirection to peripheral and outlying sites include:

- Research units with limited teaching function, and new research activities not requiring Central Campus Area location;
- Research activities with special equipment, space, or other requirements that cannot be effectively accommodated in the Central Campus Park; and
- Administrative and support services not requiring a Central Campus Area location.

Priority Uses for Central Campus Area

Land to meet precinct space needs should be provided by redirection of uses not requiring Central Campus Area locations to new locations such as the peripheral Campus Environ and/or other campus properties, and reassignment of the Central Campus Area space previously occupied by those uses to priority uses. These priority uses for the Central Campus Area are:

- Instruction and research directly related to instruction; and
- Research, administrative and support services requiring proximity to instruction programs, such as student services.

Central Campus Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

The illustration of the Central Campus Area development proposed in this LRDP, shown in Figure 7, includes new buildings, additions to existing buildings, and the removal of temporary and outdated facilities to create new building sites and open space areas. The illustration does not utilize all potentially available building sites, in recognition of unforeseeable future space needs and to retain the flexibility to meet future changes in teaching and research.

Proposed building projects that are part of this LRDP implementation illustration will accommodate currently identified
campus needs for instruction and research space to the year 2005. These projects are described below by precincts and are also listed in Table 7 in the Appendix, in terms of their proposed space areas.

Engineering and Earth Sciences Precinct

Proposed new development in this precinct includes the Computer Science Building and the College of Engineering Expansion project, both sited to the east of Etcheverry Hall. These sites are currently occupied by surface parking lots and open space. Open space is proposed as part of the College of Engineering Expansion project. The precinct also includes three reserve sites. These include the parking lot to the west of 2607 Hearst, and possible redevelopment of Hesse Hall and the old wing of Davis Hall.

Mathematics and Physical Sciences Precinct

This precinct contains two approved projects, the College of Chemistry Unit III building and the Latimer Hall Roof Laboratory Addition. No other development is proposed. Two small temporary facilities, the Stanley Hall Annex and Campbell Hall Annex, are proposed to be removed for open space improvements. The parking lot to the west of Stanley Hall is designated as a reserve site.

Art, Music and Professions Precinct

Proposed new development in this precinct includes the School of Business Administration Building to be located on the site occupied by Cowell Hospital and the adjacent parking lot to the east. The project would include the removal of Cowell and 2220 Piedmont. Several building additions are also proposed, including: the Morrison-Hertz Addition to meet the needs of the Department of Music; the Law Building Addition; the Wurster Hall Fourth Floor Link Addition for Environmental Design; the Kroeber Hall South Addition to provide space for the Lowie Museum; and Minor Hall Expansion to replace the space now occupied by the School of Optometry in Cowell Hospital. Designated reserve sites include the site occupied by the remaining Piedmont buildings and 2251 College. In conjunction with this site, the parking lot to the east of Wurster Hall is designated as an open space reserve site for the possible future development of a new glade. Other reserve sites are the area to the north of Parking Structure “B” and the south wing of Wurster Hall for a future floor addition. The Goodspeed Natural Area is primarily situated in this precinct.

Humanities and Social Sciences Precinct

The Dwinelle Hall Attic Expansion is proposed in this precinct to meet the needs of the Humanities. The removal of South Hall Annex is also proposed to improve the open space setting around historic South Hall. One reserve site, on the parking lot to the west of Dwinelle Hall, is designated. Part of the Grinnell Natural Area extends into this precinct.

Agriculture and Life Sciences Precinct

This precinct includes five approved projects: the Genetics and Plant Biology Building (including the Northwest Parking Facility), Northwest Animal Facility, Life Sciences Building Renovation, the Genetics and Plant Biology Greenhouse on the Oxford Tract,
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Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
and the reuse of University Hall and its parking structure. The South Oxford Tract Development is proposed to provide space for the College of Natural Resources. An addition to the University Hall parking structure is also proposed. The UC Garage site is identified for potential joint development (possibly in conjunction with the property at 1925 Walnut) with the private sector or the City, to possibly provide space for campus, private, or public uses. Adjacent to the precinct, the UC Printing Plant site (currently under jurisdiction of the Office of the President) is similarly designated as a potential joint development site. The precinct also identifies two reserve sites on the north and southwest portions of the Oxford Tract. Two of the three Central Campus Park designated Natural Areas, the Wickson Natural Area and part of the Grinnell Natural Area, are located in this precinct. An open space improvement project, the Wellman Courtyard Restoration, is also proposed in this precinct.

Library and Administration Precinct

New development proposed in this precinct includes the Doe and Moffitt Libraries Addition and the Doe Library Infill project to meet the needs of the Main Library Complex, and the Student Services Building, sited to the west of Evans Hall, to replace inadequate facilities in the T-buildings and enhance student services programs in relation to academic programs. The removal of the six temporary buildings will result in the restoration of the Central Glade as a major open space. A reserve site for a below-ground building is designated to the east of the Main Library. A new facility to house the East Asian Library is also proposed in the LRDP, but not sited in this implementation illustration.

Student Services and Recreation Precinct

Development proposed in this precinct includes a University Health Service Facility on the parking lot bounded by Bancroft Way, Dana Street and Durant Avenue, to replace the facilities now located in Cowell Hospital. If other facilities are identified for the University Health Service, this site could be used for other student services activities in relation to student housing in Southside. A portion of the Bancroft/Durant site (located south of Edwards Track Stadium between Bancroft Way and Durant Avenue) is also being considered as the site for the University Health Service Facility. The Alumni House Addition is also proposed, as is an ROTC Facility to replace the existing temporary facility. The parking lot to the north of Sproul Hall and the A&E Building is proposed to be converted to a bicycle parking area. Three reserve sites are identified: the site now occupied by the Hellman Tennis Courts; the parking lots to the north and south of 2223 Fulton; and the Bancroft/Durant site, now occupied by a parking lot and recreation facilities. (As noted above, a portion of the Bancroft/Durant site is being considered as an alternate site for the University Health Service Facility.) A 25-yard pool is proposed to be located to the east of the existing pool at Spieker Aquatics Complex. This may be enclosed and include spectator seating, restrooms, and other support facilities as needed. Various improvements, including lockers, team rooms, weight training, ticket booth, and support facilities are proposed at Edwards Track to serve Men’s and Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics.
The Campus Environ includes the Southside, Westside/Downtown and Northside neighborhoods surrounding the Central Campus Park and the South Shattuck area. The number of campus properties and activities, and the amount of campus-leased space in this area are important considerations in how the Campus Environ is planned.

Some major instruction and research uses are located in these neighborhoods, especially in blocks immediately adjacent to the Central Campus Park, such as Etcheverry Hall and the Oxford Tract research facilities. Further from the Central Campus Park, existing uses are primarily support services for the Central Campus, including Physical Resources, Human Resources, student housing, recreational facilities, and parking.

A severe shortage of affordable private housing for students is prompting the campus to develop student housing in the Campus Environ to replace housing lost from the private market. This housing development will displace some parking, research and support services, which will in turn need to be relocated. Some acquisition of additional property may also be necessary to meet these needs.

The Campus Environ Plan is first described generally, and the more specific plans for each of the surrounding neighborhoods follow.

Campus Environ
Planning Premises

The Plan for the Campus Environ is based on the need to provide space for appropriate instruction and research, support services, administrative offices and student housing, convenient to the Central Campus Park. The basic planning premises address appropriate locations for campus uses based on their needs for proximity to related activities and the relationship to the surrounding community.

Instruction and Research Uses
Instruction uses, and research uses directly related to instruction, should be located adjacent to related departments on the Central Campus Park to maintain academic interaction and make it possible to walk between classes in related departments within the 10-minute class change period. Instruction and research facilities that do not need Central Campus locations should be conveniently located on campus property near the Central Campus Park. Some of these activities should be located in the Westside, where they are most compatible with the planning goals of the City of Berkeley for the downtown area.

Support Services
Administration and support services requiring convenient public access should be located in the Westside area near retail services and transit. Where feasible, support services primarily for students, such as Housing and Food Services, University Health Service and other services, should be located in areas which are easily accessible to student residential areas in the Southside. The need for child care facilities and the feasibility of locating such facilities in the Campus Environ or other areas is currently being studied by the campus. Opportunities to replace leased
space serving support services with owned space would be explored.

Campus Residential Neighborhoods and Student Services
Campus residential neighborhoods are identified in the Southside, reinforced by new student housing on sites currently owned by the campus, and along South Shattuck Avenue on sites that may be acquired to increase housing availability for students. Sites in the Southside are identified for services which are integral to student life and convenient to the concentration of student residents in the Southside.

Student Housing
Housing is planned to meet a range of different needs, including: 1) single student, lower division housing very near campus, with access to existing centralized dining and support services in the Southside to preserve affordability; and 2) single student, upper division housing in apartments attractive to older students, conveniently located within walking or biking distance to campus and retail services.

Parking Facilities
Parking facilities are planned within the Campus Environs and at remote locations to replace parking displaced by development proposed in the LRDP. These locations have been identified in conjunction with housing projects in the Southside in order to minimize the cost of providing parking, to maintain a sufficient supply of parking to meet needs within convenient walking distance of the Central Campus Park, and to minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding community.

Potential Joint Development Sites
Areas are identified for potential joint development with the private sector and/or with the City of Berkeley. These areas represent targets of opportunity where development could result in projects that are mutually beneficial. These projects could include academic, student housing, and support services appropriate to the downtown setting over ground floor retail and with other private sector uses in mixed-use development that would support the aims of current city plans for the downtown commercial district.

Ground floor retail uses, which would be privately operated and subject to City taxes, would be considered where such uses support City goals and are compatible with adjacent land uses. Joint development with the private sector or the City would be considered to relate to the City’s land use goals and to make projects to meet campus goals financially feasible.

Land Acquisition and Tenant Relocation
Land acquisition in this LRDP for the Campus Environs would be limited to the maximum extent feasible. Generally, the campus will utilize property it currently owns to meet its needs. Where feasible, the campus may acquire properties to reduce the amount of leased space. Opportunity sites are expected to be acquired to meet some student housing needs. Target areas for acquisition for housing are the South Shattuck and Downtown areas, the Southside, and properties near or adjacent to existing campus land holdings to be used for housing. Where properties need to be acquired, preference will be given to properties that are underutilized, not on the tax rolls, and/or where displacement of existing residential and commercial tenants would be minimized. If any displacement occurs, the campus will follow applicable State Relocation Guidelines and the University of California Relocation Regulations.

Relation to Existing Land Uses and Development Character
Campus development in the Campus Environs is planned to be compatible with the physical character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the area’s historic architectural resources. The campus can contribute to the vitality of the commercial and residential districts serving the Campus Environs by locating activities on its property that enhance the surrounding commercial, institutional and residential uses.

Relationship with City Land Use Policies
Development in the Campus Environs is proposed to be sensitive to City land use
plans and policies as well as to economic realities and campus needs. The campus will coordinate with City efforts for housing development and downtown revitalization, including consulting with the City on appropriate plans and policies to meet mutual campus and City goals.

**Campus Land Uses in the Campus Environ**

Proposed uses for campus land in the Campus Environ are intended to integrate University-related activities within the land use pattern of the surrounding area. Proposed campus development in the Campus Environ is planned in order to preserve and reinforce existing retail districts by including ground level retail space in proposed campus projects in retail areas, protect existing low-density residential neighborhoods from incompatible development, and relate Campus Environ support activities to the Central Campus Park uses they serve. It recognizes the potential benefits of joint development of mixed-use retail, housing and office space to help revitalize the downtown area.

**Northside**

The Northside includes a small commercial district along Euclid and Hearst Avenues opposite North Gate. The Graduate Theological Union (GTU), a major concentration of educational and residential facilities for several religious affiliations, is also located in the Northside area, interspersed with residential development. Adjacent to the Central Campus Park, instruction and research uses are currently located along Hearst Avenue, and are proposed to include the new Computer Science Building and the College of Engineering Expansion at Le Roy Avenue. A cluster of student housing is located opposite the Northeast corner of the Central Campus Park, and includes Stern Hall, Cloyne Court, and the new Foothill Housing. Additional student housing is planned at the southwest corner of Ridge Road and La Loma Avenue. Much of the higher density housing in the area which formerly served University students is now occupied by GTU students.

Access to the Northside is complicated by the topography, the lack of alternative vehicular routes besides Hearst Avenue and Gayley Road, limited parking facilities, and limited transit service to the area. The Northside area is therefore appropriate primarily for housing and for a limited number of campus facilities which would benefit from convenient pedestrian access to adjacent uses in the northern portion of the Central Campus Park.

**Northside Planning Premises**

Proposed development in the Northside neighborhood includes residential development, with some instruction and research uses adjacent to the Central Campus Park. The amount of campus development is limited by the amount of developable campus property and the predominantly residential character of the neighborhood.

**Instruction and Research Development**

Instruction and Research uses, such as the proposed Computer Science Building, would be concentrated immediately adjacent to related Central Campus Park uses to maintain pedestrian proximity.

**Residential Infill Development**

Campus development in the Northside, such as the Ridge/La Loma Residence Hall, is planned to be near existing centralized dining facilities and be compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood. In addition, the campus may explore possibilities for smaller scale infill development or acquisition of existing institutional housing to accommodate student housing without disrupting the character of the Northside neighborhood.

In addition to the proposed development described for the Central Campus Area, proposed development for the Northside includes the Ridge/La Loma Residence Hall on the site currently used as a surface parking lot at the southwest corner of Ridge Road and La Loma Avenue. The illustration of this development is shown in Figure 7.
Westside/Downtown

The Berkeley downtown district is the City’s focus of commercial activity, its Civic Center, the central entertainment district, and also serves as a residential neighborhood. Current City plans for the downtown seek to establish the area as a compact, economically vital, historic City Center with a defined core and transition zones buffering surrounding lower-density residential neighborhoods. The downtown is notable for its historic structures and its cultural diversity. The City aims to protect these qualities while addressing questions of social equity, the scale of development, and economic vitality.

Through the years, the University has played an important role in support of the commercial activities in the downtown. A number of University personnel are located in campus-owned buildings in the downtown or in leased space. They help support the retail establishments in the downtown and link “town and gown.”

The University owns a number of properties along the Oxford Street corridor, including the Oxford Tract. When the Office of the President completes its move to Oakland, it will transfer University Hall and the parking structure on Addison Street to the Berkeley campus for its use.

One potential opportunity site is 2151 Berkeley Way, currently used by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) for laboratory and office space. Although DHS has indicated a preference for relocating these functions and vacating 2151 Berkeley Way, and the potential acquisition of this facility by The Regents for use by the University and/or the Berkeley campus has been discussed, neither the DHS relocation nor the potential future uses of 2151 Berkeley Way have been approved or funded.

The LRDP does not propose the acquisition of, nor rely on the availability of, 2151 Berkeley Way. Should this site be made available to The Regents and to the campus, further planning would be necessary to determine appropriate uses. Given the relatively large size of the DHS facility (approximately 110,000 ASF) and its existing science-oriented uses, its acquisition and use by the campus would require an amendment to the LRDP as well as project-specific CEQA review.

In addition, the campus and the YMCA are in preliminary discussions regarding the potential for a joint-use student/low-income housing and YMCA project located approximately one-half block west of Shattuck Avenue between Allston Way and Center Street. This is the type of joint development/housing project opportunity that will be explored consistent with this LRDP.

Another possible opportunity site in preliminary discussions is the former Presentation High School. The existing building and adjacent property may be appropriate for faculty housing.

A number of specific areas in the downtown are underutilized. Some of these are in the area between the downtown core and the campus along Oxford Street. Parking lots and single-story buildings tend to erode the vitality and appearance of the scattered retail businesses in this transition area between the campus and the downtown.

The City’s recently completed Draft Downtown Plan, and other City of Berkeley land use policies for this area, identify a range of mixed-use development, including residential, office and retail uses, as well as on-site parking and centralized parking structures. Policies attempt to encourage the development of housing, particularly along Oxford and major transit routes. The City’s Draft Downtown Plan recommends an increase in campus presence, through location of campus uses oriented to the public, in the downtown area.

Westside Planning Premises

Campus Needs and Appropriate Uses
The Westside represents a significant opportunity for the campus to accommodate space needs for administrative and support services, which can be relocated from the Central Campus Park to release valuable Central Campus space for instruction and research uses. In addition, the downtown area, including the Oxford Street corridor, could provide sites for a significant amount of new student housing that could include ground floor retail space, if affordable rents can be achieved within the context of existing high land and development costs. The City
wishes to encourage housing development in the downtown, but zoning restrictions and high land costs have discouraged private development. Some areas of the Westside are also appropriate for instruction and research uses that can function away from the Central Campus Park. Campus activities serving the general public are also appropriate for the Westside. Public services might include visitor information, shuttle stops, exhibits, ticket offices and information kiosks.

Potential Joint Development
Joint development with the City and/or the private sector of key parcels could help to provide needed space for campus uses, while also incorporating private or public uses. This could also enhance the appearance and vitality of the downtown area. The UC Garage and UC Printing Plant are two sites identified for potential joint development, possibly in combination with private and City-owned properties. The proposed East Asian Library (which is not sited in this implementation scenario), as well as possible replacement of leased space, may be considered for the joint development/opportunity sites in the Westside.

The illustration of the Central Campus Area development proposed in this LRDP, shown in Figure 7, includes the projects in the Westside.

Southside

The Southside community, comprised of the Piedmont and Telegraph neighborhoods, has been intertwined with that of the Berkeley campus since the College of California moved to Berkeley in 1860. Much of the Southside was, in fact, owned by the College, and was sold by the University for residential and commercial development to help finance campus construction. The original orientation of the campus to Oakland, and the growth of the campus south of Strawberry Creek, with the retention of the original street grid in campus entries at College, Telegraph, and Dana, have made the
Southside neighborhood the most easily accessible to the campus.

The rapid increase in campus enrollment after World War II resulted in extensive campus acquisition and development in the Southside area. Very little campus development occurred in the 70's, leaving much of the land acquired earlier undeveloped, except for parking lots and temporary buildings. The development of these parcels, in combination with cooperative efforts by the campus, City and community, is planned to help address campus and community needs for open space and recreation, student housing and support services, while improving the attractiveness and vitality of the Southside neighborhood.

The Neighborhood and Its Residents
Approximately 8,700 students live in the Southside, the area generally bounded by Bancroft Way, Dwight Way, Ellsworth Street, and Prospect Street. This number represents about 85 percent of the resident population, and by the year 2005, the LRDP envisions additional student housing in the Southside that would increase this figure to 90 percent. Excluding commercial properties, the campus and its affiliates (fraternities, sororities and cooperative housing) own about two-thirds of the land. In addition to campus-related housing and recreation facilities, this campus property is used by Organized Research Units, support services, and parking. The remaining land in the Southside area is owned by a number of large churches and institutions and a scattering of single-family homes and apartment buildings. Many of the Southside institutions have an historically close relationship to the campus community and exist, in part, to serve the needs and interests of that community. The Southside contains services for the disabled, both students and non-students, and for a small but significant homeless population. The scattering of single-family homes reflects the area's initial development as a family neighborhood which was home to a substantial number of campus faculty and staff. The area is also noted for its many historically and architecturally significant structures.

The Retail District
Central to the Southside community is the Bancroft Way/Telegraph Avenue shopping area, the major and most lively commercial area serving the needs of students, faculty and staff. Its bookstores, restaurants and coffee houses make it a place of intellectual excitement. The retail district also includes stores aimed at the youth market and souvenir shops which, together with the street vendors marketing their crafts, give the area a bazaar-like atmosphere. These unique qualities draw people of all ages from throughout the Bay Area, especially on weekends.

The retail district's reputation as an exciting and lively place has also included problems of crime and safety. The area has periodically attracted large numbers of young non-students, accompanied by increases in drug trafficking and street crime, as well as a number of homeless people. Through increased campus and City police presence and community organization, some of these problems in the Southside have been reduced. Drug sales and crimes related to drugs continue to be a serious problem in the area. The transient nature of Southside residents and the large number of non-residents attracted to the area necessitate ongoing efforts by the campus, City, merchants, civic organizations, and residents to address problems of crime, drugs, homelessness, noise and trash.

The Bancroft Way/Telegraph Avenue commercial district, the large concentration of student housing, and other activities in the south campus area generate heavy pedestrian and bicycle traffic volumes both day and night, particularly on the north-south streets linking the University and the Southside. The flow of pedestrian and bicycle traffic is often interrupted by heavy automobile and truck traffic along the east-west streets linking major access routes and parking areas.

The Piedmont Area
The Southside community includes the Piedmont Avenue neighborhood located east of the Telegraph retail district and College Avenue. This lower hillside district is
characterized by large older houses interspersed with some apartment buildings. It is home to almost all of the fraternities and sororities at the Berkeley campus, as well as many housing cooperatives, rooming houses, and other student residences, and a few private homes and institutions. Although the neighborhood is ringed by large campus housing developments including International House, the Clark Kerr Campus, the Smyth-Fernwald apartments, and two of the high-rise Residence Hall units, almost none of the property within it is in direct campus ownership. The area is of vital importance to the campus because of its concentration of affiliated student housing and its proximity to the Central Campus Park.

**The Surrounding Area**

Immediately to the south of the Southside are residential neighborhoods which are less intensively influenced by the campus population and campus-related activities and uses. The area has a substantial housing stock that provides a significant amount of private sector housing for students within walking distance to the campus, though the availability of student housing has been falling as more units are converted into more permanent resident housing. The surrounding area, because of its proximity, is heavily affected by the Southside and the overspill of some Southside planning issues.

**Southside Planning Premises**

The Plan provides a concept for the Southside community that strengthens its role in complementing the mission and functions of the campus and, at the same time, enables it to better serve its residents and the larger community.

The concept of Southside is a place where students, faculty and the community can develop an intellectual synergy supported by a mixture of bookstores, shops, coffee houses, and other commercial and recreation facilities in an environment that is attractive and safe, both day and night. It’s a place where students living in nearby campus housing can find contrast and relief from institutional living with an odd-hour meal, a study space without the constrained atmosphere of traditional study halls, or an opportunity to meet friends for casual conversation in a well-lit and safe neighborhood. And it is a place where pedestrians and bicyclists are given priority and feel safe on the streets, where through-traffic is separated from local traffic, and where parking demand is controlled.

The Plan proposes to re-establish the continuity of the building pattern in the Southside by replacing the large surface parking lots with appropriately scaled student housing built above new parking structures. The appearance of the street frontage of this infill development on campus property would be articulated to retain an appropriate residential image. Improved open space and recreational opportunities for students and residents are also proposed. These concepts are represented in Figure 8.

**Southside Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation**

The illustration of Southside development proposed in this LRDP, shown in Figure 8, includes new buildings, building additions, recreation and parking facilities, and the removal of facilities to create new building sites. The area includes one reserve site, the parking lot located at the southeast corner of College and Durant Avenues.

**Student Housing**

The Plan includes the development of a Southside student housing neighborhood by providing, directly or in cooperation with private developers, new housing for both lower division and upper division students. New housing would be located near the open space and related recreation improvements planned for People’s Park to provide an open space focus for residents. The new housing would be designed primarily as residence halls and suites to take advantage of the existing centralized dining facilities, in order to minimize costs and make campus housing affordable to more students.

A number of residence hall projects are proposed. These projects are described
Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
below, and are also listed with the proposed number of beds in Table 6 in the Housing section and in Table 7 in Appendix B. The Bowditch Residence Hall includes a parking garage and would be located west of Underhill Field, on the site now occupied by temporary facilities at 2401 and 2405 Bowditch, a surface parking area, and a recreational court. The Anna Head Residence Hall includes a dining facility and parking garage, and would be located north and west of the existing Anna Head buildings and would require the removal of an existing parking lot. The Channing/Bowditch Residence Hall would be located primarily along Channing Way, and would require the removal of 2334 Bowditch and temporary facilities at 2535, 2539 and 2543 Channing and some surface parking. The Dwight Residence Hall would be located approximately mid-block between Telegraph Avenue and Dana Street, and would require the removal of 2427 Dwight and an existing parking lot. The Haste/Channing Residence Hall, located approximately mid-block on a surface parking lot between Telegraph Avenue and Dana Street, would also include offices and a parking garage. Also proposed is an addition above an existing parking lot on the north side of International House. In addition to these projects, housing is proposed at opportunity sites in the Southside.

Support Services and Other Uses
The Plan also emphasizes Southside as a central place in student life by concentrating student-oriented services. Activities that would support this planning premise include:

- Use of the Bancroft/Dana site possibly for the relocation of the University Health Service from Cowell Hospital, or for other student services. A portion of the Bancroft/Durant site (located south of Edwards Track Stadium between Bancroft Way and Durant Avenue) is also being considered as the site for the University Health Service Facility.

- The restoration of the Anna Head School historic buildings to house student services and become a student study hall and activity center.

Organized Research Units and Institutes
Organized research units and institutes are appropriate to the Southside. These include office-type uses which can take advantage of appropriate existing campus building stock convenient to the Central Campus, and in scale with the existing neighborhood.

Recreation and Open Space
The Plan proposes new recreational facilities, including:

- Improving the People’s Park site as a campus and public open space, providing active and passive recreation. This open space area would relate to new student housing nearby.

- Developing recreation spaces in conjunction with new student housing.

- Expanding the Channing tennis courts with two additional tennis courts over the existing surface parking.

- Adding six tennis courts on the Clark Kerr Campus.

Parking Facilities
The Plan provides new parking facilities within the Southside to replace some of the existing surface parking to be removed for the new development. This is discussed further in Chapter Six.

Relation to City Issues and Policies
The plan for the Southside was developed to coincide with the general land use policies of the City that aim to preserve the retail district, limit office expansion, promote the
vitality of the residential environment, encourage pedestrian, bike and transit access to the campus, and preserve historic architectural and landscape resources. The campus intends to continue to take into consideration the City’s policies in implementing this plan for the Southside and work closely with the City to implement community improvements. The trade-off issues concerning housing and open space are discussed in the earlier section on Housing.

Other proposed development in the Central Campus Area adjacent to Southside is described in Chapter Two and is illustrated in Figure 7.

South Shattuck Area

The area along Shattuck Avenue south of Durant Avenue has recently been rezoned by the City to encourage housing development above ground floor retail. Much of the area is currently used by automobile-oriented commercial services which are in the process of relocating to other areas of the City. Like the Downtown, the area is within walking distance to campus and has excellent transit accessibility. It also has the capacity for higher-density development without adversely affecting existing residential neighborhoods.

The only University-owned properties in the South Shattuck Area are the service facility at 2000 Carleton Street, containing warehouses, offices and maintenance shops, and a parcel at Shattuck and Channing Way which has been previously approved for the development of student apartments over ground floor retail and parking.

South Shattuck Planning Premises

Student Housing Development

The South Shattuck Area offers the opportunity for additional student housing development which could meet University needs and also help to achieve City objectives for housing, a more pedestrian-oriented retail district, and a more urban streetscape along Shattuck Avenue. The campus is interested in the possible development of sites in this area as a complement to development of existing campus-owned sites, since they could involve a minimum amount of displacement and disruption of existing neighborhoods while being convenient to transit and within walking distance of campus and retail support services. This area is illustrated in Figure 8.

Ground Level Retail

Projects could incorporate ground level retail space along Shattuck to preserve the retail character of the street consistent with City policy objectives and related parking for retail and housing. The current Shattuck/Channing housing project represents a prototype for development of this area. It presents an appropriately urban character for the wide Shattuck Avenue corridor, and includes ground floor retail and retail parking.
The Hill Area consists of approximately 850 acres of land and extends east from Gayley Road to Grizzly Peak Boulevard, encompassing the full north-south extent of campus property within these boundaries. The area borders open lands of the East Bay Regional Park District and low-density hillside residential development. The Plan does not include the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, a federally funded national laboratory on University land, under separate jurisdiction.

The Hill Area includes developed sites and environmentally sensitive ecological areas. Approximately 300 acres of land are designated as an Ecological Study Area subject to limited use. Open space values and ecological conservation govern the hill setting. Development is concentrated along Centennial Drive, and new development opportunities are constrained.

The hillside and canyon environment is rugged, ecologically sensitive, and highly
Hill Area Land Use Planning Zones
visible throughout the Bay Area. The Hill Area begins at the base of the Berkeley Hills at an elevation of about 400 feet above sea level and rises abruptly to the east to reach elevations exceeding 1,500 feet. Many hillside locations afford outstanding views of the Golden Gate Bridge and San Francisco Bay.

Hillside vegetation includes oak-bay woodland, northern coastal scrub, annual grassland, various conifer plantations and eucalyptus plantations. Much of the area once occupied by eucalyptus plantations has been logged. Two major stream systems, Strawberry Creek and Claremont Creek, drain the Hill Area.

Hill Area Planning Premises

The overall planning objective for the Hill Area is to administer most of the area as a conservation land resource with limited areas designated for development.

Conservation of Natural and Recreational Areas

Major portions of the Hill Area are proposed to continue to be managed as an environmental teaching resource, such as the Ecological Study Area and Faunal Refuge Area. In addition, the Hill Area is proposed to continue to be used and managed as a recreational resource.

Appropriate Uses and Development

The Hill Area is appropriate for research facilities which would benefit from a location remote in feeling but near the Campus Environ, and which reinforce existing uses. Shared common support facilities, including food and small conference facilities, are also appropriate to facilitate contact between researchers and help reduce the necessity for automobile trips. In general, the Hill Area is well suited to uses which require and are compatible with a natural or seminatural environment, such as the Field Station for Behavioral Research. Research activities not requiring wet laboratory facilities, or uses without high service requirements, are suitable for the area. In addition to research and recreational uses, a site is reserved for future faculty housing adjacent to existing residential areas near roads and services.

Hill Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

For planning purposes, the Hill Area has been divided into seven management zones, reflective of their ecological and land use characteristics, as shown on Figure 9. Proposed development and uses in these zones are described below.

The illustration of proposed Hill Area development, shown in Figure 10, includes new buildings, building additions, the removal of temporary facilities, parking areas, and the designation of reserve sites for potential future development opportunities not proposed to occur during the LRDP planning horizon.

Foothill Area

Residential, recreational, and cultural uses and parking are located in the Foothill Area, including the approved Foothill Student Housing project, currently under construction; medium and low-density residential uses border the northwest and south edges. The Plan includes the following:

Strawberry Canyon Recreation Area

Proposed improvements for Men's Intercollegiate Athletics, Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, and Recreational Sports include increasing the size of Strawberry Field to accommodate football practice, rugby, and soccer and softball practice and competitions. This would include a realignment of Centennial Road near the intersection with Stadium Rimway, removal of the existing tennis courts, and reconfiguration of the existing parking area. Other proposed improvements include reconfiguration of the existing Stern pool, spectator seating, and related facilities, such as concessions, locker rooms, restrooms and showers, storage and offices, and upgrading of the field lighting.
FIGURE 10
Hill Area Illustration of LRDP Implementation

Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
Memorial Stadium
Additional space is proposed within Memorial Stadium for Intercollegiate Athletics. The improvements to Strawberry Field will enable a return to natural turf in Memorial Stadium for safety and aesthetic reasons.

Charter Hill Preservation
No changes are proposed to Charter Hill, to maintain its natural and historic features.

Lower Neighborhood
The Lower Neighborhood includes the Poultry Husbandry Area and the Acid House, and is characterized by small-scale facilities along Centennial Drive. The Poultry Husbandry Area contains buildings originally used for research by the College of Natural Resources. Small sheds are used by Physical Resources for material storage. The upper portion of the area, including a large barn, is leased to Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory for use as a maintenance yard. The Poultry Husbandry Area is designated as a reserve site for development of small buildings for research or support services, similar in scale to the Strawberry Canyon Research Facility, which will continue to be used for research.

An Environment, Health and Safety Facility is proposed to replace existing facilities, including the Acid House. The facility, which is not sited in this implementation illustration, would be located in an area that is suitable for the proposed use. The siting, design, construction and operation of this facility are subject to and will comply with all applicable federal, state and local regulations, and will be accompanied by extensive environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA.

Upper Neighborhood
The Upper Neighborhood is utilized for research and cultural activities and contains four major parking areas. The major activities include:

Lawrence Hall of Science
The internationally renowned Lawrence Hall of Science houses a science museum and curriculum development center for primary and secondary science education. It is located on a major promontory with panoramic views of San Francisco Bay. Additions to the building are planned to provide space to the north and to the south to enhance program activities and improve visitor accommodation.

Samuel Silver Laboratory
The Silver Laboratory provides space for Space Sciences research and support activities. It is augmented by a temporary annex and six temporary trailers. An addition is planned to replace the trailers and provide other needed space. The area to the north and east of Silver Laboratory is designated as a site for possible development, although no specific use is proposed in this LRDP.

Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (MSRI) and Goat Barn Rim
The Mathematical Sciences Research Institute houses an independent institute which leases the building from the campus. An addition to the building is planned. Adjacent to MSRI, approximately six acres of land on the northwest edge of Goat Barn Rim are reserved for possible future research facilities.

Field Station for Behavioral Research (FSBR) and Chaparral Hill
This area occupies approximately 20 acres south of Grizzly Peak Boulevard. Thirteen specialized buildings and outdoor animal facilities accommodate research on animal behavior that requires a natural outdoor field laboratory setting. Research conducted at the Field Station for Behavioral Research requires isolation from other activities. If feasible, the Field Station may be considered for relocation in the future to a nearby reserve site on Chaparral Hill, where the environmental conditions, terrain and site conditions would be compatible with the research activity. The current FSBR site is designated as a reserve site for future possible research facilities.

Northwest Promontory
This hillside area contains approximately seven developable acres south of existing private residential development on Summit Road. This site is southwest of the intersection of Centennial Drive and Grizzly Peak Boulevard. This area is designated as a reserve site for possible future faculty housing development compatible with the existing neighboring private residential use.
Hill Area Parking
New parking is planned at the upper fire trail lot, and parking areas on the upper hill terraces and the area near the Botanical Garden will be constructed in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in the Foothill Housing Project EIR.

Botanical Garden
The Botanical Garden is situated on a 34-acre site on the west-facing slopes of Strawberry Canyon. Three one-story office buildings, 12 greenhouses, a barn and several small lath houses occupy the grounds. Additional parking, entry improvements, and replacement office, greenhouse, and support space are planned to help the Garden meet its instructional and public service goals. The improvements would replace several old office and greenhouse structures proposed for removal. An area of approximately 40 acres to the east is identified for Garden expansion.

Ecological Study Area
The Ecological Study Area (ESA) was established in 1969. Management guidelines for the maintenance and preservation of the ESA lands were established in 1979 with the Management Plan for Strawberry and Claremont Canyons. Three hundred acres of the ESA are presently reserved as natural areas for research and instruction, near the Central Campus Park. The LRDP includes expansion of the formal boundaries of the Ecological Study Area (see Figure 10).

Natural Areas
The natural areas are the remaining undeveloped lands located around sites which are presently developed, designated for development or identified for future inclusion in the Ecological Study Area.

Claremont Canyon
The Hill Area includes an undeveloped portion of Claremont Canyon, adjacent to the southeastern portion of the Ecological Study Area and to East Bay Regional Parks District lands. The land has limited value for biological studies, but is used by students and researchers in the earth sciences. Campus property in Claremont Canyon is separated by a ridge from the other Hill Area land. Claremont Canyon property is planned to be reserved as an undeveloped area until future study identifies appropriate uses.

Planning Coordination with Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
The Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (LBL) is a federal research facility that occupies about 130 acres in the northern portion of the Hill Area. Although LBL operates as a separate entity from the Berkeley campus, both provide cooperation and mutual assistance in addressing planning issues. LBL's Long Range Development Plan was approved by The Regents in 1987 and is available to the public through their Planning and Development Office. The relationship of the LBL Plan and this Plan were examined in the accompanying EIR.
Other Properties

The campus owns several properties outside of the Campus Environs and Hill Area. With two exceptions, this LRDP establishes land use priorities and a vision of proposed development of these other properties. The two major parcels for which planning is not yet complete are the Albany and Harrison Street properties and the Richmond Field Station.

Albany and Harrison Street Properties

University Village is a 920-unit apartment community in Albany for student families. This includes 420 units of housing originally constructed on campus property to serve shipyard workers in Richmond during World War II and 500 apartment units constructed by the campus in 1962. Support facilities include a Community Center, office and maintenance facilities, child care center, laundry, recreation spaces, community garden area, and parking. A playfield is used by other members of the Albany community for Little League competition. The Village occupies approximately 50 acres. In addition, the Gill Tract is a research complex adjacent to University Village which consists of approximately 15 acres with laboratories, greenhouses, offices, and open plot cultivation that serves the Division of Biological Control and other units in the College of Natural Resources. The Plan proposes the relocation of activities housed in the offices and laboratories to the Campus Environs and to the southern portion of the Oxford Tract, but does not propose any development or proposed use for the Gill Tract.

There are two former industrial properties located on Harrison Street that are primarily undeveloped. The site at Fourth and Harrison of approximately 12 acres includes land in both Berkeley and Albany. This site includes a former industrial warehouse and a building currently leased by the City of Berkeley for use as a homeless shelter.

The site at Eighth and Harrison is approximately seven acres and located south of Codornices Creek in the City of Berkeley. This has two small industrial-type structures and some trailers used by the Department of Art Practice, and a satellite parking area is being constructed in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in the Foothill Housing Project EIR.

Future planning for the Albany and Harrison Street properties may include replacement and renovation of outmoded housing and additional housing and related community facilities for upper division and graduate students. A separate master planning effort is under way to consider potential development opportunities at this area, and no changes to the Albany and Harrison Street properties are proposed pending the completion of this master planning effort and its accompanying environmental and public review in accordance with CEQA.

Richmond Field Station

The Richmond Field Station is a major campus resource for new research programs that require large land areas or facilities suitable for special conditions, such as large equipment, noise, high volume traffic, and other factors. This area also provides a site to redirect central campus research and support
units that are not directly involved with instruction and do not require proximity to the Campus Environ, and a possible site for partnership development of research facilities with the private sector. Potential development scenarios for this area are being developed and will be subject to separate environmental and public review in accordance with CEQA.

**Other Campus Property Planning Premises**

**Accommodation of Uses Relocated From Campus Environ**

Campus properties outside the Campus Environ should be considered for redirection of campus units not requiring a Central Campus Area or Campus Environ location.

**Relation to Existing Land Uses and Development Character**

Development at other campus properties is planned to be compatible with the physical character and scale of the surrounding neighborhoods and their historic architectural resources. The campus can contribute to the vitality of the commercial and residential districts serving these areas by locating activities on its property that enhance the surrounding commercial, institutional and residential uses.

**800-806 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley**

This property is located approximately 2.5 miles from the Central Campus. The facility is used by the Office of Laboratory Animal Care. The campus is in the midst of an extensive program to improve and relocate animal facilities to a Central Campus location. When this plan is implemented, the present use of this facility will be discontinued, as described in the EIR for the Northwest Animal Facility. No specific project is proposed for this site under the current LRDP implementation illustration.

**6701 San Pablo, Oakland**

This former office headquarters with manufacturing and warehouse facilities was purchased by the University in 1979 from the SCM Corporation. The land area is comprised of five parcels totaling approximately seven acres. The property is located in three jurisdictions, Emeryville, Oakland and Berkeley, and is 2.5 miles south and west of the Central Campus.

The existing building is used for campus and Office of the President administrative and research purposes, and for warehousing and storage. A substantial portion of the building is being reassigned for use by Material Management functions, including Purchasing, Storehouse and Receiving. Another portion of the building is leased by a private company as a research facility. The facilities will continue to be used for auxiliary and support activities. Parking areas and a Gas and Chemical Storage Facility to replace existing facilities are proposed.

One of the five parcels comprising the 6701 San Pablo properties has been identified by the campus as a possible site for a City-sponsored facility to serve the homeless. This site, on Murray Street in the City of Berkeley, is currently under study by a joint City-University task force, and the campus has obtained a grant for preliminary design and has agreed to assist the City in fund raising. This project is not included in this LRDP and, in the event that the project is deemed feasible, the environmental and public review would be conducted by the City of Berkeley in accordance with CEQA.

**Other Properties**

Other properties for which no changes in use are proposed in this LRDP are:

- Blake House and Gardens, Kensington
- 2000 Carleton Street, Berkeley
- Glascock Boat House, Oakland (2909 Glascock Avenue)
- University Extension, San Francisco (55 Laguna Street)
- The Russell Reservation, Lafayette
- Gump South Pacific Biological Research Station
- Hat Creek Laboratory
- Natural Reserve System Properties administered by the Berkeley Campus, including Chickering American River Reserve, Hastings Natural History Reserve, and Pygmy Forest Reserve
- Other distant field facilities.
Convenient access to the Berkeley campus is a major concern of students, staff and faculty who commute to campus due to the high prices and limited supply of nearby housing. At the same time, the effects of automobile traffic on noise, congestion and parking supply in the neighborhoods surrounding campus are a major concern of local residents. The provision of parking for campus commuters is expensive, both in direct costs of constructing and operating facilities and in the opportunity cost of using scarce land resources for parking rather than for other campus needs. Thus, both the campus and community have an interest in developing campus circulation patterns and parking facilities which reduce congestion and community impacts. As a land use and development plan, the LRDP provides land for vehicle circulation and parking necessary to serve campus needs to the year 2005-06. The environmental impacts of land use changes affecting circulation and parking were addressed in the LRDP EIR, as were traffic and parking mitigation measures, including transportation management policies encouraging alternate modes of transportation.

Recent Commuting Patterns

Data from 1984-85, shown in Table 11 in Appendix B and illustrated in Figure 11, indicate that the campus population has an unusually low rate of drive-alone commuting, particularly among students, of whom only 15 percent drive to campus. Full-time staff members and faculty have much higher rates, at 57 and 65 percent, respectively. However, because there are many more students than staff and faculty, the commute choices of students are particularly important, and depend to a large degree on whether students can find housing convenient to campus by walking, bicycle, or transit.

Conflicts Within and Around the Central Campus Park

The large number of pedestrians and bicyclists who travel to the Central Campus Park each day conflict with the heavy auto traffic. This is particularly true where pedestrian and cyclist routes cross the perimeter streets which border the Central Campus Park.

Conflict also exists between motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians within the Central Campus Park itself. There is a need to relocate and/or consolidate some of the parking on the Central Campus Park to reduce the impact of the automobile on these other modes of travel, and on the campus environment.

Parking Supply

The current supply of parking that is located on or adjacent to the Central Campus Park is expected to decrease by the year 2005. Surface parking lots on the Central Campus Park are among the few remaining building sites that have been identified for new construction. Other surface parking areas are planned to be removed for landscape, pedestrian circulation, or bicycle improvements. Parking is also planned to be removed to construct projects adjacent to the Central Campus Park, most notably to provide sites for additional student housing in
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the Southside neighborhood. In addition to the loss of parking which could result from campus projects, the City of Berkeley's expansion of neighborhood permit parking areas has resulted in a loss of long term on-street parking.

Circulation and Parking Planning Premises

The premises which guide campus circulation and parking planning to the year 2005 include:

*Replace surface parking displaced by development on and adjacent to the Central Campus Park to continue to meet the basic parking needs of faculty, staff, students and visitors.* Parking on the Central Campus Park would be adequate to meet the needs of disabled persons, delivery and service vehicles, official visitors, and departments and faculty members who need vehicles to carry out their responsibilities. The travel needs of the campus commuter population would be met to an increasing degree by parking lots in the Campus Environ, satellite parking lots, carpools, and other alternative modes of transportation. Transportation management strategies were addressed in the EIR.

*Provide adequate replacement parking.* Replacement parking would be located to encourage travel on less congested streets, facilitate pedestrian access to the Central Campus Park, and encourage use of alternative transportation modes.

*Create an "Auto Free Zone" on the Central Campus Park to reduce motor vehicle traffic in order to minimize noise and conflicts with pedestrians.* The gradual removal of surface parking from the Central Campus Park is planned to be accompanied by closure of campus roads to general traffic. Commuter vehicles would be restricted to those roads which lead to parking or passenger dropoff areas located close to the perimeter of the Central Campus Park.

Motorcycles and motor scooters would be subject to the same principles applied to other motor vehicles.

Circulation and Parking Illustrations of LRDP Implementation

**Central Campus Park Vehicular Circulation**

The Central Campus Park Vehicular Circulation Illustration of LRDP Implementation, shown in Figure 12, illustrates the primary access points, the Auto Free Zone, and service routes for vehicular access and circulation on the Central Campus Park.

**Parking**

The Campus Parking Illustration of LRDP Implementation, shown in Figure 13, illustrates the proposed removal and replacement of parking within the Campus Environ. Existing parking which is removed to provide sites for new development and other improvements is planned to be replaced by new parking facilities within walking distance to campus and at remote locations, to be connected to campus by shuttle buses and informal carpools. Table 12 in Appendix B summarizes the proposed parking changes to the year 2005.
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Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
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Note: Because the LRDP is a long range plan, and because the academic and institutional needs of the campus will continue to evolve during the LRDP planning period, specific projects identified serve only as an illustration of how the LRDP may be implemented. The specific use, size, and location of all building projects, as well as project design and construction issues, will be subject to individual review and approval consistent with CEQA.
Introduction: Academic Planning At Berkeley

Californians have given Berkeley a mandate to assume responsibility for the most advanced levels of teaching and scholarship in extant fields of learning, and to exercise leadership in discerning and developing new fields. In seeking to fulfill this mandate, its successive academic plans—of which this is the sixth since 1957—have all been based on a principle of evolutionary development. Rather than setting forth a categorical blueprint of Berkeley’s academic future, each plan has sought to articulate the conditions appropriate for all campus faculties and programs to follow emerging trends in contemporary research and scholarship, to update their curricula, to adapt their programs to the requirements of the changing generations of students, and to renew their capabilities through a regular inflow of new talent.

In the current plan, major emphasis is placed on maintaining and enhancing the research and scholarly excellence of all Berkeley’s faculties in a period when the major part of the State’s resources will necessarily be assigned to the growth of other parts of the University system; and on adapting Berkeley’s undergraduate program to the requirements of the scholastically and ethnically diverse student body the campus will educate.

Like its predecessors, the present plan seeks an appropriate balance among the various fields—addressing the needs and priorities of those units possessing lesser budgetary leverage or fund-raising potential commensurately with those that are presently more favored. Like its predecessors, it is the product of extensive and wide-ranging faculty advice at many levels. Students were included on these committees, and influenced the development of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). To ensure the currency of its research program, Berkeley encourages the faculties in specific study areas or disciplines to review their fields periodically to determine and recommend new directions.

The Administration has consulted with officers of the Academic Senate and the Committee on Academic Planning about the Academic Planning Statement 1990-2005 and the LRDP. A group composed of members of the Committee on Academic Planning, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Division, and the Chairs of several Senate Committees met during the summer of 1989. The result was agreement with the Administration to
include the section entitled “Expansion of the Planning Process,” which the Senate regards as an important programmatic innovation and approved in draft form at the Meeting of the Division on September 12, 1989 (page 6 of the Notice of that meeting). There has been no formal review by the Academic Senate of the balance of the Academic Planning Statement or the LRDP. The ad hoc group, which met during the summer, concluded that both the Academic Planning Statement and the LRDP are acceptable working documents. It is assumed that implementation of the LRDP, like other future projects, will include academic effect studies as described in the “Expansion of the Planning Process.”

Expansion of the Planning Process

Many forces in society shape a modern university. To promote the mission of the campus, academic planning seeks to harness, moderate and use to advantage these forces. The effort demands diligence and attention to the balance of the academic programs as well as a conscious commitment to respond to new challenges and to create new opportunities.

During the period of the LRDP, UC Berkeley will be acting under particularly difficult constraints. It will not be expanding its faculty or its student body. It will be replacing half of its current faculty in a competitive market under the disadvantage of the high cost of housing in the Bay Area. Given the State’s demographic profile, diversification of the faculty and the graduate student body may not be rapid enough to stem continuing criticism. Research will become more costly as the campus strives to maintain a faculty of distinction in an increasingly competitive technological environment and there will be a growing dependence on private donations, federal grants and industrial contracts. There will be increasing pressure toward opportunism to ease the stress and conflict of transition. National policies and social forces will emphasize the expansion of specialization and applied knowledge, and enhancing a faculty committed to the intellectual life of the University in its broader dimensions, and toward the development of new knowledge will require positive action. To maintain balance and to sustain excellence, to continue to educate the future leaders of California, to respond prudently to opportunity, and to do it all decently and humanely, will require planning that makes possible the realization of short term opportunities within the context of long term goals.

To help achieve development consistent with long-range goals, the planning process shall include, as an integral part, a study of the overall academic effects of proposals that involve new buildings, or substantial alteration of old buildings, or substantial reallocations of space. An academic effect study will also be required for major new programs or revisions of existing ones that entail such physical changes. In all cases, the academic effect study shall consider the promotion of excellence in teaching, research and public service; the equitable use of resources and space; provision of needed classrooms, libraries, and other support services; and the maintenance of a congenial environment for students, faculty and staff.

The Chancellor, or his or her designee, and the Divisional Council of the Academic Senate shall agree on who shall have responsibility for the academic effect study for each proposal. The procedures for conducting an academic effect study will be developed and implemented during 1990. The Academic Senate is to be notified of proposals at the earliest stages of consideration before they are presented to any other body for
approval. The academic effect study is to begin at the inception of the proposal and shall be revised and modified as the proposal becomes more specific. It is expected that the study (and its revisions) will shape the discussion about implementation of a project after it has been approved.

The Divisional Council and the Chancellor or their designees will have responsibility to include an academic effect study in each proposal, and to ensure that timely and careful discussion and review occurs as a collaborative effort of the Administration and the Academic Senate.

Achieving Diversity and Expanding Excellence

The great achievement of Berkeley’s undergraduate admissions policy in the 1980’s has been to diversify the student body successfully while raising the academic level of the freshman class. From 1982 to 1988, the qualifications of entering freshmen rose substantially, as reflected in a 51 point increase (from 1,134 to 1,185) in the combined average scores on the verbal and mathematical components of the Scholastic Aptitude Test.

To strengthen the undergraduate curriculum, breadth requirements were revised to include quantitative reasoning, and expansion of the lower division Reading and Composition sequence was instituted. A Division of Freshman and Sophomore Studies was established to develop special seminars and courses for lower division students and to increase faculty contact in the lower division. Computer workstations on campus were increased, and there has been considerable progress in the development of self-paced course work. The proportion of lower division to upper division students has changed from 50/50 to 44/56, a distribution that is better suited to Berkeley’s teaching strengths and is more closely in accord with the 40/60 ratio envisioned by the Master Plan for Higher Education.

To increase students’ appreciation for the richness of student life on the campus, a number of programs have been implemented, including expansion of the Student Learning Center, enlargement of the advisory staff of the College of Letters and Science, creation of a Multicultural Action Team to work with student groups and help build cooperative relationships among the diverse student population, and the shaping of a new academic support community tied to student housing (programs, counseling, and library and computer facilities in the residence halls).

Faculty and graduate student diversity is being addressed by the Provost’s Academic Affirmative Action Council composed of faculty, administrators and students. Consistent with the All University Faculty Meeting on Affirmative Action sponsored by the President’s Office, the campus has held a similar meeting with department chairmen, deans, and affirmative action officers in the departments. A survey has been conducted to identify assets and difficulties faced in recruiting underrepresented minorities and women to faculty positions. Plans are being formulated to promote increased diversity among faculty and graduate students on the Berkeley campus.

Campus outreach programs are being expanded in the Lawrence Hall of Science and improvement of facilities for recreational sports will enhance the activities in special programs designed for pre-college students.

Projects proposed in the LRDP address the need to enhance undergraduate life on the campus and the need to promote community outreach. For example, the expansion of
student services facilities, the university health service and student housing are intended to improve the extra-curricular environment. The computer science building, the addition of space for the humanities and the expansion of the Doe-Moffitt Libraries are needed to improve the academic quality of campus life, while the addition to the Lawrence Hall of Science will facilitate efforts to provide community services. In the following section, the academic considerations are discussed for each of the projects proposed in the LRDP.

**Academic Background on LRDP Projects**

The following sections present background information about the academic considerations for physical development projects in the biological sciences, the physical sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, the library and the academic environment in which students live and learn.

**Biological Sciences**

During the past twenty years, the main emphasis in the biological sciences has shifted from the study of organisms and species to molecular biochemistry, molecular genetics, and cell biology. In keeping with Berkeley's traditions, as this has occurred, research in these latter areas has been undertaken by faculty members throughout the established organismally-oriented departments. The consequence has been a somewhat dispersed research effort, much of which has been conducted under considerable handicap in outdated and inadequate laboratory facilities, often in improvised conditions.

Accordingly, the reorganization of Biology was initiated in the late 1970's by a group of faculty members concerned about Berkeley's inability to keep pace with the evolution of modern, high-tech biological research and teaching. In 1981, their efforts led to the appointment of an internal self-study committee. The work of this internal committee was complemented by a review study conducted by an external committee of nationally distinguished biological scientists. Both groups concluded that organizational and programmatic changes, and additional space and modernization of facilities, were needed, and recommended the creation of a Chancellor's Advisory Council on Biology, to serve as a link between the Colleges of Letters and Science and Natural Resources, to implement the recommended changes, and to coordinate plans for new and updated facilities.

In 1984, the Advisory Council submitted a draft plan to the Chancellor. Between July 1, 1985, and September 1986, this plan underwent three iterations of review and re-drafting, including review by the External Review Committee, by the faculty members of Berkeley's Biological Science departments separately and in groups, and by the principal standing committees of the Academic Senate.

In conjunction with these deliberations, proposals for construction of the Life Sciences Building Addition and the Genetics and Plant Biology buildings, for the renovation and modernization of the Life Sciences Building, and for the related space re-assignments were developed and reviewed via the established channels for the approval of capital projects. In these deliberations, the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee (SACI) and the Chancellor's Planning Committee (CPC) (comprising the Chancellor and his senior academic and administrative officers) played the predominant role.
Culminating fifteen years of stock taking, deliberation and planning on the part of the faculty—a process that has included both an internal self-study and an external review by a group of the nation’s leading biologists—a major reorganization of Berkeley’s biological science programs became effective on July 1, 1989. Construction already undertaken that is reflected in the LRDP provides for its physical implementation, and aims to complete the necessary re-housing of the faculty and their support staff and equipment by 1993-94. The particulars are as follows:

1. The existing departments of Zoology and Paleontology, with elements from the departments of Anatomy-Physiology, Botany and Genetics, are consolidated in the new department of Integrative Biology whose teaching and research programs will focus on the integration of structure within living systems.

2. The existing departments of Biochemistry, Biophysics and Medical Physics, Genetics, Microbiology and Immunology, Molecular Biology, and Physiology-Physiology are consolidated in the new department of Molecular and Cell Biology. Teaching and research programs will focus on the molecular foundations of cellular life organized in six divisions: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Cell and Developmental Biology, Biophysics and Cell Physiology, Genetics, and Immunology and Neurobiology.

3. The major parts of the existing departments of Botany and Molecular Plant Biology are consolidated in the new department of Plant Biology. Teaching and research programs will focus on the molecular, physiological and cellular aspects of plant science.

Construction and programs already undertaken that are reflected in the LRDP provide the requisite physical facilities to implement the reorganization, and to furnish the biological science faculties with state-of-the-art laboratories and laboratory services, as follows:

- the recently completed Life Sciences Building Addition (122,000 assignable square feet (ASF)) houses affinity groups in neurobiology, cell biology, developmental biology, immunology and molecular genetics;
- the construction of the Genetics and Plant Biology Building (being completed presently) provides 106,000 ASF for affinity groups in molecular plant biology, biochemistry, and molecular biology;
- the renovation of the Life Sciences Building (scheduled for completion in the mid 1990's) will provide a total of 269,000 ASF of technologically modern space for affinity groups in comparative structure and function, evolutionary biology and systematics, comparative endocrinology, population and community ecology, behavioral biology, evolutionary genetics, paleontology, and physical anthropology. In addition, the building will have an enlarged biology library (45,800 ASF), and the natural history collections and the museums relevant to instruction and research in biology, including the Herbaria and the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology will be reassigned more appropriate locations. The Museum of Paleontology, will be relocated from the Earth Sciences Building. Assembling all these museums convenient to one another will facilitate the exploration of new directions in systematic biology;
- the construction of the Northwest Animal Facility (scheduled for completion in the early 1990's) will replace 27,000 ASF of space currently used for care and use of laboratory animal colonies with 31,000 ASF of such space that conforms to prevailing national standards for research animal care;
• the construction of the Genetics and Plant Biology Greenhouse on the Oxford Tract provides an additional 11,000 ASF of accessible and modern greenhouse space for the experimental activities of the faculties of Genetics and Plant Biology;

• together, these projects will provide 539,000 ASF of new, remodelled, and technically advanced space for teaching and research in the Biological Sciences;

• additional new construction (44,000 ASF on the Oxford Tract), and reassignment and renovation of released space will provide improvements for other life sciences programs including the College of Natural Resources, the School of Public Health and the department of Psychology.

Physical Sciences and Engineering

Although no similar reorganization is under way or contemplated in the physical sciences or engineering, the scholarly work of these faculties has been revolutionized during the past ten years by the introduction of extremely complex instrumentation made possible by developments in electronics and computing. These have provided all branches of science with powerful analytic tools, in effect giving them an almost limitless capability in data analysis because of the ability of computers to manipulate numerous variables, and to process, store, and retrieve data rapidly. They have had a particularly liberating effect on theoretical work because of their capability to model physical phenomena. This, in turn, has led to an efflorescence of new specialties and interdisciplinary programs, particularly in engineering.

The center of these developments has been the evolution of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, which is both a producer and a product of the electronic revolution. Its own areas of study are determined by the technological developments for which it is responsible. The effects have been widespread. In Mathematics, the ability of computers to perform complex operations quickly has led to the solution of an array of long-standing problems in theory, and these have stimulated intense activity in applied mathematics, particularly in applications in physics, chemistry, biology, and engineering. The result has been major breakthroughs in scientific computing, in the modelling of physical phenomena, and in linear programming that have proved beneficial to all the physical sciences.

In Physics, the ability to devise complex models of reasonable precision has reinvigorated the search for a unified field theory. Improved instrumentation in solid state and laser physics has facilitated the creation of new materials, and has permitted an accumulation of new knowledge regarding the structure and properties of matter. Research activity in Astronomy and in Geology and Geophysics now typically combines physics and mathematics with field work enhanced by high technology telescopes, x-ray diffraction equipment, and probes that have opened up new realms of celestial and terrestrial observation. And in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, improved instrumentation has expanded activity at the interface between biology and synthetic chemistry, and in the process technologies of (1) semiconductor and solid-state, and (2) biological and biochemical materials.

These developments demand increased allocations of laboratory and service space and the provision of state-of-the-art research equipment and facilities, most notably for Computer Science and Chemical Engineering, each of which has been inadequately housed since the early 1970's.
The Computer Science Division of the department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences is among the most severely impacted instructional units on the campus, with demand for access to both its major and service programs far exceeding the places it is able to make available. Its need for more space has been long recognized, and was formalized in 1984 when the Chair of the department and the Associate Chair of its Computer Science Division jointly proposed to the Dean of Engineering that new space be constructed to accommodate the latter unit. That proposal was developed by a faculty-student committee.

The departmental proposal was reviewed and approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Provost for Professional Schools and Colleges, and the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee, following which preliminary architectural, environmental and site evaluation studies were authorized by the Chancellor. These studies were conducted during 1985 and 1986, and led to a supplement to the Etcheverry Site Utilization Study and a building proposal that were reviewed and approved by the academic units occupying Etcheverry Hall (the departments of Mechanical Engineering, Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, and Nuclear Engineering, and the Operations Research Center, an Organized Research Unit), and by the College of Engineering Building Committee.

Following endorsement by the College Building Committee, a Project Planning Guide (PPG) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) were prepared jointly by the Campus Planning Office and the College. In 1987, these were reviewed and approved by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and the Chancellor’s Planning Committee. At their July 1987 meeting, the Regents approved an amendment to the 1987-90 Capital Improvement Program to include Berkeley’s Computer Science Building.

The department of Chemical Engineering, which will be the principal occupant of Chemistry Unit III, is rivaled only by the similar departments at the California Institute of Technology and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the quality of its programs and the caliber of its graduates. It plays an increasingly important role in the process phase of developments in Biotechnology. Because of this, and the requirements of industry in energy conservation and waste disposal, it has grown rapidly since the mid 1970’s. It now enrolls about 350 undergraduate and 150 graduate students, and produces approximately 80 baccalaureates and 30 graduate degrees annually.

The need for a third Chemistry building devoted primarily to Chemical Engineering has been acknowledged by the campus since the early 1960’s. In 1981, the department’s Industrial Advisory Board presented a report to the Chair that expressed serious criticism of the quality and adequacy of existing space, and recommended construction of a new building. This led the Dean of Chemistry to appoint a special committee, that included faculty and student participation, to prepare a College space plan.

Following approval of the space plan by the Provost for Professional Schools and Colleges, the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and the Chancellor’s Planning Committee, the architectural firm of Stone, Marraccini and Patterson was appointed to undertake preliminary architectural, environmental and site evaluation studies. Chemical Engineering Program Planning and Building Committees were also appointed to assist in their work, the latter of which was chaired by the Provost for Professional Schools and Colleges.

Following endorsement, in September 1983, of the studies submitted by Stone, Marraccini and Patterson and their sub-contractors by the Chemical Engineering Build-
ing Committee, a PPG, an EIR and a fund-raising plan were prepared jointly by the Campus Planning Office, the Development Office and the College. In 1984, these were reviewed and approved by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee, the Chancellor’s Planning Committee, and The Regents.

The LRDP addresses other academic needs of the physical sciences in the following way:

- the removal of the Etcheverry nuclear reactor will assist in siting the new Computer Science Building;

- the construction of the Computer Science Building (scheduled for completion in the early 1990’s) will provide 60,000 ASF for Computer Science;

- the construction of the College of Chemistry Unit III (scheduled for completion in the mid 1990’s) will provide 62,000 ASF for Chemical Engineering, synthetic chemistry, and related support and service facilities;

- the relocation of Computer Science to its new building will release a total of 23,000 ASF for other units in Evans Hall;

- the relocation of paleontologists and the Museum of Paleontology to the renovated Life Sciences Building will release approximately 27,000 ASF in the Earth Sciences Building for Geology and Geophysics, Geography, and other units;

- the construction of a 15,000 ASF addition to Silver Laboratory of the Space Sciences Laboratory will replace substandard temporary facilities, and will provide needed space for astrophysics and planetary physics.

Social Sciences

The use of computers also has enlarged the ambit of social science research during the past decade. Moreover, their introduction comes at a propitious time, as these years witnessed a turning away, in discipline after discipline, from the study of universal and large social systems, from attempts to develop encompassing social science theories, and from the creation of large-scale social models. In place of broad theories, social scientists now seek to formulate answers to specific sorts of problems, and to address tractable issues concerning individuals, groups, sectors of the society, or parts of the economy. Such problems and issues require the integrative attention of several disciplines. The result is a significant expansion of interdisciplinary cooperation in research and a tendency to consolidate in research units, programs, or projects, specialized lines of research that employ the methods and concepts of several disciplines.

Among the most prominent of such consolidations at Berkeley is a combination of research efforts involving studies of the man-computer interface, and of the relationship between language, psychology, information processing, and artificial intelligence, looking towards a cognitive science. Such research enlists the cooperation of philosophers, mathematicians, psychologists, computer scientists, and linguists, and employs computer-based statistical techniques to identify the statistically significant relationships in complex cross-tabulations that can be used in structural equations to develop causal models.

A second such consolidation is the restructuring of International Studies now being implemented to create the Berkeley Institutes of International and Area Studies headed by a Dean who reports to The Vice Chancellor, and is responsible for all organized research units in international and area studies. The Dean, assisted by an Executive
Committee of representative faculty members, will supervise specialized faculty committees concerned with developments in relevant fields. These agencies will be involved with academic units in recruiting specialists, will coordinate the aggregate campus research effort in international studies, and will be responsible for various curricula offerings. The aim is to maximize opportunities for cooperative interdisciplinary effort while preserving the autonomy of participating units.

A third step in a similar direction is the trade of space between Near Eastern Studies and Economics that took place in 1989-90. This trade relocated Near Eastern Studies from Evans Hall to Barrows Hall where it occupies 8,000 ASF in greater proximity to the research units and departments with which it works. The trade also re-unites the formerly dispersed faculty of the Economics Department in 13,000 ASF in Evans Hall in propinquity to Mathematics and Statistics.

Most of the social science units presently operate under severe space restrictions that have been aggravated in recent years by the computing explosion. The LRDP proposes certain measures to alleviate their situation.

The Haas School of Business is one of the top ten business schools in the United States. With an annual output of roughly 300 Bachelor’s and close to 350 MBA’s it is a principal supplier of future managers for the expanding economy of the Bay Area and California. The campus administration has been concerned for more than a decade about the pressures on its facilities and capabilities imposed by escalating student and employer demand.

In 1977, a special committee chaired by Professor Fred Morrissey submitted a report to the then-Dean Earl Cheit, recommending the construction of a new building of 91,400 ASF to permit the School to relocate from its existing overcrowded quarters in Barrows Hall. Following review by the predecessors of the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements and Chancellor’s Planning Committees, The Regents approved the inclusion of a Business Administration Building, to be funded from non-State funds, in the University’s 1983-86 Major Capital Improvement Program. Immediately following this action, plans were initiated for fund-raising.

In 1984-85 an ad hoc review committee chaired by Professor Keith Crandall of Civil Engineering, and including representatives of the business community, recommended a number of measures for strengthening and updating the School’s academic program. These necessitated reconsideration of its space needs. In 1985, Dean Ray Miles appointed a reconstituted Business School Building Committee chaired by Professors Fred Morrissey and Dow Otaw. After lengthy analysis and consultation this committee submitted a revised proposal to incorporate the Business Library, the Institute of Business and Economic Research and the Center for Research in Management in the new School.

In 1986, the Campus Planning Office conducted a facilities program study that: (a) specified space needs and priorities in detail, (b) translated these into a space program, and (c) assessed the feasibility of housing this program on several potential sites. Based on this study, ROMA Design Group, a San Francisco architectural firm, was engaged to develop a facilities program and site evaluation. A Business Administration Building Committee, chaired by Professor Gordon Rausser of Agricultural and Resource Economics supervised their work in cooperation with a Program Committee chaired by Andrew Shogan of the Business School.
In October 1986, ROMA's Facilities Program Study Report was reviewed and approved by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee, and the Chancellor's Planning Committee. Subsequent site selection and massing studies and recommendations have also been reviewed and approved by these bodies.

- new construction (scheduled for completion in the early 1990's) will provide 122,000 ASF for the Haas School of Business, including 35,000 ASF for a Business Library and 19,000 assignable square feet for classrooms;
- the relocation of Business Administration will release 57,000 ASF in Barrows Hall;
- the relocation of the Business Library (coupled with the removal of the remainder of the social sciences graduate collection to the enlarged Doe Library) will release nearly 20,000 ASF in Stephens Hall;
- the space released in these two locations (77,000 ASF) will be used primarily to improve the space allocations of the other departments and research units in the social sciences, including Ethnic Studies, to alleviate the severely overcrowded condition of humanities departments presently located in Dwinelle Hall, and to replace the space to be eliminated through the demolition of the temporary buildings in the central glade.

**Humanities**

There are eighteen academic departments classified as humanities at Berkeley. Three are responsible for instruction and research in the performing arts. It has long been acknowledged that the humanities departments are the most overcrowded units on the campus. Like the social sciences, their scholarly activities are now heavily impacted and influenced by computer technology, by an expanding use of evidential data obtained from collections of manuscripts, texts and artifacts, and (in the performing arts) by an increasing need to enhance scholarly studies with professional training in the skills and techniques of performance.

Traditionally viewed as the domain of the individual scholar, event or movement, current humanities' research generally seeks to balance the study of humanistic phenomena as autonomous creations or experiences with the study of their role as the products and producers of specific historical cultures. The result is an expansion of quantitative, interdisciplinary and cooperative research, and an emergence of active sub-groups interested in semiotics, structuralism, and other forms of linguistic, psychological, sociological and economic analysis.

One manifestation of the new interdisciplinary emphasis is the newly formed Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities. It sponsors, finances, and services research projects across a broad spectrum of interest, supports resident fellows and post-doctoral scholars, conducts interdisciplinary programs often combining seminars, symposia and lectures with dramatic and musical performances and art exhibitions, and publishes journals and a newsletter that keep the humanities' scholarly community abreast of developments in the field.

A second manifestation is the expanding interest in performance now evident in the departments of Music, Art Practice, and Dramatic Art. An increasing amount of activity in this area is undertaken by the department in cooperation with one another, and with other faculties. A particular example is the recently established Program in New Music and Audio Technology, involving faculty members and students of the department of Music in cooperative endeavors with colleagues in computer science, perceptual psy-
chology, linguistics, mathematics and architecture, with the members of Stanford's Center for Computer Research in Music and Acoustics, and with those of the Institut pour Recherche et Coordination Acoustique/Musique of the Pompidou Center in Paris.

As noted above, the developing research program in the humanities at Berkeley is more severely hampered by space limitations than that of any other campus disciplinary division. Dwinelle Hall, which houses many of the humanities faculty and classrooms, has long been acknowledged as the most overcrowded academic building on the Berkeley campus. However, the problem is larger than the provision of adequate office and classroom space for faculty and students. The Main Library and the East Asian Library, which are the principal scholarly resources for the humanities, also suffer from serious physical inadequacies that restrict access to materials, curtail services, and threaten the safety of their users, staff and collections.

For years, the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee has kept the Dwinelle space situation under regular review, and has sought to effect marginal improvements in the space conditions of the incumbent units as circumstances have permitted. In 1986, it asked the Dwinelle Hall Space Committee (comprising representatives of the occupant departments and the Campus Planning Office) to develop a proposal for a more permanent alleviation of the situation.

After considering various alternative possibilities, including the construction of an addition to Dwinelle Hall in the adjacent parking lot (a solution it dismissed on environmental grounds), the Dwinelle Hall Space Committee recommended the attic addition project proposed in this LRDP. After review by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and the Chancellor's Planning Committee, the architectural firm of Wong, Brochini and Associates was engaged to conduct a feasibility study. The completion of this study led to the appointment of an ad hoc steering committee chaired by the Dean of Humanities to analyze the space needs of the departmental incumbents of Dwinelle Hall in detail, and to develop a revised project proposal. This proposal, accompanied by a petition stressing the urgency of the need for the proposed addition, and signed by a majority of the faculty housed in Dwinelle Hall, was reviewed and approved by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and by the Chancellor's Planning Committee before inclusion in the University's Capital Improvement Program.

The East Asian Library, which is the largest of Berkeley's branch libraries, and contains the second largest collection of books and other materials in East Asian languages outside East Asia, is inadequately and inefficiently housed. Half of the collection is located six miles from campus in remote storage, and the remainder inconveniently divided between three on-campus buildings. Its main center, Durant Hall, is in need of renovation, and is seismically unsafe. Its inadequacies have been compounded in the past decade because of a significant increase in user volume and frequency arising from the contemporary salience of Pacific Rim studies.

The campus administration has been concerned for many years about the accessibility of the East Asian collection. In 1980, the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and the Campus Planning Office conducted a detailed space study. This concluded that the situation could not be properly alleviated without a new building. Between 1982 and 1987 the issue was taken under advisement by a number of special groups, including a Task Force on Library Facilities (an agency appointed to assist in the development of the campus Space Plan), an ad hoc committee appointed to review the Institute of East Asian Studies (the Holton-Wade Committee), and the Committee
on Pacific-Asian Programs and Studies (a special blue-ribbon task group appointed by the Chancellor to review the coverage and quality of campus programs in Pacific Rim scholarship and outreach). The latter committee recommended immediate action to provide a new physical facility that would centralize the working collection and ancillary services to be funded from private sources. In response to its advice, the architectural firm of Esherick, Homsey, Dodge and Davis was engaged to make a programmatic and architectural study.

The completion of this study led to the appointment of an ad hoc steering committee to review the space needs of users in detail, and to develop a project proposal. This committee was chaired by Professor David Keightley of the department of History, and comprised representative faculty, students, and library staff. Its proposal was reviewed and approved by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee and by the Chancellor’s Planning Committee before inclusion in the University’s Capital Improvement Program and in Berkeley’s Capital Campaign.

The LRDP proposes the following measures to alleviate the principal problems:

- the purchase and rehabilitation of 1750 Arch Street, now renamed McEnery Hall, provided more than 3,000 ASF of research and performance space (including a recording studio and concert hall) for the Music and Audio Technology program;

- the construction of the Morrison-Hertz Addition will provide a further 30,000 ASF for Music;

- the implementation of the Dwinelle Hall expansion project (scheduled for completion in the early 1990’s) will provide 29,000 ASF for the humanities;

- the relocation to off-campus premises of nonacademic units presently occupying space in Wheeler Hall will release a further 5,000 ASF for the humanities;

- the relocation of Business Administration to its own building (scheduled for 1992-93) will release 57,000 ASF in Barrows Hall, a significant part of which will be assigned to the humanities;

- the relocation of the East Asian Library to its planned new building (whose completion is scheduled for sometime in the 1990’s) will provide 45,000 ASF for that unit, and will release 10,000 ASF in Durant Hall for the Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities and related programs;

- the renovation of the former Art Gallery (scheduled for completion in the mid 1990’s) will provide 3,000 ASF for practice and rehearsal space for Music;

- the relocation of Subject A to the enlarged Dwinelle Hall will release 2,000 ASF for Dramatic Art in the Dwinelle Hall Annex.

**The Library**

The Doe-Moffitt Libraries project will increase the safety of Berkeley students, faculty and staff by strengthening the Moffitt Library seismically and by removing the Main Library collection from the unsafe Doe stacks to a new, larger, underground facility in the area north of Doe and east of Moffitt. In addition to modernizing and improving library services, the project will enable the campus to redesign the landscape of the Central Glade, and to reduce vehicular traffic on Campanile Way.
The project is the product of some twenty years of study and deliberation arising from concern about the safety of the present stacks. The several studies were conducted by a number of campus agencies, including the Campus Planning Office and the Library Committee of the Academic Senate. Prior to the development of the project itself, the campus administration conducted three years of intensive planning, both internally, and with the assistance of architectural and engineering consultants funded by the Office of the President. The Library Committee of the Academic Senate and the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee played a major advisory role in this planning effort.

The project’s present design was developed in consultation with a broad variety of campus representatives. Two special steering committees, constituted in 1986, have met dozens of times over the past three years to direct the work of the architects and to resolve policy issues. These committees (chaired respectively by the Provost and Dean of the College of Letters and Science and by the University Librarian) comprise faculty members from a representative range of disciplines, administrators, librarians and students. Their reports and recommendations have been reviewed at appropriate intervals by the principal Standing Committees of the Academic Senate, by the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee, and by the Chancellor’s Planning Committee.

The LRDP proposes the following measures to address the needs of the Library:

- the construction of the Doe and Moffitt Libraries Addition and Seismic Improvements project (scheduled for completion in the mid 1990’s) will: (1) strengthen both buildings seismically, (2) remove Doe’s unsafe central stack core and relocate its collection, (3) provide a net increase of 64,000 ASF for additional library stacks and for service use, and (4) improve the operating efficiency of both libraries by making it possible to arrange the collections and services more rationally than at present;
- a subsequent Doe Library infill project will provide a further 24,000 ASF for library stacks and services.

**Academic Environment**

Berkeley’s students are the most important beneficiaries of the faculties’ scholarship. Graduate students receive much of their training through direct participation in the research effort. Undergraduate students are the immediate consumers of a broadened and contemporaneous curriculum built on faculty research. And all students, at all levels, are nourished by the critical outlook and intellectual climate that are the abiding characteristics of Berkeley’s scholarly community.

Teaching the attitudes and values of the scholarly community among an ever more heterogeneous body of undergraduate students will be a major campus preoccupation during the period encompassed by the LRDP. Having achieved diversity in its undergraduate population, Berkeley is shifting the emphasis of its student support services from recruitment to retention. Its aim now is to increase the persistence and success rate of all its students.

This effort must encompass all aspects of the educational enterprise, and reach into all areas of campus life. Its aim will be to eliminate the disparities of academic performance and the obstacles to community access that stem from differences of educational experience or from socioeconomic or cultural background, and to create a harmonious, integrated and self-confident student body.
Three particular components of the LRDP are designed to supplement and support the effort: (1) a rounding-out of Berkeley’s ongoing program to rehabilitate and update its classrooms and other teaching facilities; (2) the physical consolidation of the campus’ student support services, including the provision of a central physical facility, accessible to all sectors of the campus that will house services most directly associated with the educational program; and (3) the provision of additional student dormitories and other student housing accommodation to enable more undergraduates and graduates to reside near campus.

Teaching facilities and student housing are a special concern. Although current State standards for classroom provision suggest that Berkeley has adequate general assignment classroom space in the aggregate, the experience of recent years has demonstrated otherwise. The situation was aggravated by the reinstatement of the semester calendar in 1983, and by changed patterns of course enrollment demand. Modes of instruction have also changed over the years, requiring that many existing classrooms be redesigned to incorporate up-to-date teaching technologies.

Berkeley is comparably deficient in its ability to house its undergraduate students. Subject until recently to a long-standing Regental policy that targeted the provision of University housing to only 25% of the student body of each campus and relied on adjacent private rental accommodations for the rest, it has witnessed a progressive decline in private rentals for students throughout the City of Berkeley. Today, approximately 3,900 units (or 40% of the former rental stock) is available. As a result, the number of students now commuting to campus each day has risen to a level that is educationally disadvantageous. Clearly, the situation is incompatible with the goal of a complete and integrated academic community.

**Classrooms**

The need both for additional and renovated classrooms and for additional student housing is recognized in the LRDP. The individual academic projects it includes will provide 70,000 ASF of newly constructed general assignment classrooms and specialized departmental teaching facilities. Up to 30,000 ASF of additional classroom space will also be made available by reassignment when academic units move to newly constructed space. Moreover, the ongoing program of classroom renovation will continue during the period covered by the LRDP. The relevant highlights of the Plan are as follows:

- the construction of the Genetics and Plant Biology Building (to be completed in 1989-90) includes 4,275 ASF of classrooms and 8,838 ASF of teaching laboratories;
- the Computer Science Building includes 7,375 ASF of instructional facilities;
- the Business Administration Building will include 9,500 ASF of general assignment classrooms and 18,800 ASF of departmental classrooms and other instructional facilities;
- the proposed expansion of facilities for the department of Music includes 13,800 ASF of instructional space;
- the proposed ROTC building will include 3,300 ASF of general assignment classrooms and 1,680 ASF of class laboratories;
- College of Chemistry Unit III will include a 1,500 ASF general assignment lecture hall;
• the renovation of the Life Sciences Building will provide 10,040 ASF of renovated
general assignment classrooms and 37,475 ASF of renovated teaching laboratories;
• secondary effects of the Dwinelle Hall Attic Expansion, Business Administration
Building, and other projects will release up to 30,000 ASF for additional classrooms and
class laboratories;
• a Student Services Building will provide 36,000 ASF on the central campus for student
service units now housed in dispersed and inadequate quarters;
• student housing projects will provide from 2,350 to 3,410 new beds.

In summary, the capital projects will add 18,575 ASF for newly constructed general
assignment classrooms on the campus. These new classrooms could accommodate 1,304
students in 25 classrooms, each of which would seat 50 students. Further, up to 18,000
ASF of space in existing buildings, equivalent to 24 new fifty-seat classrooms, will be
converted to general assignment lecture and seminar use. An additional 61,000 ASF is
identified as additional specialized space for teaching (51,000 ASF of newly constructed
space and 10,000 ASF of reassigned space).
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**TABLE 7**

Summary of Illustration of Approved and Proposed Campus Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Academic Space 1</th>
<th>Support Space 1</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Recreation Facilities</th>
<th>Project Category 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASF GSF</td>
<td>ASF GSF</td>
<td>ASF GSF [Beds]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>ENGINEERING AND EARTH SCIENCES PRECINCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Computer Science Building³</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>College of Engineering Expansion³</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES PRECINCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>College of Chemistry Unit III</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Latimer Hall Roof Laboratory Addition⁴</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Space Improvements (Removal of Stanley and Campbell Annexes)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>ART, MUSIC AND PROFESSIONS PRECINCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Business Administration Building (and Removal of Cowell Hospital and 2220 Piedmont)</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(88,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Law Building Addition</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Wurster Hall Fourth Floor Link Addition</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Kroeber Hall South Addition (Lowie Museum)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Morrison-Hertz Addition</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Minor Hall Expansion</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Academic Space¹ ASF</td>
<td>Support Space¹ ASF</td>
<td>Housing ASF CSF [Beds]</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Project Category²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td><strong>HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES PRECINCT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Dwimelle Hall Attic Expansion</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Space Improvements (Removal of South Hall Annex)</td>
<td>(2,100)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES PRECINCT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Genetics and Plant Biology Building and Northwest Parking Facility⁴</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>LSB Renovation (Central Court Infill)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Genetics and Plant Biology Greenhouse³,⁴</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Northwest Animal Facility⁴</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weliman Courtyard Restoration</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>University Hall Reuse³,⁴,⁵</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>94,700</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>UC Garage Joint Development Site³,⁶</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>(10,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(14,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>South Oxford Tract Development³</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>University Hall Parking Structure Reuse³,⁵</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>University Hall Parking Structure Addition³</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>UC Printing Plant Joint Development Site³,⁶</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Asian Library (site to be determined)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td><strong>LIBRARY AND ADMINISTRATION PRECINCT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Doe and Moffitt Libraries Underground Addition</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>(79,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Doe Library Infill</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Academic Space¹ ASF/ GSF</td>
<td>Support Space¹ ASF/ GSF</td>
<td>Housing ASF GSF [Beds]</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Project Category²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Student Services Building (and Removal of T-Buildings)</td>
<td>(20,400) / (29,000)</td>
<td>36,000 / 60,000 / (30,000) / (42,000)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Central Glade Restoration</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Student Services and Recreation Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Alumni House Addition</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>5,800 / 8,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>ROTC Facility (and Removal of Temporary ROTC Building)</td>
<td>9,600 / 16,000 / (6,900) / (9,200)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>University Health Service Facility³ (or other Student Service facility)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>54,000 / 90,000 plus 6,000 / 8,000 retail</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bicycle Parking Area</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreation Improvements</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>swimming pool and other improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Southside Area³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Bowditch Residence Hall and Parking Garage (and Removal of 2401-2405 Bowditch)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>(6,200) / (7,400)</td>
<td>92,600-107,300 / 123,500-157,800 [475-550 beds]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Channing/Bowditch Residence Hall (and Removal of 2334 Bowditch and 2535, 2539 and 2543 Channing)</td>
<td>(1,900) / (3,300)</td>
<td>(8,200) / (11,700)</td>
<td>36,100-39,000 / 48,100-57,400 [185-200 beds]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Anna Head Residence Hall, Dining Facility and Parking Garage</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>59,900-65,500 / 74,100-95,100 [150-210 beds]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>People's Park</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>open space and recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Dwight Residence Hall (and removal of 2427 Dwight)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>(3,100) / (3,900)</td>
<td>17,600-20,500 / 23,500-30,100 [90-105 beds]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Haste/Channing Residence Hall, Offices and Parking Garage</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>16,000 / 19,500</td>
<td>24,400 / 34,500 [125 beds]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Additional Channing Tennis Courts</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2 tennis courts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ ASF = Academic Space; GSF = Gross Square Feet
² Project Category: 1 = Residential, 2 = Student Services, 3 = Shopping/Office, 4 = Recreation
³ Includes University Health Service Facility and University Health Service Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Academic Space¹</th>
<th>Support Space¹</th>
<th>Housing ASF</th>
<th>Recreation Facilities</th>
<th>Project Category²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASF GSF</td>
<td>ASF GSF</td>
<td>ASF GSF</td>
<td>[Beds]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Shattuck/Channing Student Housing³</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>42,653</td>
<td>63,475</td>
<td>[157 beds] plus 10,200 10,560 retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clark Kerr Campus Tennis Courts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6 tennis courts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>International House Addition</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14,600-29,300</td>
<td>19,500-43,100</td>
<td>[75-150 beds]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity Sites in Southside for Student Housing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>82,900-144,300</td>
<td>110,500-212,200</td>
<td>[425-740 beds]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• South Shattuck Avenue and Other Opportunity Sites in Berkeley for Student Housing and Related Parking</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>approx. 47,000</td>
<td>62,000 retail</td>
<td>209,300-344,200</td>
<td>268,300-506,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>HILL AREA³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Foothill Student Housing Project⁴</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>147,343</td>
<td>212,105</td>
<td>[760 beds]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Ridge/La Loma Residence Hall</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9,800-10,700</td>
<td>13,100-15,700</td>
<td>[50-55 beds]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics Facilities, Step 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Lawrence Hall of Science Additions and Alterations, Step 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Lawrence Hall of Science Additions and Alterations, Step 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Upper Hill Terraces Parking</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Botanical Garden Parking</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Fire Trail Parking Area</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment, Health and Safety Facility (site to be determined)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Addition</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Silver Laboratory Addition (and removal of temporary trailers)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(8,200)</td>
<td>(9,900)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Academic Space(^1) ASF</td>
<td>Support Space(^3) ASF</td>
<td>Housing ASF GSF [Beds]</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Project Category(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Botanical Garden Improvements (and removal of some existing structures)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strawberry Canyon Recreation Area Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>field expansion and other improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.0 OTHER AREAS

| 10.1 | Harrison Street Satellite Parking Lot\(^6\)                                   | •                         |                        | •                      | •                    | 1                     |
| 10.2 | Gas and Chemical Storage Facility (6701 San Pablo)                            | •                         | 4,500                  | •                      |                      | 2                     |
|       |                                                                                       | 5,000                  |                        |                        |                      | 2                     |
| 10.3 | Parking at 6701 San Pablo                                                          | •                         |                        | •                      | •                    | 2                     |

\(^1\)Numbers in parentheses indicate a deduction of ASF and GSF for building or space removals.

\(^2\)Category 1: Approved Projects (projects for which design and environmental review have been approved); Category 2: Proposed but not yet Approved Projects.

\(^3\)Project Site not within Central Campus Park.

\(^4\)Approved project currently under construction or recently completed construction.

\(^5\)Existing facility transferred to Berkeley campus from Office of the President.

\(^6\)Amount of campus space in potential joint development projects unknown.
### TABLE 8
UC Operated and Affiliated Housing: 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OPERATED HOUSING FACILITIES</th>
<th>Number of Student Bed Spaces</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Student Housing Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1 Residence Halls</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 Residence Halls</td>
<td>941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Residence Halls</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manville Hall</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles Hall</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serr Hall</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Street House</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storb House</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Kerr Campus Residence Halls</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International House</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills College contract for space</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Names contract for space</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth House</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Way House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Single Student Housing Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,074</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Family Student Housing              |                             |            |       |
| University Village (Albany)         | 920                         |            |       |
| Smyth-Fernwald                      | 102                         |            |       |
| **Total Family Student Housing Spaces** | **1,022**                  |            |       |

**TOTAL UC OPERATED HOUSING SPACES** 6,096

### AFFILIATE OPERATED HOUSING FACILITIES*

| Single Student Housing Spaces       |                             |            |       |
| Cooperative (18 Housing Facilities) | 1,400                       |            |       |
| Fraternities (40 Housing Facilities)| 1,400                       |            |       |
| Sororities (16 Housing Facilities) | 800                         |            |       |
| Casa Joaquin Murieta                | 38                          |            |       |
| **TOTAL AFFILIATE OPERATED BED SPACES** | **3,638**                  |            |       |

### UC OPERATED HOUSING SPACES UNDER DEVELOPMENT

| Foothill Project                    | 760                         |            |       |
| Shattuck/Channing Project           | 155                         |            |       |
| **TOTAL UC OPERATED UNDER DEVELOPMENT** | **905**                   |            |       |

*Affiliate housing is available for single students only.
TABLE 9
Proposed Distribution of Single Student Housing in Berkeley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores(^2)</th>
<th>Upper Division(^3)</th>
<th>Graduates(^4)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Residence Halls(^1)</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>1,700-2,200</td>
<td>1,700-2,700</td>
<td>800-1,600</td>
<td>8,100-10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliates</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private(^5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>200-700</td>
<td>3,200-4,200</td>
<td>2,600-3,400</td>
<td>6,000-8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Assumptions for Residence Halls/University Apartments:
- 90% of all Freshmen (10% living at home—based on 1988 Student Housing and Transportation Survey)
- 45-60% of all Sophomores
- 15-25% of Upper Division
- 12-25% of Graduates

\(^2\) Assumes 85% of all Sophomores live in Berkeley.

\(^3\) 75% of Upper Division in Berkeley.

\(^4\) 68% of Graduates in Berkeley.

\(^5\) 1979 proportions.

The numbers on the above table (those which indicate how much of the housing in 2005 that will be supplied by the private market and in University affiliates will be occupied by various academic levels) are based upon approximations of how such housing is occupied today, excluding freshmen. The demand for University housing for the several academic levels is the residual after affiliate and private housing is accounted for.

The major finding from this analysis is that, if the University is to meet the year 2005 demand for single student housing, it will need to balance its development efforts between housing lower division students—heretofore the University’s nearly exclusive target population—and housing upper division and graduate students.
### TABLE 10

**Year 2005:**
**Distribution of Existing, Planned and Net New Needed Single Student University Housing by Affordability Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability Levels 1988</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Needed Number of Beds</td>
<td>Existing and Planned</td>
<td>Net Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/Mod.</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,400&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING AND PLANNED BEDS** 5,800

**TOTAL ADDITIONAL NEEDED** 3,400

**TOTAL UNIVERSITY HOUSING, EXISTING AND PROPOSED YEAR 2005** 9,200

<sup>1</sup>Ninety percent of Foothill and Kerr
<sup>2</sup>Ten percent of Foothill and Kerr and 50 others
<sup>3</sup>Two thirds of Shattuck/Channing
<sup>4</sup>Marville, one third of International House
<sup>5</sup>One third of International House
<sup>6</sup>One third of Shattuck/Channing

### TABLE 11

**Mode of Travel to Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Driver</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Passenger</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/Van Pool</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter/Motorcycle</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17,320</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Removed Approved</td>
<td>Proposed Cat. 1</td>
<td>Removed Proposed Cat. 2</td>
<td>Added Approved</td>
<td>Proposed Cat. 1</td>
<td>Added Proposed Cat. 2</td>
<td>Net Change Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMPUS ENVIRONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Campus Park</td>
<td>1,900 (100)</td>
<td>(550)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350 (550)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>0 (70)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (70)</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside/Downtown</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>300 180</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>0 (720)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>0 (250)</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shattuck Corridor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>4505</td>
<td>60 450</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6,270 (100)</td>
<td>(1,340)</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>710 (240)</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HILL AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Area</td>
<td>780 (230)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>0 (70)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower and Upper Neighborhood</td>
<td>370 (30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>220 60</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,150 (260)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150 60</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6701 San Pablo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Carleton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LRDP PLANNING AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1Includes spaces created through the use of parking attendants.
2Includes University Hall.
3Includes Clark Kerr Campus and Smyth/Fernwald parking.
4Includes all campus-owned parking not presently administered by Parking Services.
5Primarily for new student residences; does not contribute to commuter parking supply.
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