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**What UC Berkeley is proposing:**

In the Upper Hearst Final SEIR, <https://capitalstrategies.berkeley.edu/resources-notices/public-notices>, UC Berkeley is proposing three things:

Campus-wide:

1. Change in **base student population up to approximately 11,300 new students,** of which approximately 9,000 have already been added (in violation of UC Berkeley’s current Long Range Development Plan. **UC currently enrolls over 42,000 students.**

On its **one acre** at Upper Hearst and Ridge parking lot:

1. **37,000** square feet **expansion of** **academic space** for the Goldman School of Public Policy (GSPP) in an up to 8-story building with event space with a capacity for 300 meeting attendees. UC claims that this expansion result in **5 new employees** and **30 additional students** on a year-round basis.
2. **Faculty, Visitor Scholar, & Graduate Student housing** – up to **150 units** in a mixed-use building up to 6-stories tall.

**Talking Points – student increase:**

1. **We object to the adoption of the final EIR** for the Upper Hearst Project due to its **insufficient analysis of the impacts** of increasing student enrollment by 11,285, to over 44,000 students.
2. UCB’s proposed change is student enrollment is **huge and is a MAJOR AMENDMENT** to the campus Long Range Development Plan that needs to be separately studied and not mixed in with the Goldman School facility expansion and faculty and graduate student housing projects.
3. **UCB has failed to justify a need for 11,300 additional students**. UCB says enrollment is driven by the growth in high school population. But between 2005 and 2018, California’s population of 17- and 18-year olds has grown by 10% yet UCB wants to grow its student population by 34%!

From 2010 to 2018 nonresident students at UCB grew by 8,049, while the number of California resident students fell by 291. **Almost all of UCB’s enrollment over 33,450 has been of out-of-state students.** These additional out of state students generate over approximately $250 million in additional revenue, none of which has been used to mitigate impacts on the City of Berkeley or its neighborhoods.

1. UCB has **failed to analyze the impact of 11,300 new students on the City of Berkeley**, limiting its analysis to just the campus environment and saying that this increase “would not substantially affect the regional population” with the region defined as the 9-county Bay Area!
2. **But common sense tells you that UC Berkeley’s** **impact is felt locally, not regionally!** This increase represents 9.3% of Berkeley’s current population (11,300 new students/121,900 Berkeley’s 2018 population). UC Berkeley analysis must show the impacts on Berkeley.
3. **The impact of 11,300 new students is huge.** Here’s how it impacts Berkeley:
   1. **Increased pressure on the local housing market** with higher rents and more displacement of low- and moderate-income non-student households, accelerating gentrification and increasing rental rates for Berkeley residents and students.
   2. **Increased demand for police protection** –UC is already one of the nation’s most dangerous universities and UC has cut, not increased, its UC Police force.
   3. **Increased demand for fire and emergency medical services**. Berkeley has experienced periods where the City’s first responders are so busy transporting UCB students to emergency rooms for alcohol-related medical conditions that the rest of the City was under covered.
   4. **Increased water consumption**, waste water, storm water contamination, and solid waste. **Currently UC pays almost nothing for these services.**
   5. **Increased demand for parks and open space.**
   6. **More noise in Berkeley’s residential neighborhoods** with loud parties, late night traffic, and moving-day trash.
4. A part of this project, **UC Berkeley is not proposing a single unit of new housing for undergraduates** even through the student population would increase by 11,385. **In 2005 UC Berkeley said that it was necessary to build 2,500 beds in order to mitigate the impact of 1,650 additional students! They built less than 1500.**
5. **Students are being underserved by the University** both because of the absence of housing and declining faculty-student ratios. The UC system needs to **shift new students to campuses in lower-cost housing markets** (like Merced, Riverside, and Davis) so student have access to more affordable housing.
6. UC Berkeley is the campus with the **lowest percentage of undergraduate housing** in the UC system!
7. UC Berkeley is among the top 20 least-safe universities in the United States. Yet the UC **says its does not need a single additional police officer to service 11,285 more students** –and offers no analysis to support this claim.

**Talking Points – Fiscal impacts:**

1. While **Berkeley receives many benefits** from having a UC campus, UCB is not paying its fair share for City Services. UCB is tax exempt and it does not pay property taxes or development impact fees.
2. **Unplanned, unmitigated, and unanalyzed student population growth stress the City’s already overtaxed services**, such as police, fire, and social services.
3. Increasing enrollment so dramatically without adequately studying its many impacts and taking measures to lessen those impacts will not only **lower the quality of life for Berkeley residents, but for UCB students as well**.
4. The City has prepared an analysis that shows that the **City of Berkeley spent about $21 million in 2018 to provide city services to UCB**. Under an old agreement from 2005, UCB only paid the City less than $1 million in 2018 to pay for these services.