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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study has been prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project (the “project” or “San Joaquin Apartments project”) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3 Sections 15000–15387, respectively.

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

**Proposed Development.** The University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) has proposed to construct the San Joaquin Apartments project to provide 1,000 bed spaces for undergraduate students. The project would also provide 24 residential units that would be occupied by resident assistants, resident directors, UCSB faculty and visitors to the UCSB campus. The San Joaquin Apartments project site is located on the UCSB Storke Campus at the northeast corner of the intersection of El Colegio Road and Storke Road. The project site is approximately 4,000 feet west of the UCSB Main Campus, south of and adjacent to residences located in the City of Goleta, and north of and adjacent to the unincorporated community of Isla Vista and the Isla Vista Elementary School in Santa Barbara County. The location of the project site is depicted on Figure 1.1-1.

The proposed project site has been previously developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall, which was formerly known as Francisco Torres and provides 1,325 bed spaces for undergraduate students in two residential towers that are 10- and 11-stories in height. The proposed bed spaces and residential units to be provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project would be provided in 13 new buildings that would range between two and seven stories in height. The proposed buildings would be predominately located on portions of the 13-acre project site that have been previously developed with paved vehicle and bicycle parking facilities.

The San Joaquin Apartments project would also provide a variety of accessory uses that would primarily serve the on-site student population, such as new food service facilities, recreation facilities, and a variety of other student service-related uses. Parking for both the Santa Catalina residence hall and the San Joaquin Apartments project would be provided in two locations: Parking Lot No. 50, which was developed to serve the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing Facility and has been under-utilized since the San Clemente project opened in 2008; and an new parking area/reconfigured parking lot to be developed adjacent to the project site on the west side of Storke Road on the UCSB West Campus. The location of the proposed residential development and project-related parking facilities are depicted on Figure 1.1-2.

**Long Range Development Plan Revisions.** The UCSB 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) was approved by the Regents in September 2010 and serves as the General
Plan/Local Coastal Plan for the UCSB campus. Proposed development projects on UCSB campus must be consistent with the land use requirements and policies of the 2010 LRDP. The 2010 LRDP applied a “Housing” land use designation to the San Joaquin Apartments project site, therefore, the project is consistent with the LRDP’s land use requirements. The 2010 LRDP estimated that the project site could accommodate 168 housing units for 600 students. Implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments project would require a revision to the 2010 LRDP to transfer residential units and bed spaces to the project site from other future development site identified by the 2010 LRDP. The proposed revision to the 2010 LRDP would not increase the total number of future bed spaces or residential units on the UCSB campus above what was identified by the 2010 LRDP.

The 2010 LRDP has not been certified by the California Coastal Commission, and until it has been certified, development projects at UCSB that require a Notice of Impending Development from the California Coastal Commission must also be found to be consistent with the requirements of the previously adopted 1990 LRDP. The 1990 LRDP does not include the San Joaquin Apartments project site because UCSB acquired it after the 1990 LRDP was prepared. If the Coastal Commission does not certify the 2010 LRDP prior to their consideration of the San Joaquin Apartments project, the 1990 LRDP would need to be amended to add the project site and to apply a “Student Housing” land use designation to the site.

1.2 REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The University of California is the Lead Agency for the San Joaquin Apartments project and is responsible for complying with the requirements of CEQA. The Board of Regents for the University of California, or its delegate, is the primary decision-making body for this project.

The California Coastal Commission will review the San Joaquin Apartments project for compliance with the requirements of the California Coastal Act and the UCSB 1990 or 2010 LRDP, whichever is in effect at the time action by the Coastal Commission is requested by UCSB. A Notice of Impending Development will be submitted to the Coastal Commission for review and approval upon approval of a final environmental document.

Prior to the start of construction activities, the project must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity from the Water Resources Control Board.

Encroachment permits from the County of Santa Barbara are required for driveway improvements or other construction activities that occur in County right-of-way areas, such as along El Colegio Road or Storke Road adjacent to the project site,

Authority to Construct permits will be required from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for proposed diesel-powered emergency generators and any water heaters/boilers that exceed size thresholds specified by the APCD.
1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential for the San Joaquin Apartments project to result in significant environmental impacts. As described by section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study can be used to:

- Provide a preliminary analysis of potential project-specific and cumulative environmental effects of a proposed project.
- Identify environmental issue areas where the proposed project may have the potential to result in significant impacts and that should be evaluated in the project-specific EIR.
- Enable the lead agency to modify a project to avoid adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby allowing a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration to be prepared for the project.
- Document the factual basis for the finding in a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant impact on the environment.

As described in Sections 4.0 (Environmental Factors Potentially Affected) and 5.0 (Environmental Determination) this Initial Study has been prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments project to provide a preliminary assessment of project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project, and to define the “scope” of the impact analysis that is to be provided in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
1.4 PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency Name and Address:</td>
<td>The Regents of the University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1111 Franklin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person and phone number:</td>
<td>Ms. Shari Hammond, (805) 893-3796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project location:</td>
<td>The San Joaquin Apartments project is located on the Storke Campus of UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor’s name and address:</td>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93106-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian of the administrative record for this project:</td>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Campus Planning and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous EIRs relied upon for evaluation purposes</td>
<td>The UCSB 2010 LRDP Final EIR EIR (SCH# 2007051128) is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference. The EIR may also be downloaded from the following internet address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://lrdp.id.ucsb.edu/documents-and-materials">http://lrdp.id.ucsb.edu/documents-and-materials</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1.1-2
Project Components
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 REGIONAL SETTING

The UCSB campus is located approximately 10 miles west of the City of Santa Barbara in an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County. This project region is referred to as the South Coast region of the County, and occupies a coastal plain about three miles wide between the Pacific Ocean and the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains.

The UCSB campus encompasses a total of approximately 1,055 acres and is located in an unincorporated portion of southern Santa Barbara County. The campus is comprised of four areas known as the Main Campus, Storke Campus, West Campus, and North Campus. The Main Campus contains most of the UCSB academic and support buildings and facilities. The Storke Campus has been used for the development of student housing, parking facilities, athletic fields, and contains natural areas including the Storke Wetlands. The West Campus is largely devoted to a UCSB natural reserve that includes the Devereux Slough and Coal Oil Point Reserve. The West Campus also includes the former Devereux School property, student family and faculty housing, and facilities associated with the Ellwood Marine Terminal. The 174-acre North Campus borders the City of Goleta and is comprised of approximately 70 acres of permanent open space, with plans for 312 units of faculty student housing on the remaining property. Of the approved 312 residential units, 22 faculty units have been developed and 37 are under construction.

The residential units provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project would be located on the UCSB Storke Campus. El Colegio Road, the unincorporated community of Isla Vista, and the Isla Vista Elementary School border the Storke Campus and the proposed project site to the south. The UCSB Main Campus is to the east and the UCSB West campus is located to the west of the Storke Campus. The Goleta Slough, the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and properties in the City of Goleta are located north of the Storke Campus.

2.2 PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

2.2.1 Project Site

San Joaquin Apartments Project Site. The San Joaquin Apartment project site encompasses approximately 13 acres. The proposed project also includes the development of a new 1.5-acre parking lot to be located at northeast corner of the West Campus. Additional parking for the project would be provided in an existing parking structure located at the northwest corner of the intersection of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road.

The proposed housing site has been developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall, which was formerly known as Francisco Torres before it was purchased by UCSB in 2003. The Santa Catalina facility was developed in 1966 and provides 1,325 bed spaces for undergraduate
students in two “tower” structures that are 10- and 11-stories in height. Almost one-third of the UCSB freshman class resides at the Santa Catalina residence hall. A two-story “podium” building provides a variety of student support uses and is located between the two residence hall towers. Parking for approximately 700 vehicles is provided on the west and north sides of the Santa Catalina facility, and bicycle parking and turf areas are provided on the east side of the Santa Catalina facility site.

**Proposed Parking Lot Site.** A 207-space parking lot would be developed on the west side of Storke Road on a 1.5-acre area located adjacent to the proposed housing site. The proposed parking lot site is presently covered with mowed turf and is adjacent to the UCSB West Campus Family Apartments located on the west side of Storke Road and adjacent to the proposed housing site. The proposed parking lot would be used to provide parking for both the San Joaquin Apartments and the existing Santa Catalina residence hall. An existing 81-space parking lot used by and located adjacent to the West Campus Family Apartments would be restriped to provide 17 additional parking spaces. The additional 17 parking spaces provided in the existing parking lot would be used to serve the San Joaquin Apartments project. In total, the parking area located west of the project site would provide 224 parking spaces available for use by the San Joaquin Apartments project and the Santa Catalina residence hall.

**Parking Lot No. 50.** Parking Lot No. 50 is located on the Storke Campus on the northwest corner of the intersection of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road, approximately 3,750 feet (0.7 of a mile) east of the proposed housing site. Parking Lot No. 50 is a five-level structure that provides 785 parking spaces. The parking structure capacity is typically only about 50 percent utilized. Existing parking capacity provided by Parking Lot 50 would be used to serve both the San Joaquin Apartments and the existing Santa Catalina residence hall.

### 2.2.2 Surrounding Land Uses

**San Joaquin Apartments Project Site.** Land uses near the San Joaquin Apartments project site are described below. Figure 2.2-1 depicts land uses adjacent to the project site.

**North.** The Storke Ranch residential community is located north of and adjacent to the proposed housing project site. This residential area is located in the City of Goleta and consists of two-story detached and attached single-family dwellings.

A vacant parcel is located to the northwest of the project site on the UCSB West Campus. This parcel is the site for the 151-unit Sierra Madre Family Housing project, which was approved by the California Coastal Commission 2006. Construction of the Sierra Madre project will begin in late summer or fall of 2013.

To the northeast of the San Joaquin Apartments project site is the UCSB Storke Family Housing facility, which provides 342 residential units. Further to the northeast is the Goleta Slough. The slough consists of approximately 430 acres of wetland habitat, and 396 of those acres are included in the Goleta Slough Ecological Reserve. The Reserve is managed by the
San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project Initial Study
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California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Located within the historic area of the Goleta Slough is the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The western end of the Airport’s main runway is a minimum of approximately one mile northeast of the San Joaquin Apartment project site.

South. El Colegio Road extends along the southern perimeter of the proposed housing site, and the unincorporated community of Isla Vista extends southward from El Colegio Road to the Pacific Ocean. The Isla Vista Elementary School is located adjacent to El Colegio Road and the southwestern portion of the housing project site.

An open space area known as the Camino Corto Open Space is south of and adjacent to El Colegio Road and the southeastern portion of the project site. Another open space area, the Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve, is located south of and adjacent to El Colegio Road and is southeast of the project site. Devereux Slough and the Coal Oil Point Reserve are located to the southwest of the project site.

East. An open space area that provides both wetland and degrade upland habitat is located east of and adjacent to the proposed housing site. The 2010 LRDP applied an “Open Space” land use designation to this area, and portions of this parcel are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area by the 2010 LRDP.

West. Storke Road extends along the western perimeter of the housing project site, and the UCSB West Campus is located west of and adjacent to Storke Road. The West Campus Family Apartments provide 250 units and are west of the proposed housing project site. The Ocean Meadows Golf Course is located northwest of the project site.

Proposed Parking Lot Site. Land uses near the 1.5-acre area that would be used to provide the proposed 207-space parking lot are described below. Figure 2.2-1 depicts the land uses adjacent to the parking lot site.

North. The site for the 151-unit Sierra Madre Family Housing project is north of and adjacent to the proposed parking lot site. The Storke Ranch residential community is located to the northeast of the parking lot site.

South. A small playground that is used primarily by residents of the West Campus Family Apartments abuts the proposed parking lot site to the south, and open space area provided on the West Campus is located further to the south of the parking lot site. The Orfalea Family Childrens Center, which provides child care services, is approximately 900 feet south of the parking lot site. The Isla Vista Elementary School is on the south side of El Colegio Road and is southeast of the parking lot site.

East. The San Joaquin Apartments/Santa Catalina residence hall project site is located on the east side of Storke Road and east of the proposed parking lot site.
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West. The West Campus Family Apartments are located west of and adjacent to the proposed parking lot site.

Parking Lot No. 50. Land uses near the existing parking structure that would be used by the proposed project are described below.

North. Recreation facilities, including tennis courts and Storke Field are located north of the parking structure.

South. Residential units provided by the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing facility abut the parking structure to the south. El Colegio Road and residential units in the community of Isla Vista are further to the south of the parking structure.

East. Stadium Road, Parking Lot 30, and sports fields located on the UCSB Main Campus are east of the parking structure.

West. The San Clemente Graduate Student Housing facility is located to the west of the parking structure.

2.3 EXISTING ON-CAMPUS HOUSING

UCSB currently provides housing for 6,652 single students and 592 apartment units for students with families. An additional 151 units (114 student units and 37 faculty units) are to be provided by the Sierra Madre project, which will begin construction in late summer or fall 2013. A limited number of faculty housing units are provided by the West Campus Point Faculty Housing project (65 units), and when completed, the North Campus Faculty Housing project will provide an additional 161 units of faculty housing. The North Campus Faculty Housing project currently provides 22 units of faculty housing and 37 units are under construction. A summary of existing and approved housing facilities located on the UCSB campus is provided on Table 2.3-1. The location of each housing facility is depicted on Figure 2.3-1.
Table 2.3-1
Summary of Existing and Permitted Housing on the UCSB Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Facility</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Bed Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacapa/Santa Rosa/Santa Cruz Residence Halls</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel/San Nicolas Residence Halls</td>
<td>814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita Village</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael Residence Hall</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Catalina</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Apartments</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Apartments</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente Apartments</td>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Apartments</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Family Apartments</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke Family Housing</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre Family Housing *</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Faculty Housing**</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Point Faculty Housing</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>6,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 LRDP EIR
* Permitted, awaiting construction
** 22 units are occupied and 37 units are under construction

2.4 1990 and 2010 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

2.4.1 2010 Long Range Development Plan

The 2010 LRDP proposes a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the UCSB campus through 2025 to accommodate an on-campus enrollment of up to a three-quarter average of 25,000 full-time equivalent students, and a total of approximately 6,400 faculty and staff. When the 2010 LRDP was prepared, the three-quarter average student headcount at UCSB was approximately 20,000 and there were approximately 4,700 faculty and staff. Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would result in an enrollment increase of 5,000 students over a 15-year period and an increase of approximately 1,700 faculty and staff.

The 2010 LRDP identifies the proposed project as the “Santa Catalina Addition” and applied a “Housing” land use designation to the project site. The 2010 LRDP estimated that 168 units/600 bed spaces would be provided in new structures to be located near the southeast, southwest and northeast corners of the project site, and that the new building heights would range between 40 and 60 feet. In addition to the new residential units, the 2010 LRDP indicates that up to 12,000 gross square feet on non-residential space could be provided on the site. The 2010 LRDP also depicts a new roadway and bicycle path on the project site, extending eastward...
from Storke Road to the eastern portion of the site, then turning southward to intersect with El Colegio Road. The proposed road and path would align with Camino Corto, which is a north-south street in the Isla Vista Community south of the project site. The project design assumptions described above for the project site were evaluated by the 2010 LRDP EIR.

It is an objective of the 2010 LRDP to provide on-campus housing for 100 percent of the proposed student enrollment growth, and to provide additional housing units for faculty and staff. A mitigation measure was identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR that requires UCSB to work toward achieving specified housing development goals commensurate with enrollment increases.

A summary of the additional on-campus development proposed by the 2010 LRDP is provided on Table 2.3-2. A summary of housing projects proposed by the 2010 LRDP is provided on Table 2.3-3, and the locations of proposed housing projects are depicted on Figure 2.3-2. The 2010 LRDP proposes to provide 5,448 new bed spaces (a net increase of 4,766 bed spaces) for single students, a total of 239 units for student families, and a total of 1,874 faculty and staff housing units.

The 2010 LRDP must still be certified by the California Coastal Commission, and after it is certified, the LRDP will also serve as the UCSB Local Coastal Plan. Prior to certifying the 2010 LRDP, the Coastal Commission must determine that it is consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act.
Table 2.3-2
Proposed 2010 Long Range Development Plan
Development Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current (2008)</th>
<th>2010 LRDP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(three-quarter average</td>
<td>20,000 students</td>
<td>5,000 additional students at a rate of 1% per year</td>
<td>25,000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,054 faculty</td>
<td>336 additional faculty</td>
<td>1,400 faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,631 staff</td>
<td>1,400 additional staff</td>
<td>5,031 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction, Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Support Space (ASF)</td>
<td>Approximately 2.7 million assignable square feet</td>
<td>Approximately 1.8 million assignable square feet</td>
<td>4.5 million assignable square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction, Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Support Space (GSF)</td>
<td>Approximately 3.8 million gross square feet</td>
<td>Approximately 2.5 million gross square feet</td>
<td>6.3 million gross square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student, Faculty and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Housing Units</td>
<td>6,652 bed spaces</td>
<td>4,766 additional bed spaces</td>
<td>11,418 single student bed spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>553 student units</td>
<td>239 additional student family units</td>
<td>943 student family units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151 student units (pending)</td>
<td>1,874 additional faculty and staff housing units</td>
<td>2,100 faculty and staff housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 faculty units</td>
<td>161 faculty units (pending) (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161 faculty units (pending) (a)</td>
<td>1,874 additional faculty and staff housing units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic/Recreational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>Approximately 26 acres of recreational field</td>
<td>5 additional acres of recreational fields</td>
<td>31 acres of recreational fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td>6,700 spaces constructed or planned (Non-housing)</td>
<td>Replace 5,100 spaces</td>
<td>Approximately 14,230 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,880 constructed or planned (Housing)</td>
<td>Construct 3,650 additional spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Inventory: 10,580 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 LRDP Final EIR, 2010

(a) The 161 pending faculty units are associated with the North Campus Faculty Housing project. 22 of the units are now occupied, and 37 of the units are now under construction. The 151 pending student units are associated with the Sierra Madre Apartments project and will be under construction in the late summer or fall of 2013.
### Table 2.3-3
**Summary of On-Campus Housing Proposed by the 2010 LRDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed Removed</th>
<th>Proposed New</th>
<th>Net New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housed</td>
<td>Housed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>(342)</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Mesa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units Total</strong></td>
<td>592</td>
<td>(592)</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BedSpaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacapa/Santa Rosa</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>2,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa/Santa Cruz Residence Halls</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel/San Nicolas Residence Halls</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Catalina</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>(682)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bed Spaces Total</strong></td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>(682)</td>
<td>5,448</td>
<td>4,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 LRDP Final EIR, Table 3.0-9

### 2.4.2 1990 Long Range Development Plan

Until the 2010 LRDP is certified, development projects at UCSB that require a Notice of Impending Development from the Coastal Commission must also be found to be consistent with the requirements of the previously adopted 1990 LRDP. The 1990 LRDP does not address the proposed project site, as the Santa Catalina property was obtained by the University in 2003 and was not added to the 1990 LRDP. The 1990 LRDP indicates that “the role of the Storke Campus is to support the academic, recreational, housing and parking needs of the Main Campus.”

### 2.5 CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT

A list of reasonably foreseeable cumulative development projects on the UCSB campus is provided on Table 2.5-1. Information sources used to compile the cumulative development list was provided by the University’s *2010-2020 Consolidated State and Non-State Capital Financial Plan*. State capital projects are funded annually without guarantee or commitment to future funding; some listed projects are unfunded and not approved. Project locations, building sizes, and project schedules are subject to change.

---

*University of California, Santa Barbara*
Table 2.5-1
UC Santa Barbara Cumulative Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Project</th>
<th>Description/Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Faculty Housing</td>
<td>161 faculty housing units adjacent to Phelps Road north of Ocean Meadows Golf Course.</td>
<td>22 units in Phase I are complete and 37 units are under construction. Coastal Commission approval of project in November 2006; EIR, SCH#2003071178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre Housing</td>
<td>151 student, faculty, and staff housing units located along Storke Road.</td>
<td>Awaiting construction. Coastal Commission approval in November 2006; EIR, SCH#2003071178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson Library Addition</td>
<td>Three-story addition to Davidson Library including study space, office, storage, etc. 40,884 ASF</td>
<td>Awaiting construction. Coastal Commission approval in December 2010; MND adopted February 2009, SCH#2008011080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus Infrastructure Improvement Project</td>
<td>Planned throughout the Main Campus, the project is proposed to correct critical infrastructure deficiencies. The project will address storm drainage, sanitary sewer, potable and reclaimed water and natural gas pipelines.</td>
<td>MND adopted November 2007, SCH#2007101108. Phase 1 approved by the Coastal Commission December 2009. Phase 1a has been completed. Phase 1b awaiting funding and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon Road and Ocean Road Drainage Project</td>
<td>This project would address existing storm water drainage deficiencies along the eastern and western perimeters of the Main Campus, and would eliminate five bluff-top storm drain outfalls that discharge to the Pacific Ocean. The proposed drainage system would convey storm water to the Campus Lagoon.</td>
<td>Planning stages, 0 ASF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering Building</td>
<td>Three-story research building including a vivarium facility in the basement.</td>
<td>Awaiting construction. MND adopted June, 2010, SCH #2010051047. Approved by the Coastal Commission October 2011. 48,690 ASF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Club Expansion</td>
<td>The Faculty Club is located between Parking Lot 23 and the Campus Lagoon. The project would renovate existing facilities and provide a total of 30 new guest rooms, for a total of 34 rooms on the project site.</td>
<td>MND Circulated for public review January 2013. 2013 SCH#2013011036. Awaiting adoption and submittal to the Coastal Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Science Education Building</td>
<td>Located on Lagoon Road south of the Marine Science Research Building. This two-story building to house the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary offices and educational facilities associated with the campus’ Outreach Center for Teaching Ocean Science. 9,730 ASF</td>
<td>Under construction. EA/MND adopted September 2008, SCH#20080771128. Approved by Coastal Commission October 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.5-1
**UC Santa Barbara Cumulative Development Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Road Housing</td>
<td>543 housing units with 407 units located west of Ocean Road, which would be realigned, and 136 units to be included as part of two parking structures on the east side of Ocean Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics Residence Project</td>
<td>This project would provide 41 residential units that would be used by visiting scholars participating in KITP functions. The project site is located on the Storke Campus, west of and adjacent to the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Complex</td>
<td>New athletic pool and tennis courts. Located near Rob Gym.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Water Loop</td>
<td>Underground infrastructure Under construction, Exempted by the Coastal Commission June, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>Laboratory, research offices and support space for energy-related research. Approximately 30,000 ASF. Planning stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NOTE: ASF = Assignable Square Footage.

### 2.6 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Areas to the south of the San Joaquin Apartments project site are located in the community of Isla Vista, which is an unincorporated portion of Santa Barbara County. The Goleta Community Plan has applied an “Educational Facility” land use designation to the Isla Vista Elementary School site, and an “Existing Public or Private Park/Recreation and/or Open Space” land use designation to the Camino Corto Open Space and the Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve properties. Most other parcels in Isla Vista adjacent to El Colegio Road have a residential land use designation of 20 units/acre.

The Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors approved the Isla Vista Master Plan in 2007. The Master Plan supplemants the Goleta Community Plan and proposes to rezone land in the community of Isla Vista to provide for the potential development of 1,447 additional multi-family housing units and approximately 40,000 square feet of new commercial uses. The Master Plan also includes objectives to enhance the interface between Isla Vista and UCSB. New development design principles for the Storke Campus suggested by the Plan include items such as:

- Provide housing that faces the street
- Street extensions should appear to be an extension of the Isla Vista street grid
• Provide building footprints similar to typical buildings in Isla Vista
• Provide well-articulated building facades, and
• Provide a variety of building types to promote the feeling of “town” on the Storke Campus.

2.7 CITY OF GOLETA LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan provides programs and policies to guide the future growth and development of the City through 2030. The City’s Land Use Plan map indicates that the Storke Ranch project, which is north of and adjacent to the project site, has a land use designation of “Planned Residential – 12.3 units/acre.”
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3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section describes the characteristics of San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvement Project (the “project” or “San Joaquin Apartments project”).

3.1 PROJECT COMPONENTS

San Joaquin Apartments project consists of four major components.

Proposed Residences. The proposed project would provide 1,000 bed spaces for undergraduate students, 13 residential units for resident assistants, and 11 residential units that would be occupied by resident directors, UCSB faculty and visitors. The bed spaces and residential units would be provided in 17 new buildings that would be developed on the 13-acre project site. The project site has been previously developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall, which will continue to be occupied.

Accessory Uses. The proposed project would provide a variety of accessory uses to meet the needs of the student residents, including uses such as: a new dining commons, café and convenience store; recreation rooms and study lounges; and laundry, mail and vending facilities. Outdoor accessory uses would include recreation facilities such as a multi-purpose turf area, volleyball and basketball courts; dining areas; and bicycle parking and a bicycle repair facility.

Parking. Approximately 700 parking spaces are currently provided on the project site to serve the Santa Catalina residence hall, although less than half of the existing spaces are typically occupied. The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the removal of the existing on-site parking spaces. Parking for the Santa Catalina residence hall and the San Joaquin Apartments project would be provided at two locations: Parking Lot No. 50, which was constructed to serve the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing facility and is located on the northwest corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road; and a new/reconfigured parking lot to be located adjacent to the project site on the west side of Storke Road.

LRDP Revisions. The UCSB 2010 LRDP was adopted by the Regents in September 2010 and supersedes the land use and policy requirements of the 1990 LRDP. The San Joaquin project would provide 400 more bed spaces and 23 more residential units on the project site than was estimated by the 2010 LRDP. UCSB will request that the Regents approve a revision to the 2010 LRDP that would transfer 400 bed spaces and 23 units to the San Joaquin project site from other planned on-campus housing development sites identified by the 2010 LRDP. The San Joaquin Project-Specific EIR will evaluate the impacts of the proposed project, including impacts that have the potential to result from the transfer of additional bed spaces and units to the project site.

UCSB has requested that the California Coastal Commission amend the 1990 LRDP to reflect the land use and policy requirements of the 2010 LRDP. Amendments to the 1990 LRDP
being considered by the Coastal Commission also include a request to transfer 400 bed spaces and 23 units to the San Joaquin project site from other planned on-campus housing development sites identified by the 2010 LRDP. If the requested amendments to the 1990 LRDP have not been approved by the Coastal Commission prior to their action on the San Joaquin project, UCSB may request that the Coastal Commission consider a separate amendment to the 1990 LRDP that would add the San Joaquin project to the existing 1990 LRDP.

3.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The San Joaquin Apartments project site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of El Colegio Road and Storke Road. A new parking lot that would serve the San Joaquin Apartments project and the Santa Catalina residence hall would be located adjacent to the project site on the west side of Storke Road. Parking for the residents of the project site would also be provided in an existing parking structure located on the northwest corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road. The locations of the proposed San Joaquin Apartments project and the proposed parking areas are depicted on Figure 1.1-2.

3.3 PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN

3.3.1 Residential Facilities

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide a total of 1,000 bed spaces for undergraduate students and 24 residential units for resident assistants, resident directors, UCSB faculty and visitors to the UCSB Campus. The proposed bed spaces and residential units would be provided in 17 new buildings that would be located throughout the project site.

Proposed Buildings. The proposed buildings would be located in one of three “zones” on the project site. Each zone is described below and depicted on Figures 3.3-1, 2 and 3.

North Village. The North Village would extend across the entire northern portion of the project site and would occupy an area that is predominately developed as a paved parking lot. Residential units would be provided in 14 mostly two- and three-story buildings that would be constructed in a variety of configurations and generally grouped around landscaped courtyards. The buildings in the North Village would generally be 25-35 feet in height, although architectural features associated with some structures would be taller.

Storke Gateway. The Storke Gateway would be located on the western portion of the project site, west of the existing Santa Catalina residence hall towers, north of and adjacent to El Colegio Road, and east of and adjacent to Storke Road. This portion of the project site is currently developed with a paved parking lot. Two (2) six-story buildings would be developed in the Storke Gateway zone. The northern building would provide five (5) floors of residential units built over a one-story “podium.” The podium floor space would be used to provide a convenience store and a café. The store would carry items commonly used by project residents, although both the store and café would be available for use by the public. The southern building
in the Storke Gateway zone would provide six (6) floors of residential units. Both the northern and southern buildings would be approximately 75 feet in height.

**Portola Dining Commons.** The Portola Dining Commons building would occupy the southeastern corner of the project site, north of and adjacent to El Colegio Road. This portion of the project site is predominately occupied by a mowed turf area and a paved bicycle parking area. The building would include three (3) floors of residential units built over a one-story podium that would provide floor space for the new dining commons. The maximum height of the Dining Commons building would vary between approximately 50 and 68 feet due to grade changes around the building. The dining facility would be used primarily by occupants of the Santa Catalina residence hall, but would also be available to residents of the San Joaquin Apartments project. A loading dock facility would be located at the northeast corner of the building.

**Proposed Residences.** The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide 1,000 bed spaces in 167 units. Each unit would typically be occupied by six persons and would consist of three bedrooms, a living room and dining area, a kitchen and two bathrooms. Each unit would be approximately 1,140 square feet in size. The project would also provide 24 residential units that would be occupied by resident assistants, resident directors, UCSB faculty and visitors to the UCSB campus. Apartments for resident assistants (13) and visitors (3) would be approximately 500 square feet each and would be provided in a studio or one-bedroom/one bath configuration. Apartments for resident directors (4) would be approximately 1,140 square feet and provided in a one to three bedroom/1.5 bath configuration. Apartments for faculty would be approximately 1,140 square feet and would be provided in a three-bedroom/two bath configuration.

Additional floor area would be provided in each of the proposed residential building for infrastructure purposes, such as mechanical, electrical and plumbing equipment; and area to temporarily store recyclable and waste materials. Outdoor service areas provided for each building would also include areas for the storage of recyclables and waste material.

### 3.3.2 Accessory Uses

**Student Activity and Support Uses.** A variety of student support uses would be provided by the proposed project. These types of uses include study lounges and recreation rooms; laundry rooms; vending areas; mail facilities; a maintenance shop and custodial supply rooms.

**Food Service Facilities.** The proposed project includes the decommissioning of the existing Santa Catalina residence hall dining commons and providing upgraded food service facilities. Several food service options would be provided on the project site.

**Dining Commons.** The new facility would provide a variety of food service options along with associated preparation and support space. The new dining commons would provide approximately 24,000 square feet of floor area, which also includes facilities such as offices,
work stations, locker rooms and restrooms. The new dining commons would also include a
3,600 square foot outdoor dining area, a loading dock at the northeast corner of the building, and
a covered area for the temporary storage of recyclables and solid waste.

Café. The podium space provided by the northern Storke Gateway building would be
used to provide a new café. The café would occupy approximately 4,500 square feet and would
also provide a small (approximately 400 square foot) outdoor dining area. Other outdoor
facilities would include a covered area for the temporary storage of recyclables and waste
material.

Convenience Store. The podium space provided by the northern Storke Gateway
building would provide a new convenience store. The store would sell items such as coffee,
fresh produce, ready-to-eat food and dry goods, and would have approximately 6,500 square feet
of floor area.

Recreation Facilities. In addition to the indoor recreation rooms that would be provided
within proposed residential buildings, the project would provide a variety of outdoor recreation
facilities. The existing swimming pool located on the project site would be retained, and three
volleyball courts and two basketball courts would be located east of the northern Santa Catalina
residential hall tower. A new multi-purpose turf area would also be provided to the west of the
Santa Catalina building in an area currently occupied by two tennis courts, which would be
removed. An existing volleyball court located near the northeast corner of the project site would
also be removed.

3.3.4 Circulation and Transportation

Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths. Pedestrian and bicycle pathways would be provided
throughout the project site, and the pathway system would also provide emergency vehicle
access to each of the existing and proposed buildings. A primary circulation/access path would
be located along the northern and eastern perimeters of the project site and would connect to the
existing pedestrian/bicycle paths that extend to the Main Campus and that also connect to a
regional bike path system. The proposed internal bicycle and pedestrian circulation system is
depicted on Figure 3.3-1.

The project would also provide new off-site pedestrian/bike paths that would connect to
the existing pedestrian/bike path that extends between the project site and the Main Campus.
The new paths would be located on the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site.
No lighting would be provided along the pathway, and restoration activities would be conducted
in wetland, buffer area and upland habitat areas to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitat that may
result from the construction of the pathways. Restoration activities would be conducted at
appropriate mitigation ratios to minimize project-related impacts to sensitive habitats, and could
include actions such as removing non-native vegetation (e.g., pampas grass) and providing other
habitat enhancements. The location of the proposed pathways is depicted on Figure 3.3-1.
Transportation Shuttle. The project would include a shuttle bus system that would provide transportation for residents between the project site and the Main Campus, as well as other major destinations in the project vicinity. Shuttle stops would include three locations on the project site (one in each project zone); Parking Lot No. 50 near the entrance to the Main Campus; and the Main Campus bus loop, which is located near the center of the Main Campus. Shuttle service would also be provided to the Camino Real Marketplace, which is located approximately 0.75 of a mile north of the project site and provides movie theaters, restaurants and shopping.

3.3.4 Parking Facilities

Vehicle and bicycle parking facilities that would be provided for both the Santa Catalina residence hall and the San Joaquin Apartments project are described below.

Vehicle Parking. Vehicle parking to serve the Santa Catalina residence hall and San Joaquin Apartments project would be provided in two locations.

Proposed Parking Lot. A new parking lot would be provided on the west side of Storke Road adjacent to the San Joaquin Apartments project site. The parking lot site is approximately 1.5 acres in size and would provide 207 parking spaces. An existing parking lot used by residents of the UCSB West Campus Family Apartments is located south of and adjacent to the proposed parking lot. The existing parking lot would be restriped to provide 17 additional parking spaces. In total, 224 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in the proposed parking area located west of and adjacent to the project site. The location and design of the proposed parking lot is depicted on Figure 3.3-4.

Vehicle access driveways to the proposed parking lot would be provided at the northern and southern ends of the parking lot. Landscaping would be provided around the perimeter of the parking lot, and low-intensity security lighting would also be provided. All lighting fixtures would be directed and shielded to minimize lighting of adjacent areas.

Parking Lot No. 50. Parking Lot No. 50 is a five-level structure that was developed to serve the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing facility. The structure provides 785 parking spaces and is located at the northwest corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road, approximately 3,750 feet (0.7 of a mile) east of the San Joaquin Apartments project site. The parking structure has been under-utilized since it opened in 2008, as typically about 50 percent of the provided parking spaces are occupied.

Bicycle Parking. The existing bicycle parking area located near the southeast corner of the project site would be removed to facilitate the development of the proposed structure in the project’s eastern zone. A approximately 2,576 new bicycle parking spaces would be distributed throughout the project site to serve the Santa Catalina residence hall and the residents of the San Joaquin Apartments project. The location of proposed bicycle parking areas is depicted on Figure 3.3-1.
3.3.5 Landscaping

Landscaping would be provided throughout the project site and would emphasize the use of native and Mediterranean drought-tolerant species. Major landscape elements provided on the project site would include:

- A turf area that would facilitate a variety of active and passive recreation uses.
- Courtyard areas adjacent to proposed and existing buildings.
- A plaza area adjacent to Storke Road.
- Trees and shrubs along proposed pathways and between buildings.
- Trees and shrubs provided within and around bicycle parking areas.
- Trees and other landscaping adjacent to the intersection of El Colegio Road and Storke Road, and along the southern project site perimeter adjacent to El Colegio Road.

3.3.6 Sustainable Design Features

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide a variety of sustainable design features to reduce the project’s energy use and associated direct and indirect air emissions. The proposed project would also support University sustainability goals by seeking a LEED\(^1\) “Gold” Certification. In accordance with the UC Sustainable Practice policies, it would be the goal of the proposed building’s design to outperform the energy-efficiency standards of California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6, which is also known as the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, by at least 20 percent. Energy efficient design features would include the use of various passive heating, cooling, ventilation and lighting mechanisms.

The project would also comply with California Green Building Standards Code (Part 11 of Title 24, the California Building Standards Code). The purpose of the Green Building Standards Code is to improve public health, safety and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices. Provisions of the Green Building Standards Code apply to buildings designed and constructed by the University of California. The project would implement a variety of measures to comply with building standards for residential and non-residential occupancies, including water and energy conservation measures such as: achieving a twenty percent reduction in potable water use in plumbing fixtures; use of weather- or soil moisture-based irrigation controllers; providing indoor

---

\(^{1}\) The Leadership for Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating program was developed by the U.S. Green Building Council, the Congress for the New Urbanism, and the Natural Resources Defense Council, and integrates the principles of smart growth, new urbanism and green building practices. Projects are evaluated using the LEED rating system by determining that the development meets certain prerequisite criteria, and then by assigning “credits” prescribed for the various evaluation criteria. Based on the point total earned, development projects may be “certified” or awarded silver, gold or platinum ratings.
and outdoor water meters; and achieving energy efficiency standards that exceed Title 24 requirements by twenty percent.

3.3.7 Staffing

Staffing positions at the San Joaquin Apartments project would include resident directors, assistant resident directors, and resident assistants. Residential units for these positions would be provided on the project site. Staff for the proposed dining commons would be similar to the number of staff employed at the existing Santa Catalina dining commons. It is expected that a limited number of additional full-time employees would be required to manage the proposed café and convenience store. Other employees at these facilities would likely be part-time positions filled primarily by existing UCSB students.

3.3.8 Utilities

Utility services for the San Joaquin Apartments project are provided on or adjacent to the project site. Utility requirements for the project are described below.

Potable Water. Potable water service in the project area is provided by the Goleta Water District. Existing service lines are located along El Colegio Road and Storke Road.

Reclaimed Water. Reclaimed water that is used by UCSB and others in the project area is produced by the Goleta Sanitary District and distributed by the Goleta Water District. Existing service lines are located along El Colegio Road and Storke Road.

Stormwater Drainage. Stormwater from the San Joaquin Apartments project site currently flows to the east and north and is directed to the Storke Wetlands, which are hydrologically connected to the Goleta Slough. Runoff from the project site would continue to be directed to the Storke wetlands. A variety of measures would be incorporated into the project’s design to manage and treat stormwater runoff before discharge from the project site, including: directing stormwater from driveways and parking areas to bio-filtration planters, bioswales or vegetated buffers; the use of pervious pavers, permeable paving systems or pervious paving material in selected locations; providing bioretention terraces in northeast corner of the project site; and directing runoff to vegetated areas provided throughout the project site.

Runoff from the area on the west side of Storke Road that would be used to develop the proposed parking lot drains northward to an earthen swale along the west side of Storke Road. Storm water from the proposed parking lot would continue to be directed to the existing storm drain system to the east. Stormwater filtration planters and bioswales would be provided throughout and adjacent to the parking lot to treat stormwater prior to off-site discharge.

Wastewater. The project site is located in the Goleta West Sanitary District service area. Wastewater collected by the District is sent to the Goleta Sanitary District’s wastewater
treatment plant. Wastewater from the project site would be collected by an existing pipeline that extends eastward from the project site.

**Natural Gas.** Natural gas service for the project site is currently provided by a service line located along El Colegio Road.

**Electricity.** Electrical service to the project site is provided by existing lines located along Storke Road. Emergency back-up power would be provided by two diesel-powered generators that would be installed on the project site.

### 3.4 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS

Development of the San Joaquin Apartments project would require the demolition of existing paved parking areas, two tennis courts, and other minor site improvements on the project site. The project site is mostly level, therefore, grading would generally be required primarily for the preparation of foundations for the proposed buildings.

It is anticipated that construction of the project would begin in fall 2014, and the new residences would be ready for occupancy for the Fall quarter of 2016. The Santa Catalina residence hall would continue to be occupied during the construction of the proposed project. Staging and construction worker parking for the proposed project would occur on the project site.

Prior to the start of construction activities a Notice of Intent to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit would be filed with the State Water Resources Control Board. All project-related construction activities would occur in accordance with the requirements of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that has been reviewed by the UCSB Environmental Health and Safety office and filed with the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Throughout the duration of the construction project, appropriate traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety control measures would be implemented, including the use of temporary fencing around construction sites and storage areas, barriers, signage, flag persons, traffic control and detours.

### 3.5 EXISTING DINING COMMONS RELEASE SPACE

The existing dining commons facility at the Santa Catalina residence hall is located in the podium space between the two residential building towers and provides approximately 30,000 square feet of floor area. The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the decommissioning of the existing dining commons facility. The proposed project does not include the renovation or establishment of new uses in the vacated dining commons space as no project-related budget funds are available to renovate the released space. If and when funds become available, it is anticipated that possible future uses for the released space could include student service-related functions intended primarily for the use of residents of the Santa Catalina residence hall and the San Joaquin Apartments. Types of uses that may be considered in the
future could include a new fitness facility (e.g., gym equipment and related activities), meeting and study rooms, and perhaps a small movie theater.

3.6 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVISIONS

3.6.1 2010 Long Range Development Plan

The 2010 LRDP applied a “Housing” land use designation to the San Joaquin Apartments project site and estimated that the site could be used for the development of 168 housing units for 600 students. The proposed project would provide 167 units/1,000 bed spaces for students. To accommodate the proposed project, 400 bed spaces would be transferred from other planned on-campus housing development sites identified by the 2010 LRDP. Bed spaces would be transferred from the proposed expansion of the Santa Rosa, Anacapa and Santa Cruz dormitory complex located on the eastern portion of the Main Campus. The proposed bed space transfer would reduce the planned number of student bed spaces in the dormitory area from 2,544 to 2,144.

The proposed project also includes 24 additional residential units that would be occupied by staff, faculty and visitors. Overall, the proposed project would provide 191 units (167 student units plus 24 for staff, faculty and visitors), which is 23 more units on the project site than the 168 units currently identified by the 2010 LRDP. The additional 23 residential units proposed for the San Joaquin Apartments project would be transferred from the West Campus Family Apartments site, which was identified by the 2010 LRDP as a future site for 481 residential units. The proposed transfer would reduce the planned number of units at the West Campus Apartments site to 458. With the proposed amendment to the 2010 LRDP, San Joaquin Apartments project would not increase the total number of future residential units on the UCSB campus above the number of units identified by the 2010 LRDP.

The 2010 LRDP applied a “Housing” land use designation to the proposed parking lot site on the west side of Storke Road. Parking lots for housing resident use is an allowed use under the “Housing” land use designation. Therefore, this portion of the proposed project would be consistent with the land use requirements of the 2010 LRDP.

3.6.2 1990 Long Range Development Plan

The 2010 LRDP has not been certified by the California Coastal Commission. Until the 2010 LRDP is certified, development projects at UCSB that require a Notice of Impending Development from the Coastal Commission must also be found to be consistent with the requirements of the previously adopted 1990 LRDP. The 1990 LRDP does not include the San Joaquin Apartments project site because UCSB did not own the property in 1990. UCSB has requested that the Coastal Commission amend the 1990 LRDP to reflect the land use and policy requirements of the 2010 LRDP. If the Coastal Commission has not approved the requested amendment to the 1990 LRDP before their action on the San Joaquin project, UCSB may request that the Coastal Commission consider a separate amendment to the 1990 LRDP to add the San
Joaquin project to the existing 1990 LRDP and to apply a “Student Housing” land use designation the site.

The 1990 LRDP applied a “Student Housing” land use designation to the proposed parking lot site on the west side of Storke Road. Parking lots for student housing residents is a use allowed by the “Student Housing” land use designation. Therefore an amendment to the 1990 LRDP is not required for the proposed parking lot.

3.7 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Major objectives of the San Joaquin Apartment project include the following:

1. Implement provisions of the 2010 LRDP indicating that UCSB will provide on-campus housing to accommodate planned student enrollment growth.

2. Provide on-site services required for student residents and provide amenities that enhance learning and social interaction.

3. Provide housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses and minimizes environmental impacts to resources on and adjacent to the project site.

4. Provide a project design that implements the University’s sustainability goals.

5. Provide parking adequate to accommodate the proposed project’s demand.
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4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

Descriptions of project-specific and cumulative impacts that have the potential to be significant, or that have been determined to be less than significant, are provided in the narrative of Section 6.0 of this Initial Study.

If this Initial Study’s evaluation of potential environmental impacts concludes that the San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in an impact regarding a specific environmental issue area, that issue area is denoted with an “NI” (no impact) on the list of issue areas provided below. For environmental issue areas denoted by an “LS,” it was determined by this Initial Study that the proposed project’s impacts would be less than significant, and that no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required. Environmental issue areas denoted with an “M” would have impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures identified by this Initial Study. The identified mitigation measures include measures provided by the 2010 LRDP Final EIR and measures developed specifically for the San Joaquin Apartments project. Environmental issue areas denoted with an “S” could have potentially significant impacts that should be evaluated further by an EIR prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI  No impact  
LS  Less than significant impact  
M  Less than significant with the implementation of proposed mitigation  
S  Potentially significant impact
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

☐ I find that the proposed project WOULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, the project impacts were adequately addressed in an earlier document or there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made that will avoid or reduce any potential significant effects to a less than significant level. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT will be prepared.

[Signature]
[Printed Name]

Date

[Signature]
[Printed Name]

University of California, Santa Barbara

University of California, Santa Barbara
6.0. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The University has defined the column headings in the Initial Study checklist as follows:

A) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that the project’s effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impacts” a Project EIR will be prepared.

B) “Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR” applies where the potential impacts of the proposed project were adequately addressed in the LRDP EIR and mitigation measures identified in the LRDP EIR will mitigate any impacts of the proposed project to the extent feasible. All applicable LRDP EIR mitigation measures are incorporated into the project as proposed. The impact analysis in this document summarizes and cross references (including section/page numbers) the relevant analysis in the LRDP EIR.

C) “Less Than Significant With Project-level Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of project specific mitigation measures will reduce an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” All project-level mitigation measures must be described, including a brief explanation of how the measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

D) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project will not result in any significant effects. The effects may or may not have been discussed in the LRDP Program EIR. The project impact is less than significant without the incorporation of LRDP or Project-level mitigation.

E) “No Impact” applies where a project would not result in any impact in the category or the category does not apply. “No Impact” answers need to be adequately supported by the information sources cited, which show that the impact does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).
6.1 AESTHETICS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.1 Setting

**Project Site Conditions.** The project site is predominately developed with student housing and associated support facilities. The student residences are provided by the Santa Catalina residence hall, which includes the 11-story North Tower and the 10-story South Tower. The tower structures are the dominant visual feature on the project site and can be seen from many locations throughout the project area. Other major development features that contribute to the project site’s visual character include the two-story “podium” building located between the north and south towers; a large bicycle parking area near the southeast corner of the site adjacent to El Colegio Road; a large paved parking area on the northern half of the project site; and smaller parking area located in the southwest corner of the site. A turf area approximately two acres in area is located along the eastern edge of the project site. Landscaping is dispersed throughout the project site and generally consists of small landscape shrubs and ground covers, and small- to moderately-sized landscape trees.
Locations near the project site that are generally accessible to the public and provide the most prominent views of the project site are located along El Colegio Road and Storke Road. Other nearby public locations that provide views of the project site include the parking lot for Isla Vista Elementary School; Camino Corto, which is a north-south street in Isla Vista; and streets in the Storke Ranch residential community that are adjacent to the project site, such as Sweet Rain Place and Poppyfield Place.

**Surrounding Area Conditions.** The visual character of the area near the project site is generally defined by views of major roadways, residential buildings, the Isla Vista Elementary School, and views of open space areas. Residential development along El Colegio Road predominately consists of two- and some three-story buildings located adjacent to the street, such as apartment buildings in Isla Vista and the San Clemente Graduate Student Housing facility on the Storke Campus. The Isla Vista Elementary School provides a cluster of single-story buildings located directly south of the project site. Development adjacent to Storke Road near the project site includes the Storke Ranch residential community, which is north of and adjacent to the project site; and the UCSB West Campus Family Apartments. Development in the Storke Ranch community consists of a mix of two-story detached and attached residences. Residences in the Storke Ranch community located adjacent to the project site are six-unit, two-story structures. The West Campus Family Apartments consist of two-story buildings setback from Storke Road by approximately 230 feet. A playground, mowed turf area and parking lot used by residents of the West Campus apartments are also provided adjacent to Storke Road.

The major open space areas near the project site include the vacant parcel east of and adjacent to the project site, which is located on the UCSB Storke Campus; and the Camino Corto Open Space and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve, which are both located in the Isla Vista community. The 2010 LRDP proposes to include these and other open areas on and near the UCSB Campus in a proposed “Greensward,” which would provide a series of connected open space areas. The Greensward has been proposed to improve, increase and connect existing open space areas, and to protect habitat and scenic resources.

A smaller open area not associated with the proposed Greensward is the turf area located west of and adjacent to the project site on the west side of Storke Road, between the roadway and the West Campus Family Apartments. This mowed turf area would be used for the development of a parking lot that would serve the San Joaquin Apartments and Santa Catalina residence hall. Another vacant parcel is located on the west side of Storke Road northwest of the proposed project site. That property is the site for the previously approved UCSB Sierra Madre Apartments project. Development of the Sierra Madre project is expected to begin in 2013.

**Scenic Views.** Scenic views from the Storke Campus generally consist of distant views of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the north. Mountain views are provided from El Colegio Road from viewpoints adjacent to the turf area on the eastern edge of the project site, and from viewpoints near the open space parcel located east of and adjacent to the site. Mountain views from viewpoints along El Colegio Road that are south of the central portion of the project site are blocked by the existing residential towers. Limited views of the mountains are provided from
viewpoints along El Colegio Road adjacent to the parking lot on the west side of the project site, however, due to the presence of landscape trees in and adjacent to the parking lot, mountain views are often obscured. Views of the mountains from viewpoints along Storke Road are oriented northward.

Scenic views of open space areas are also provided from viewpoints located throughout the Storke Campus. Numerous public locations in the project area provide views of the Camino Corto Open Space area, the Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve, and the vacant parcel east of and adjacent to the project site.

**Night-time Lighting.** On- and off-campus exterior lighting sources in the project area generally consist of street lights along El Colegio Road, Storke Road, and the adjacent roadways in surrounding residential areas. Other lighting sources include parking lot lighting, interior structure lighting, and low-level safety and security lighting provided around on- and off-campus buildings.

**LRDP Requirements.** The 1990 LRDP does not specifically address development at the proposed project site. In general, however, 1990 LRDP policy 30251.5 and 2010 LRDP policy SCEN-3 require that “new structures on the Campus shall be in general conformance with the scale and character of surrounding development. Clustered developments and innovative designs are encouraged.”

The 2010 LRDP EIR provides two mitigation measures that are specific to development on the Storke Campus. Those measures include:

- **AES-4A:** Prior to the approval of development projects on Storke Campus under the 2010 LRDP, the UC Santa Barbra Design Review Committee shall review project designs for protection of view to the Santa Ynez Mountains from viewpoints along Storke Road, El Colegio Road, Los Carneros, and roadways within Isla Vista that intersect El Colegio Road, and within and through the Storke Campus.

- **AES-4B:** Prior to approval of Storke Campus development projects visible from off-campus areas, the UC Santa Barbara Design Review Committee shall review project designs for:
  * Campus development and design along Ocean Road respecting the adjacent Isla Vista and Storke Ranch
  * Compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods in terms of scale, proportion, appearance, and solar access, as well as maximizing views to the Pacific Ocean.
  * Project development and design on the Storke Campus shall ensure that proposed landscaping does not block view of the mountains or ocean.
6.1.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The Santa Ynez Mountains are located north of the project site and views of the mountains are generally considered to have a high scenic quality. Views of the mountains are currently provided from various viewpoints near the project site that are accessible to the public, such as locations along El Colegio Road, Storke Road, the Isla Vista Elementary School, and Camino Corto. While many of the public viewpoints in the project vicinity currently provide unobstructed views of the mountains, views towards the mountains that are provided from El Colegio Road adjacent to the project site are often blocked or obscured by the existing residential towers and intervening landscaping. The proposed project would not result in any buildings or structures that would interfere with existing mountain views that are provided from El Colegio Road, however, proposed buildings and landscaping would have the potential to block or obscure existing mountain views from other public viewpoints in the project vicinity. A substantial reduction in existing unobstructed mountain views would have the potential to result in a significant impact to the scenic vistas.

b. *Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in new development on two mowed turf areas that contribute to the open space/scenic character of the project area. New residential units would be provided on a portion of the turf area located on the eastern portion of the project site; and a parking lot would be developed on the turf area located west of the housing site, between Storke Road and the West Campus Family Apartments. The conversion of these open areas would result in an incremental reduction in open area provided in the project vicinity, which could contribute to a potentially significant impact to scenic resources.

The project would provide new pedestrian/bike pathways in the open space area located east of and adjacent to the project site. Although the development in the open space area would be minimal, the introduction of development could have a potentially significant impact to scenic resources provided by the open space area. The proposed project would not result in the loss of any open space area associated with the Camino Corto Open Space, the Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve in Isla Vista, or the parcel located east of and adjacent to the project site.

There are no trees located on the project site that substantially contribute to the visual character of the project site or surrounding area. There are no rock outcroppings, historic buildings or state scenic highways located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact on those resources.
c. **Would the project have the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

The proposed housing project site has been extensively developed to provide student housing, including the development of 10- and 11-story structures. However, the mowed turf area on the east side of the project site and the large parking areas on the northern and western portions of the site serve to reduce the overall building density of the site. The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the development of 17 additional building that vary in size and height. Proposed residential buildings in the North Village area would be mostly two- and three stories and could contribute to a substantial change in the project site’s visual character. Some of proposed buildings in the North Village would be located adjacent to Storke Ranch, resulting in potentially significant changes to existing views from locations within that residential area that are generally available to the public (i.e., roadways), as well as private residences. The structures could also result in potentially significant shadow-related impacts to Storke Ranch residences located adjacent to the project site. Structures proposed for the Storke Gateway area would be six stories and located adjacent to Storke Road and El Coegio Road, and the Portola Dining Common building would be four stories and located adjacent to El Colegio Road. Overall, the proposed building development would substantially alter the visual character of the site, which could result in a **potentially significant** aesthetic impact.

The proposed project would result in the development of a new parking lot located on the west side of Storke Road adjacent to the proposed housing site. The proposed parking area could substantially change the visual quality of the site as seen from Storke Road and possibly other nearby viewpoints. Therefore, this project component could result in **potentially significant** aesthetic impacts.

The proposed project would utilize available parking capacity provided in in Parking Lot 50, a five-story structure located at the northeast corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road on the Storke Campus. The project would also facilitate the re-use of floor space currently used as a dining commons in the existing Santa Catalina podium building. Project-related use of the existing parking structure and floor space within the existing podium building would have **no impact** to existing visual or aesthetic conditions.

d. **Would the project have the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Existing exterior lighting at the project site consists primarily of safety and securing lighting. Several types of lighting fixtures are provided in the parking lot that currently serves the Santa Catalina residence hall, including unshielded omnidirectional fixtures, fixtures that direct light downward, and several fixtures that are oriented towards the residences north of the project site. No lighting is provided in the proposed parking lot area on the west side of Storke Road.
It is anticipated that nighttime lighting intensity levels that would be provided by the proposed project would be similar to existing lighting levels provided in on- and off-campus residential areas. However, due to the proximity of proposed structures and the proposed parking lot to residential areas, the project could result in potentially significant lighting-related impacts if a substantial increase in nighttime lighting were to occur.

6.1.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant aesthetic impacts. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The identified impacts include:

1. Obscure existing views of the Santa Ynez Mountains as seen from viewpoints located in the vicinity of the project site that are generally accessible to the public.

2. A reduction in open/undeveloped area on and near the project site.

3. The compatibility of the proposed buildings and proposed parking lot with nearby development, and the potential for adverse changes to existing views from as seen from locations near the project site that are generally accessible to the public, such as El Colegio Road, Storke Road, Storke Ranch and the Isla Vista School.

4. Potential solar access/shadow impacts from proposed to buildings located near the project site, such as residences in Storke Ranch.

5. Increased nighttime lighting.
6.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the CA Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? □ □ □ □ ✓

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? □ □ □ □ ✓

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? □ □ □ □ ✓

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? □ □ □ □ ✓

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? □ □ □ □ ✓
6.2.1 Setting

Section 12220(g) of the Public Resources Code defines “forest land” as “land that can support 10 percent native tree cover for any species, including hardwoods, under natural condition, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Public Resources Code section 4526 defines “timberland” as “land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others.”

Government Code section 51104(g) defines “timberland production zone” as “an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 5112 or 5113 and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses…”

There are no agricultural, forest lands or timberland resources, or timberland production zones on the UCSB Campus or in off-campus areas located in the vicinity of the UCSB Campus.

6.2.2 Checklist Responses

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the CA Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

See response provided below under item “e.”

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

See response provided below under item “e.”

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

See response provided below under item “e.”
d. **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

   See response provided below under item “e.”

e. **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

   There are no commercial agricultural operations or forest resources located on or near the UCSB Campus, and it is not reasonably foreseeable that commercial agricultural operations or forest resources would be established near the project site in the future. Therefore, the San Joaquin Apartments project would have **no impact** on agricultural or forest resources.

### 6.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
## 6.3 AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.1 Setting

**Air Quality Conditions.** Federal and state ambient air quality standards have been established for seven “criteria” pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulates less than 10 microns in diameter (PM$_{10}$), particulates
less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM$_{2.5}$) and lead. California has also adopted standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride and visibility reducing particles.

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that federal and state air quality standards are being met. Santa Barbara County has been designated “unclassifiable/attainment” for the federal eight-hour ozone standard, and does not meet the State eight-hour ozone standard. Santa Barbara County does not meet the state standards for PM$_{10}$ and is “unclassified” for the State PM$_{2.5}$ standard. The County is also classified as “unclassifiable/attainment” for the federal standards for PM$_{2.5}$. The County has also been designated “unclassifiable/attainment” for the federal nitrogen dioxide standard. The South Central Coast air basin is an “attainment” area for other federal and state air quality standards.

Ozone is formed in the atmosphere through a series of chemical reactions involving nitrogen oxides (NO$_x$), reactive organic gases (ROG) and sunlight. Ozone is classified as a “secondary” pollutant because it is not emitted directly into the atmosphere. The major sources of ozone in the County are motor vehicles, the petroleum industry and the use of solvents (paint, consumer products and certain industrial processes). PM$_{10}$ is generated by a variety of sources, including windblown dust, grading, agricultural tilling, road dust and quarries. Vehicle exhaust is a major source of PM$_{2.5}$.

**Air Quality Regulations.** The 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the 1988 California Clean Air Act regulate the emissions of airborne pollutants and have established ambient air quality standards. The United States Environmental Protection Agency administers federal air quality regulations, and the California Air Quality Board (CARB) is the California equivalent. The CARB establishes air quality standards and is responsible for control of mobile emission sources. Local APCDs have jurisdiction over stationary sources and must adopt plans and regulations necessary to demonstrate attainment of federal and state air quality standards. The Santa Barbara County APCD has jurisdiction over air quality attainment in the Santa Barbara portion of the South Central Coast air basin.

**Clean Air Plan.** The 1988 California Clean Air Act requires all air pollution control districts and air quality management districts in the state to adopt and enforce regulations to achieve and maintain air quality that is within the State air quality standards. The Santa Barbara APCD prepared the 1998 Clean Air Plan (CAP) to respond to federal and state requirements, and the Plan was adopted as part of the State Implementation Plan. The 2001 CAP was developed as a comprehensive update to the 1998 CAP and was expected to bring the County into attainment of the State ozone standard through 2015. By 2004 this goal was not achieved, therefore, the 2004 CAP was adopted in December of 2004 and focused primarily on the Clean Air Act requirements. A 2007 CAP was adopted by the Santa Barbara APCD Board on August 16, 2007 and a 2010 CAP was adopted on January 20, 2011. The 2010 CAP provides updated air quality information and baseline inventories, updated future emission estimates, and new chapters related to greenhouse gas, climate protection and land use.
6.3.2 Impact Significance Thresholds

**Long-Term Impacts.** The Santa Barbara APCD and Santa Barbara County have adopted thresholds of significance for evaluating a project’s air quality impacts. Consistent with the air quality impact analysis provided by the 2010 LRDP EIR, the analysis of the San Joaquin Apartments project uses the thresholds adopted by Santa Barbara County (*Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, 2008*). Based on those thresholds, a project will not have a significant project-specific or cumulative air quality impact if operation of the project will:

1. Emit (from all project sources, mobile and stationary) less than the daily trigger for offsets set in the APCD New Source Review Rule for any pollutant (55 lbs/day for ROC and NO\(_x\), and 80 lbs/day for PM\(_{10}\)).
2. Emit less than 25 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NO\(_x\)) or reactive organic compounds (ROC) from motor vehicle trips only.
3. Not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone).
4. Not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board for air toxics.
5. Be consistent with the adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

**Short-Term Impacts.** Pursuant to the County’s impact threshold guidelines, short-term impacts on air quality from construction are less than significant if standard mitigation measures for fugitive dust are implemented. Since Santa Barbara County violates the State standard for PM\(_{10}\), policies of the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan require that all discretionary construction activities implement dust control measures, regardless of the significance of fugitive dust impacts. Dust control measures are also required to minimize the potential for dust-related nuisance impacts. Thresholds for other short-term construction-related emissions have not been established because the emissions from all construction projects that occur within the air basin constitute a minor amount of the total pollution emissions. The APCD, however, recommends that construction-related emissions from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving and other activities be quantified.

6.3.3 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Consistency with the Santa Barbara County CAP means that direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for the CAP’s emissions growth assumptions and the project is consistent with policies adopted in the CAP. The CAP relies primarily on the land use and population projections provided by the Santa Barbara
County Association of Governments (SBCAG). The 2010 CAP used SBCAG’s *Regional Growth Forecast 2005-2040* (2007) to project population growth and associated air pollutant emissions throughout Santa Barbara County. The 2007 *Regional Growth Forecast* did not include population growth on the UCSB campus that would be facilitated by the 2010 LRDP.

The 1990 LRDP established a three quarter average student enrollment of 20,000. The recently adopted 2010 LRDP would increase the UCSB student enrollment approximately one percent per year to 25,000 full time equivalent students by the year 2025. The 2011-2012 UCSB three-quarter average headcount was 20,881 students (http://www.ucsb.edu//IR/PDB/enrollment.html), therefore, the campus has exceeded the 1990 LRDP enrollment projection.

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide new housing units primarily for undergraduate students. Therefore, the project would indirectly facilitate population growth on the UCSB campus that is anticipated by the 2010 LRDP, which also exceeds population levels included in the 1990 LRDP and the 2010 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would conflict with 2010 Clean Air Plan, and based on threshold No. 5 listed above, would result in a **significant impact** to air quality.

b. *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

See response provided below under item “c” regarding project-related emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter.

c. *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

**Short-Term Construction Impacts.** Project-related construction, including the operation of equipment and the excavation of soil, would result in emissions of fugitive dust, PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$, and ozone precursors. Fugitive dust has the potential to result in significant nuisance impacts and Santa Barbara County is a non-attainment area for particulate matter and ozone. Therefore, dust emissions from project-related construction have the potential to result in a **significant impact** to air quality, and the project’s emissions of ozone precursors and other criteria pollutants should be estimated as recommended by the County’s impact significance/evaluation guidelines.

**Long-Term Emissions.** Long-term project-related emissions would result primarily from vehicle trips generated by the project. Other project-related emission sources, such as water heaters and landscaping equipment, would also contribute to long-term emissions. The project would include measures to minimize long-term transportation-related emissions, such as the use of a proposed shuttle service that would transport project residents between the project site, Main Campus and other nearby destinations.
However, due to the number of residential units that would be provided, the project’s vehicle trip emissions would have the potential to exceed the County’s mobile source threshold of significance of 25 lbs per day for nitrogen oxides and reactive organic compounds. Combined mobile and stationary equipment emissions would also have the potential to exceed the 55 lbs/day threshold for ROC and NOx emissions. An assessment of project-related air emissions would be required to determine if the project would result in a significant impact to air quality.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Short-Term Construction Emissions. Construction equipment use on the project site and associated emissions of diesel particulate matter would have the potential to result in a significant impact related to the exposure of people adjacent to the project site to diesel particulate matter. Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, mainly composed of gases, vapors and fine particles. The visible emissions in diesel exhaust are known as particulate matter, and consist of carbon particles (soot) and other gases that become visible as they cool. Diesel exhaust particles carry many of the harmful organic compounds and metals present in the exhaust. Exposures to airborne respirable diesel particulate matter can result in respiratory symptoms such as changes in lung function, and cardiovascular disease. In 1998, California identified diesel particulate matter as a toxic air contaminant based on its potential to cause cancer and other adverse health effects. Further evaluation of the amount and type of construction equipment that would operate on the project site on an annual basis during project construction would be required to determine if the project would exceed annual equipment use/horsepower screening levels identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR.

Long-Term Emissions. The San Joaquin Apartments project would not include industrial or commercial uses or processes that would result in long-term emissions of toxic air contaminants. The project proposes, however, to provide two on-site diesel-powered emergency backup power generators. These emergency generators would be provided in addition to the two existing diesel-powered generators that serve the Santa Catalina residence hall (UCSB, 2010). The proposed generators would be used to provide standby power for uses such as fire pumps, elevators and emergency lighting. One generator would provide back-up power for the North Village and Storke Gateway buildings, and would be provided with an integrated steel fuel storage tank sufficient to generate power for eight hours. The second generator would serve the Portola Dining Commons and would provide power for uses such as the cold room/freezers and partial power for catering and HVAC in the dining area. This generator would be provided with an integrated steel fuel storage tank sufficient for 24 hours of continuous load. The generators would be sited to ensure that exhaust is not vented near fresh air intakes or operable windows. The generator rooms or enclosures would be designed to minimize sound intrusion into occupied areas.

Emergency generators are not used on a regular basis, but are tested periodically, which results in brief periods of diesel particulate matter emissions. The 2010 LRDP Final EIR included a health risk assessment that evaluated future toxic air contaminant emissions
on the UCSB campus, including emissions from emergency generator testing. The analysis was conducted by increasing estimated existing emergency generator testing-related emission commensurate with LRDP proposed building square footage (39 percent) and on-campus population increase (19 percent). The analysis determined that cumulative toxic air contaminant impacts resulting from the buildout of the 2010 LRDP would be less than significant (UCSB, 2010).

Compliance with APCD regulations regarding the installation and use of diesel-powered emergency generators, including compliance with existing Stationary Diesel Airborne Toxic Control Measures, would reduce the potential for project-specific health-related impacts on the project site. Although the generators would be used infrequently, diesel particulate matter emissions could result in potentially significant health-related effects that will be evaluated further by the project EIR.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not include industrial or commercial uses or processes that would have the potential to result in the creation of objectionable odors. The project would include food preparation operations, but similar to other food service operations on the UCSB campus, it is not expected that the on-site food service facilities would result in significant odor impacts. Should nuisance odors be generated by the project, APCD Rule 303 requires the preparation and implementation of an Odor Abatement Plan. Compliance with this existing regulation would require the implementation of process changes or other measures to minimize future odor impacts. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant odor-related impacts.

6.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant air quality impacts. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The identified impacts include:

1. Consistency with the Santa Barbara APCD 2010 Clean Air Plan.

2. Short-term construction-related emissions resulting from project development.


4. Long-term mobile and stationary emissions from the proposed project. This analysis should also include a qualitative evaluation of air quality impacts that could result from potential uses that may be established in the dining commons release space sometime in the future.

5. Evaluate potential health-related impacts that may result from periodic testing of proposed diesel-powered emergency generators provided on the project site.
### 6.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any applicable policies protecting biological resources?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable habitat conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.1 Setting

**Project Site.** The San Joaquin Apartments project would be implemented at the site that has been developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall, and much of the area that would be used for the development of proposed residences is presently a paved parking lot. A variety of ornamental landscaping, consisting mostly of shrubs and small- to moderately-sized trees is provided on the project site. Proposed development areas also include two mowed turf areas, one located on the eastern portion of the project site and another located on the west side of Storke Road, between the roadway and the West Campus Family Apartments.

The 2010 LRDP EIR identifies biological resources, such as common and sensitive habitat areas, located on the UCSB campus. The EIR did not identify any habitat areas on the proposed project site.

**Adjacent Areas.** The 2010 LRDP EIR identified several sensitive habitat areas adjacent to and in the vicinity of the San Joaquin Apartments project site. These areas include open space that contains wetland habitat on the UCSB property east of and adjacent to the project site; open space and sensitive habitat areas south of project site in the Isla Vista community (Del Sol and Camino Corto); and open space and sensitive habitat areas on the UCSB West Campus. Brief descriptions of habitat resources located in the vicinity of the project site are provided below.

**Storke Campus.** The UCSB property east of and adjacent to the project site was identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR as providing several habitat types, including: coastal freshwater marsh, non-native annual grassland and coyote brush scrub. Coastal freshwater marsh is considered to be a sensitive habitat, while non-native grassland and coyote brush scrub are considered to be common habitat types. The freshwater marsh areas east of the project site are designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area by the 2010 LRDP. A subsequent wetland delineation (Rincon, 2011) conducted on the property east of the project site identified areas that meet both Army Corps of Engineers and California Coastal Commission criteria for identifying wetlands. The areas identified by the wetland delineation correspond closely to the freshwater marsh areas identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR. The wetland areas east of the project site identified by the wetland delineation are depicted on Figure 6.4-1.
The open space area east of the project site receives stormwater runoff from the proposed project site and areas in Isla Vista south of El Colegio Road. From the southern end of the project site, surface runoff and runoff from a culvert that discharges from under El Colegio Road collects flows through two swales before discharging into a drainage on the northeast portion of the open space parcel. In the northwestern portion of the open space parcel, water collects in a large depression, which overflows discharging into the drainage in the northeast portion of the property. Water is then discharged to the west Storke Wetlands through a culvert located under a road that provides access to Mesa Road and the Storke Family Apartments. The west Storke Wetlands are located between the Storke Family Apartments and the Santa Ynez Apartments, and are the western extension of the larger Storke Wetlands, which are located along the northern perimeter of the Storke Campus. The Storke Wetlands cover approximately 20 acres, extend in an east-west direction, and are bisected by Los Carneros Road. The Storke Wetlands are hydrologically connected to the Goleta Slough, which is located north of the Storke Campus and Main Campus. The Goleta Slough is a 430-acre area that sustains salt marsh, seasonal freshwater wetlands and upland habitats.

West Campus. The West Campus includes large natural areas associated with the Devereux Slough and the Coal Oil Point Reserve. A variety of sensitive habitat areas are provided on the West Campus, including wetland, riparian and coastal habitats, and these areas support a variety of sensitive plant and animal species. Sensitive habitat areas on the West Campus are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas by the 2010 LRDP. The sensitive habitat areas on the West Campus are located a minimum of approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the San Joaquin Apartment project site.

Habitat areas on the West Campus located near the entrance to the West Campus and near the San Joaquin Apartments project site include small areas of eucalyptus woodland, non-native annual grassland and coyote brush scrub. These are not considered to be sensitive habitat types.

Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve. The Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve is located on the south side of El Colegio Road and south of the project site. This area encompasses 11.8 acres and includes 15 separate vernal pools that are considered sensitive habitat. The Del Sol Open Space is maintained by the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District.

Camino Corto Open Space. The Camino Corto Open Space area is located on the south side of El Colegio Road, southeast of the project site. This area encompasses 24 acres and includes four acres of vernal wetland and one acre of riparian and freshwater wetland. These are considered to be sensitive habitat types. The Camino Corto Open Space is maintained by the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District.

Other areas adjacent to the project site include the developed portions of the Storke Ranch residential community to the north, the West Campus Apartments to the west, and the site for the Sierra Madre Housing project to the northwest. These adjacent areas are either developed or extensively disturbed and do not provide sensitive habitat resources.
LRDP Requirements. The freshwater marsh (wetland) areas east of and adjacent to the project site were identified by the 2010 LRDP as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area. The 2010 LRDP also provides policies to protect wetland areas. For example, policy ERO-16(k) requires that: “new development adjacent to the required 100-foot building setback surrounding the upland limit of an identified wetland shall not result in significant adverse impacts to the wetland due to additional sediment, nutrients, pollutants, and other disturbances.”

6.4.2 Checklist Responses

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Project Site Impacts. The San Joaquin Apartments project site has been developed with residential buildings, paved parking lots and other related structures. Undeveloped portions of the project site include mowed turf areas on the west side of Storke Road that would be used for the development of a new parking lot, and mowed turf area on the east side of the project site that would be used for the development of proposed residences. Due to the predominately developed condition of the project site, no habitat is provided that would support candidate, sensitive or special status plant or animal species.

Landscape trees located on the project site would be removed to facilitate the development of the proposed project. The on-site trees are generally small or moderately-sized, therefore, it is unlikely that the trees would be used for nesting by sensitive raptor species. However, an assessment of the on-site trees is required to determine if any of the trees to be removed are considered to be mature or have biological importance. 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measure BIO-3D requires that removed native mature trees (trees with a trunk diameter of eight or more inches at breast height) be replaced at a ratio of 10:1, and that non-native mature trees be replaced at a ratio of 3:1. The measure also requires that other trees with biological importance be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. It is likely that implementation of this LRDP EIR mitigation measure would minimize long-term impacts resulting from the removal of trees and to sensitive bird species, however, additional evaluation of potentially significant tree removal impacts is required.

The removal of landscape trees during the normal nesting season (February 15 through September 15) would have the potential to result in impacts nesting birds, if present on the project site. Any disturbance of nesting birds would result in a significant impact as the take or disturbance of any active bird nest is prohibited under Fish and Game Code Section 3503, which states: “It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto.” This statute also applies to potential abandonment of active nests
located in trees on the project site that may result from excessive construction noise or other activity. The implementation of 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures BIO-3A, 3B and 3C would reduce to a less than significant level impacts to nesting birds that may be located on or near the project site.

The proposed project would utilize available parking capacity provided in Parking Lot 50, a five-story structure located at the northeast corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road on the Storke Campus. The project would also facilitate the re-use of floor space currently use as a dining commons in the existing Santa Catalina podium building. Project-related use of the existing parking structure and floor space within the existing podium building would have no impact to existing habitat areas.

Adjacent Area Impacts. Most off-site construction required for the proposed project would be for driveway improvements and connections to adjacent utilities. These types of construction activities would occur within the right of way for El Colegio Road and/or Storke Road and would not result in direct impacts to sensitive species.

The potential for the project to result in short-term impacts to sensitive species that may use habitat areas located near the project site would generally be limited to effects such as a construction-related increase in dust, noise or increased sediment in stormwater runoff. Potential construction-related impacts of the project are evaluated below and in response “c” provided below. The proposed project would also have the potential to result in long-term impacts to off-site sensitive species resulting from impacts that could result from the occupancy of the project, such as an increase in nighttime lighting, noise, or human presence. The potential for the project to result in long-term impacts to sensitive species that may use habitat areas located near the project site is evaluated below.

Adjacent Open Space Area. The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that several sensitive animal species have the potential to occur on the Storke Campus, including raptors, such as red-tailed hawk and white-tailed kite that may use grassland areas for foraging; loggerhead shrike, which may use grassland areas for foraging; and tri-colored blackbird, which may be found in freshwater marshes. However, the 2010 LRDP EIR reported that none of these species have been observed in the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site. Based on recent survey data that did not observe sensitive bird species using the open area east of and adjacent to the project site, short-term, construction-related activities on the project site would result in less than significant indirect impacts to sensitive bird species and no mitigation is required.

The San Joaquin Apartments project proposes to provide new off-site pedestrian/bicycle pathways on the open space area to the east of the project site. The long-term effects of the proposed pathways, as well as other project-related noise and lighting impacts to the adjacent open space area may be diminished due to the proximity of existing development (e.g., the Santa Catalina residence hall to the west, the UCSB Santa Ynez apartments to the east, and El Colegio Road and Isla Vista to the south). However, a
project-related increase in human presence and other long-term effects could have the potential to result in project-specific and cumulative impacts if sensitive wildlife uses the adjacent wetlands, buffer areas and upland habitat. Although sensitive animal species are not known to use the adjacent open space area, a potentially significant impact could occur if the proposed pathways were to substantially diminish the value of habitat that could be used by sensitive wildlife species. This potentially significant effect is to be evaluated further by the project EIR.

The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that southern tarplant, a sensitive plant species occurs on the Storke Campus, primarily adjacent to the San Clemente housing project, which is approximately 2,000 feet east of the project site. Southern tarplant has not been observed in the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site (UCSB, 2010). Therefore, the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in less than significant impacts to tar plants. The proposed project could have the potential to result in significant direct (i.e., removal) impacts to other sensitive plant species in the adjacent open area due to the construction of the proposed pathways if sensitive plants exist within or adjacent to the proposed pathway routes. The project would also have the potential to result in significant indirect impacts to sensitive wetland plants if the project would result in substantial changes to existing hydrology conditions. Additional analysis of these potentially significant impacts will be provided in the project EIR.

West Campus. The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that several sensitive plant and animal species have the potential to occur on the West Campus. Habitat types that support sensitive species include bluff top/coastal areas, vernal pools, freshwater marsh/wetlands, native grassland and riparian scrub. All of the identified sensitive habitat types located on the West Campus are at least 1,200 feet west of the southwest corner of the San Joaquin Apartments project site. Areas on the West Campus located closer to the project site support common habitat types, such as eucalyptus woodland, non-native annual grassland and coyote brush scrub. Due to the separation distance provided between habitat areas that support sensitive species and the project site, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to the sensitive species on the West Campus that were identified by the 2010 LRDP. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Aggregation sites for Monarch butterfly have been identified adjacent to Devereux School, which is more than 3,000 feet southwest of the project site; and in the Ellwood area, approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site. A few butterflies may seek temporary refuge in the eucalyptus woodland located near the intersection of El Colegio and Storke Roads, however, that woodland has not been identified as a wintering site or an important resource for Monarch butterflies (2010 LRDP EIR). Therefore, the project’s indirect impacts to monarch butterflies would be less than significant and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
The eucalyptus woodland area located on the West Campus area near the project site could periodically be used by nesting birds, although bird nest surveys conducted for the 2010 LRDP EIR did not detect the presence of nests in that area. In addition, the woodland is a minimum of approximately 200 feet from the project site, which would also reduce the potential for the project to result in construction-related noise or other activities that could cause the abandonment of an active nest.

Additional raptor and bird nest surveys were recently conducted on the UCSB campus (Dudek, 2012) at locations on or near sites identified for future residential development by the 2010 LRDP. Due to its previously developed condition, the San Joaquin Apartments project site was not surveyed, however, several sites on the West Campus located southwest of the project site were surveyed. The survey site closest to the proposed project site included the eucalyptus trees and other habitat areas located south of the West Campus Family Apartments and east of the Devereux Slough. Raptor surveys in this area observed red tailed hawks perching and foraging in several locations, and a lone white tailed kite was observed foraging in the open space area located west of the West Campus Family Apartments near the Ocean Meadows golf course. One empty stick nest was observed in the survey area in a eucalyptus tree and was likely an old American crow nest, although it was marginally suitable for a Cooper’s hawk. Bird surveys in this area identified 34 species and suitable nesting habitat is present for 27 of the identified species. Breeding by hooded orioles was confirmed in the survey area, and trees and large shrubs in the area provide habitat for most of the observed species.

The proposed project would not result in direct impacts (i.e., removal of trees or shrubs that could contain nests) in any West Campus area, and the potential for indirect impacts (i.e., noise or other activities that could result in the abandonment of a nest) appears to be low based on the previous survey results. The implementation of 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures BIO-3A, 3B and 3C would ensure that the potential for impacts to nesting birds that may use the eucalyptus trees or other habitat located near the project site is reduced to a less than significant level and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Vernal Pool/Open Space Areas. The value of vernal pool and other habitats provided by the Camino Corto and Del Sol open space areas to wildlife is generally limited due to the extensive presence of people and their pets in the vicinity of the open areas, however, the pools provide resting places for local and migrating aquatic birds during the rainy season and while they contain water (Santa Barbara County, 2007). Although the grassland habitat provided by these areas is degraded by human activities, it does provide habitat for common wildlife species that are tolerant of urban development. The grassland areas may also provide foraging habitat for sensitive raptor species such as American kestrel, white-tailed kite, red-shouldered hawks and red-tailed hawks (Santa Barbara County, 2007).
If sensitive raptor or other sensitive bird species were to utilize the adjacent vernal pool or grassland habitat areas, the proposed project could result in significant impacts due to short-term construction-related disturbances, and a long-term increase in lighting, noise, and human presence. The potential for project-related long-term human disturbance, noise, and lighting impacts is likely to be low as the open space areas are adjacent to existing urban development and lighting-related impacts would be minimized by complying with 2010 LRDP policy ESH-19. However, project-specific and cumulative disturbance impacts could be a potentially significant impact and should be evaluated further.

Several sensitive plant species have the potential to exist in the vernal pool/open space areas, including Contra Costa goldfields, although this plant is thought to be extirpated from the project area; southern tar plant along the margins of wetland areas; and black-flowered figwort in riparian areas (Santa Barbara County, 2007). The proposed project would not result in short- or long-term disturbances in the vernal pool/open space areas, or changes in hydrologic conditions that could result in significant impacts to these plants should they be located in the open space areas. Therefore, the project’s impacts to sensitive plants in the adjacent open spaces areas would be less than significant and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

There is no riparian habitat located on the San Joaquin Apartments project site. A small area of riparian habitat is provided in the Camino Corto Open Space, approximately 1,300 feet south of the project site. The proposed project site drains to the wetland area to the east and would not result in hydrologic changes that could affect the riparian area located in the Camino Corto preserve. Due to the separation distance between the project site and the Camino Corto riparian area, potential short-term construction disturbance impacts and long-term lighting, human presence and noise impacts would be less than significant. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The San Joaquin Apartments project site has been developed with residential buildings and other associated structures, and undeveloped portions of the site are occupied by mowed turf areas. No wetland habitat is provided on the project site.

Adjacent Wetlands. Consistent with LRDP policies and Coastal Commission requirements, a 100-foot wide buffer would be established around the perimeter of the
wetlands located east of the project site. The 100-foot buffer area is depicted on Figure 6.4-1 and extends onto the turf area located on the eastern portion of the project site. All proposed buildings would be located beyond the designated wetland buffer areas.

The proposed project would provide new pedestrian/bicycle paths that would extend across wetland, wetland buffer and upland habitat located in the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site. Impacts to identified wetlands and buffer areas would be minimized by conducting restoration activities at appropriate mitigation ratios, however, the proposed paths would have the potential to result in potentially significant short- and long-term impacts to sensitive wetland and other habitat areas. Project-related impacts to the sensitive habitat located east of and adjacent to the project site resulting from the construction and use of the proposed pathways will be evaluated further in the project EIR.

Project-related construction activities would also have the potential to result in inadvertent impacts to the adjacent wetlands and the buffer areas should construction equipment, personnel, or materials encroach into or be placed in a wetland or buffer area. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level by proposed mitigation measure BIO-1a, which requires the installation and maintenance of temporary construction fencing around the project site during the project’s entire construction period.

Runoff water from the project site is directed to the open space area east of the site. Project-related construction activities would result in ground disturbances that could result in significant erosion and sedimentation impacts to the adjacent wetlands, and could also result in significant sediment-related water quality impacts to the Storke Wetland located further to the east, and the Goleta Slough, which is hydrologically connected to the Storke Wetlands. Although unlikely to occur, an accidental release of hazardous construction materials from the project site would also have the potential to result in impacts to wetland areas “downstream” of the project site.

As described in Section 6.6 (Geology and Soils) and Section 6.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this Initial Study, the proposed construction site would be over one acre in area and would be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the statewide general NPDES permit for stormwater discharges from construction sites. The primary objective of the SWPPP is to identify, implement and maintain appropriate best management practices to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges from construction sites. The project would also be required to implement appropriate best management practices as required by the UCSB Storm Water Management Plan (2010), and to minimize erosion- and sediment-related impacts consistent with policy requirements of the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs. Compliance with these regulatory requirements would ensure that the project’s short-term, erosion-related impacts to the wetlands east of the project site are less than significant and no
additional analysis or mitigation measures are required. Upon the completion of construction activities, disturbed areas on the project site would be repaved, landscaped or otherwise restored to a condition similar to pre-project conditions. The proposed project would result in less than significant long-term erosion or sediment impacts to the adjacent wetlands.

Long-term impacts to the wetlands east of the project site could result if the project were to result in substantial changes to existing hydrologic characteristics of the runoff water from the project site that is conveyed to the adjacent wetlands, such as an adverse decrease in the amount of water entering the wetland areas. Significant impacts to the wetlands could also occur if the project were to result in a substantial increase in pollutants leaving the project site. The proposed project would provide a variety of design features to minimize potential changes to existing hydrologic and water quality conditions associated with runoff water that leaves the project site, such as the use of bioswales, however, potential project-related impacts to existing runoff water characteristics are potentially significant and additional analysis of possible related effects to adjacent wetlands in a project EIR is required.

Vernal Pool/Open Space Areas. The vernal pools located on the Camino Corto and Del Sol open space areas are at an elevation that is higher than the proposed project site, and the open space areas are separated from the project site by El Colegio Road. Therefore, runoff water from the project site does not enter the open space areas. The proposed project would have no impact to existing hydrologic conditions or water quality conditions in the open space areas.

West Campus. Runoff water from the project site is predominately directed to the wetlands east of and adjacent to the project site. Runoff from the eastern and southern perimeters of the project site may be directed to the roadways adjacent to the project site (i.e., El Colegio Road and Storke Road), however, due to topographic conditions along both roadways, no runoff from the project site could drain directly to the West Campus. Runoff from the turf area on the west side of Storke Road that would be used for the development of a parking lot is directed northward to an earthen swale located adjacent to Storke Road. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to existing hydrologic conditions or water quality conditions on the West Campus.

d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The San Joaquin Apartments project site has been developed with residential buildings, parking lots and other associated structures. Undeveloped portions of the site, such as the mowed turf areas on the west side of Storke Road and on the eastern portion of the project site, do not provide cover or refuge for migrating wildlife, and do not provide an important link between habitat areas provided on the West Campus and wetland habitat.
provided on the Storke Campus or in the Isla Vista community. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to wildlife migration and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

The open space area to the east of the project site could potentially be part of a wildlife corridor between Storke wetland and Camino Corto, Del Sol, West Campus and the Devereux Lagoon. The proposed project would provide bike/pedestrian pathways across the adjacent open space area, however, the paths would not be lit at night, would not result in a substantial hazard to wildlife, and would not result in a barrier to wildlife movement. Therefore, the proposed pathway would have a less than significant impact related to wildlife migration and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project conflict with any local applicable policies protecting biological resources?

Biological resource protection policies of the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs that are applicable to the San Joaquin Apartment project pertain to issues such as the minimization of lighting-related impacts; minimizing sedimentation and other impacts to sensitive habitat areas; and minimizing impacts to nesting birds and other sensitive species. While it is anticipated that the proposed project would be consistent with these policy requirements, a comprehensive evaluation of the project’s consistency with applicable policies will be provided by the project EIR (see Initial Study Section 6.9, Land Use and Planning).

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable habitat conservation plan?

The project site is not included in any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to conflicts with adopted habitat protection plans.

6.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level With Proposed Mitigation

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce two potential impacts of the San Joaquin Apartments project’s to biological resource to a less than significant level.

IMPACT BIO-1. Construction activities at the project site have the potential to result in inadvertent impacts to wetland buffer areas located on and adjacent to the project site.

BIO-1a. Temporary construction/safety fencing shall be erected and maintained along the project site’s eastern perimeter throughout the
duration of the proposed Project’s construction period. The fencing shall be provided at locations that ensure construction-related activities do not occur within designated wetland buffer areas.

**IMPACT BIO-2** Proposed construction activities could cause the abandonment of active bird nests located near the Project site.

The following mitigation measures implement the requirements of 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures BIO-3a, 3b and 3c.

**BIO-2a.** To avoid disturbance or loss of active bird nests during development of the proposed project, to the extent feasible the removal of any tree that provides nesting habitat for birds shall be conducted between September 15 and February 15, outside of the typical nesting season.

**BIO-2b.** If tree removals are determined to be necessary during the typical nesting season (February 15 to September 15), a nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approximately one week prior to the proposed action. Surveys shall follow standard protocols as established by CDFG and/or CCC. If the biologist determines that a tree is being used for nesting at that time, disturbance shall be avoided until after the young have fledged from the nest and achieved independence. If no nesting is found to occur, necessary tree removal can proceed.

**BIO-2c.** To avoid indirect disturbance of active bird nests by project construction occurring within the typical nesting season, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct one or more pre-construction surveys per standard protocols approximately one week prior to construction, to determine presence/absence of active nests adjacent to the project site. If no breeding or nesting activities are detected within 200 feet of the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed. If breeding/nesting activity is confirmed, work activities within 200 feet of the active nest shall be delayed until the young birds have fledged and left the nest.
Additional EIR Analysis

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological resources. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The identified impacts include:

1. Evaluate on-site trees to determine if any mature trees or trees with biological importance would be removed. If necessary, determine the required number of replacement trees required by 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measure BIO-3D.

2. Evaluate the potential for short-term, construction-related impacts to sensitive wildlife that may use habitat located east of and adjacent to the project site, and that is provided by the Camino Corto and Del Sol open space areas.

3. Evaluate the potential for long-term, project-related impacts to sensitive wildlife that may use habitat located east of and adjacent to the project site, and that is provided by the Camino Corto and Del Sol open space areas.

4. Evaluate the potential for direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and other sensitive habitat, plants or animals that may result from the installation of pedestrian/bike paths in the area east of and adjacent to the project site.

5. Evaluate the potential for the project to result in long-term hydrology and water quality impacts to the wetland areas located east of the project site.

6. The EIR shall also provide an evaluation of the proposed project’s consistency with the applicable biological resource policies provided by the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs.
Adjacent Parcel Wetland Delineation

Source: Rincon, 2012

Figure 6.4-1
6.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

6.5.1 Setting

Archaeological Resources. The UCSB Campus is located within the historic territory of the Native American Indian group known as the Chumash. The Chumash occupied the region from San Luis Obispo County to Malibu Canyon on the coast, the four northern Channel Islands, and inland as far as the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley. The Chumash are subdivided into factions based on distinct dialects. The Goleta area is located within the historic territory of the Barbareño Chumash whose name is derived from the Mission with local jurisdiction, Santa Barbara. The Barbareño occupied the narrow coastal plain from Point Conception in Santa Barbara County to Punta Gorda in Ventura County.

The project site is located near the Goleta Slough, which is a general area of high archaeological sensitivity. The 2010 LRDP EIR reports that several archaeological resource sites have been identified in the vicinity of the project site.
CA-SBA-50. This site was originally recorded in the 1920’s as a sparse scatter of camp refuse. An investigation of the site that was conducted in 1978 encountered some intact cultural deposits, however, most of the site had been highly disturbed as a result of past cultivation, historic ranch building construction and the construction of Los Carneros Road. Based on the results of the 1978 investigation, it was concluded that CA-SBA-50 probably represented a small, short-term limited-activity camp, which is a site type not well understood within the context of settlement systems along the Santa Barbara Channel. Therefore, the site was considered to have the potential to provide significant information regarding these particular types of sites and would qualify as an important resource under CEQA.

A subsurface test program of CA-SBA-50 was conducted in 2001 to determine if the site boundaries extended east of Los Carneros Road. No evidence of the site was found and no additional archaeological studies were recommended for the portion of the site that is east of Los Carneros Road (UCSB, 2004). In addition, archaeological monitoring during construction activities at the San Clemente project did not detect the presence of archaeological resources.

CA-SBA-51. Resources associated with this site, primarily midden material and shell scatter have been identified at several location on the West Campus (UCSB, 2010).

CA-SBA-52. This site is an extensive Native American archaeological site, and has been the subject of numerous studies since the 1920’s. Archaeological evidence indicates that SBA-52 represents a prehistoric village site and may provide the earliest evidence of canoe manufacture in the Santa Barbara area. Several Native American cemeteries have been recorded at the site. Recent investigations have determined that the site extends east and west of Los Carneros Road and north of the UCSB property line, such that SBA-52 does not extend onto the UCSB campus (UCSB, 2004).

CA-SBA-1784 and CA-SBA-1785. These sites were constructed in 1983 by the UCSB Anthropology Department for instructional purposes. The sites do not meet the CEQA criteria for importance or significance (UCSB, 2004).

Historical Resources. There are no recognized historically significant structures located on the UCSB Storke Campus. The National Register of Historic Places lists one property, (Campbell No. 2), located on the West Campus. The listings of the California Historical Landmarks of the Office of Historic Preservation, and the California Points of Historical Interest do not identify any properties on the Storke Campus. The Helana T. Devereux Hall, is located on the Devereux School grounds (West Campus area) and is Santa Barbara County Landmark No. 27.
6.5.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?*

There are no designated historical structures located on the UCSB Storke Campus, and no designated historical structures are located near the proposed project site. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** on significant historical resources.

b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project site is predominately covered by buildings, paved surfaces and landscaping. Due the project site’s previously developed condition and poor ground visibility conditions, an archaeological survey of the ground surface within the project area was not performed.

The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that there is a “low” potential for archaeological resources to be buried on the portions of the project site that would be used for the development of proposed structures. However, since the project site has not been surveyed for archaeological resources, the EIR indicates that portions of the project site have a “moderate” sensitivity to yield cultural resources. Portions of the project site that have been previously developed with structures such buildings and parking lots would be unlikely to yield significant cultural resources during construction activities. However, previously undeveloped areas of the project site (i.e., the turf area on the east side of the housing site, the turf area on the west side of Storke Road that is to be used for the development of a new parking lot, and along the alignment of the proposed off-site pathways east of the project site) would have a higher potential to yield cultural resources during construction activities. The removal or disturbance of archaeological resources could result in a potentially significant impact. This potential impact can be **reduced to a less than significant** level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures CUL-1a through 1e.

c. *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Although marine fossils are present in the project region, previous development on the UCSB campus has not encountered unique paleontological resources and it is not likely that significant paleontological resources are located at the project site. There are no unique geological features located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** on paleontological resources or unique geological features.
d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Several of the recorded archaeological sites on the UCSB Campus (SBA-48, SBA-49 and 1954-1) have included burial sites. These sites, however, are not located on the Storke Campus. Due to previous construction activities that have occurred on the project site, it is unlikely that previously undetected burial sites would be encountered. In the unlikely event that Native American or historic-period burials are encountered, a significant cultural resource impact would result. If human remains are encountered within campus grounds, the University will be responsible for complying with provisions of Public Resources Code Sections 5097.98 and 5097.99, and 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, as amended by Assembly Bill 2641. With the implementation of regulatory requirements and proposed mitigation measures CUL-1a through 1e, potentially significant impacts to burial sites that may be located on the project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

6.5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments project has the potential to encounter previously undetected cultural resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No additional EIR analysis or mitigation measures are required.

CUL-1. Ground disturbing activities that occur in conjunction with the development of the San Joaquin Apartments project have the potential to result in significant impacts to previously undetected cultural resources.

CUL-1a. At the commencement of project construction, an archaeologist shall provide a brief cultural resources orientation to the construction crew on the types of prehistoric and/or historic resources that might become exposed during earth disturbing activities, and the steps to be taken in the event that such a find is encountered.

CUL-1b. An archaeologist shall be retained to monitor initial grading activities conducted on portions of the project site that have not been previously disturbed or only minimally disturbed by previous construction activities. These areas include:

- The proposed parking lot area on the west side of Storke Road.
- The grass area on the eastern side of the project site, and
- Any disturbance of the ground surface required to construct the proposed pedestrian/bike paths and bridge that would extend from
the project site across the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site.

Results of this initial monitoring shall determine if any additional construction monitoring or subsurface testing is warranted.

**CUL-1c.** The archaeologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or redirect project construction in the event that potentially significant cultural resources are exposed. Based on monitoring observations and the actual extent of project disturbance, the lead archaeologist shall have the authority to refine the monitoring requirements as appropriate (i.e., change to spot checks, reduce or increase the area to be monitored) in consultation with the UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design. Upon completion of the monitoring program a monitoring report shall be presented to the UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design and to the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC).

**CUL-1d.** In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within the vicinity of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. A Chumash representative should monitor any mitigation work associated with Native American cultural material.

**CUL-1e.** If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission. If avoidance of the remains is not feasible, they should be excavated and removed by a qualified archaeologist in the presence of the Most Likely Descendant. Repatriation of the exhumed remains and all associated items shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Health and Safety Code 8010-8011).
### 6.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequely Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Landslides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequely Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequely Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequely Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequely Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporate</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.1 Setting

**Regional Setting.** Most of the UCSB Campus is located on a marine terrace approximately 30-40 feet above sea level. Stream erosion over the past 10,000 years has eroded the terrace to form a series of valleys, which have accumulated deposits of gravel, sand, silt, and clay. Deposits of older and recent alluvium, which reach a thickness of about 25 feet, typically overlie bedrock material. The underlying bedrock formations on the Campus include the Monterey, Sisquoc, Pico and Santa Barbara Formations.

**Site Geology.** The project site is generally level and ranges in elevation from approximately 32 feet above sea level in the southwest corner of the project site to approximately 13 feet in the northeast corner of the site. The San Joaquin Apartments project site is predominantly occupied by urban uses and development. Existing development includes the two residential towers and podium structure; paved vehicle and bicycle parking areas; and recreation facilities such as tennis courts, a swimming pool and deck area. Undeveloped areas consist of mowed turf, including two small areas along the southern portion of the project site adjacent to El Colegio Road; the approximately two-acre turf area on the eastern portion of the project site; and the 1.5-acre turf area that would be used for vehicle parking on the west side of Storke Road. The project site is underlain by artificial fill, marine terrace deposits and the Pico Formation. The marine terrace deposits are composed of dense to very dense silty sand and sand. The terrace deposits have been deposited over the Quaternary/Tertiary age Pico Formation and are approximately 15 feet in depth on the project site.

**Faulting and Seismicity.** The Santa Barbara area is seismically active and there are a large number of active and potentially active faults located throughout the region. Faults located in the project vicinity include the Campus, Coal Oil Point, Goleta Point, More Ranch and North Channel Slope faults. The Campus and Goleta Point faults are to the east of the project site and the Coal Oil Point fault is located to the south. The North Channel Slope fault is located offshore and has no apparent onshore expression.

The More Ranch fault has been mapped in the project region as having a north and south branch. The north branch has been mapped as being located approximately 750 feet north of the project site. Figure 4.5-2 (Local Faulting) of the 2010 LRDP EIR shows the south branch of the
More Ranch fault as following the general alignment of El Colegio Road to the east of the project site, and then traversing through the project site. The More Ranch fault is part of the More Ranch-Mission Ridge-Arroyo Parida fault system, which is topographically well expressed from Ellwood to Ojai and is the principal onshore fault in the project region. The More Ranch fault zone is not presently classified as an active fault by the California Geological Survey, however, the Santa Barbara County Seismic Safety Element classifies the north branch of the More Ranch fault as an active fault. The south branch of the fault is not listed in the Seismic Safety Element, however, recent investigations of this fault have classified it as being an active fault.

The project area is located in a region that has experienced moderate to large earthquakes during historic times. The faults with reported historic seismic activity that are closest to the campus are offshore in the Santa Barbara Channel. These faults have generated earthquakes of magnitude 6.3 in 1925, 5.5 in 1926, 6.0 in 1941, 5.2 in 1968, and 5.1 in 1978. The epicenters of these earthquakes were reportedly located approximately 5 to 10 miles south of the Santa Barbara coast. The campus area has also experienced strong ground motion from the 1812, 1857, 1906, 1934, 1952 and 1966 earthquakes along the San Andreas fault. The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that an earthquake on the North Channel Slope fault could result in an estimated ground acceleration of 0.66g, and an earthquake along the More Ranch-Mission Ridge-Arroyo Parida fault system could result in an estimated ground acceleration of 0.53g.²

**Liquefaction.** Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength caused by earthquake-generated ground shaking. Liquefaction typically occurs in loose, saturated granular soil. Liquefaction is generally not considered to be a significant concern if on-site soils have a high clay content, consist of dense granular soils, or if groundwater is not present within the upper 40 to 50 feet. The degree of liquefaction susceptibility at a specific location will be dependent upon a variety of factors, including soil type, texture and degree of soil saturation. Potentially liquefiable soils have been identified at localized area on the UCSB campus.

**Slope Stability.** Most of the UCSB campus is relatively level, which minimizes the potential for slope stability-related impacts. The project site is level and there are no natural or artificial slopes located adjacent to the project site.

**LRDP Requirements.** The 2010 LRDP provides policies to minimize potential geologic hazard impacts, and policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below. The 1990 LRDP also includes the following policies.

**GEO-1.** Buildings shall not be placed astride any faults. The actual setback from the fault trace shall be determined based upon site-specific geotechnical studies, but no closer than fifty feet from active or potentially active faults.

---

² Peak ground acceleration is the maximum acceleration experienced by a particle on the earth’s surface during an earthquake. It is a measure of how hard the ground shakes, as distinguished from the earthquake’s magnitude, which is a measure of the amount of energy released by the fault movement.
GEO-2. Subsurface geotechnical and soil studies shall be conducted to determine proper building foundation and infrastructure design to address potential seismic and liquefaction hazards, if any.

6.6.2 Checklist Responses

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972, which was renamed to the Earthquake Fault Zoning Act in 1994, prohibits the construction of buildings for human occupancy across active faults, and structures covered by the Act must be setback from the location of the fault. A common setback distance is approximately 50 feet, however, the actual setback requirement may be increased or decreased depending on the type of structure proposed and its intended use, and the results of required site-specific investigations. There are no state-designated Earthquake Fault Zones on the UCSB Campus or in the project area.

Geologic maps published by various researchers have identified faults in the project vicinity that are associated with the More Ranch-Mission Ridge-Arroyo Parida fault system. However, the mapped locations and names of the faults vary somewhat. A study performed in 2000 near the West Campus Family Apartments located west of the project site reportedly encountered evidence suggestive of faulting, and the fault was projected to extend east through the proposed project site. Additional fault investigations have recently been conducted on the project site (Fugro, 2012), consisting of a comprehensive series of cone penetrometer investigations, bore holes and trenches. Those investigations have confirmed the presence of faults on the project site, therefore, the project has the potential to be affected by fault movement. Although the effects of this potentially significant impact would be substantially reduced by the requirements of LRDP Policy GEO-1, this impact and the results of geological testing conducted at the project site should be described in the project EIR.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

It is likely that the proposed residences will experience strong ground shaking sometime during the life of the project. Potentially significant earthquake-related ground shaking may result from movement along a local fault or a major earthquake
along a more distant fault. Similar to other development that has occurred on the UCSB Campus and in the project region, potential ground shaking-related impacts to the proposed structures and project-related infrastructure can be reduced to a less than significant level by conducting project-specific geotechnical investigations, using foundation and building design measures recommended by engineering evaluations, and compliance with applicable regulations and design standards, including but not limited to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes the California Building Code. Although the effects of this potentially significant impact would be substantially reduced by the requirements of LRDP Policy GEO-2 and existing building regulations, the effects of this potential impact should be evaluated further by the project EIR.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

2010 LRDP EIR Figure 4.5-3 (Liquefaction Potential) indicates that areas with potentially liquefiable soils are located to the east and north of the project site. These areas generally correspond with the existing or former extent of the Storke Wetlands. The project site is not identified as containing potentially liquefiable soils.

A preliminary geotechnical report previously prepared for the project site (Fugro, 2002) evaluated the potential for liquefaction to occur based on the results of cone penetration testing. The evaluation determined that due to the dense nature of the terrace deposits on the project site, the deposits are not prone to significant seismic settlement in response to earthquake-related ground shaking. The upper terrace deposits are above the expected ground water levels, which were determined to be approximately 12 to 22 feet below the ground surface in 2002. Similar groundwater conditions were determined to exist at the project site in 2012, with measured levels approximately 15 to 20 feet below the ground surface (Fugro, 2012). Based on the conditions determined to exist at the project site, the previous geotechnical report concluded that the potential for liquefaction or seismic settlement to occur at the project site was low.

Even if liquefaction were to occur at the project site, its effects would be minimized through the implementation of a variety of project site modifications and/or building designs, such as compacting soils that have the potential to liquefy, or providing building foundations that can withstand expected amounts of liquefaction-induced ground settlement. For the San Joaquin Apartments project, liquefaction-related hazards would be minimized by complying with the requirements of the California Building Code (Title 24) and LRDP policy GEO-2, which requires that project-specific soils investigations be conducted and that appropriate building foundation construction techniques be utilized. These existing requirements are adequate to reduce potential liquefaction-related hazards at the project site to a less than significant level. No additional EIR analysis or mitigation measures are required.
iv) Landslides

The project site is generally level, and there are no slopes located adjacent to the site that would have the potential to result in significant slope stability impacts. The implementation of standard construction site safety measures would minimize potential excavation-related impacts to a less than significant level. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Potential erosion and sedimentation impacts that could be caused by the San Joaquin Apartments project would result primarily from short-term ground disturbing construction activities. The project site drains to the open space area east of the project site, which ultimately drains to the Storke Wetland and the Goleta Slough. Therefore, the discharge of sediment from the project site would have the potential to result in significant impacts to the quality of receiving waters.

The project site is more than one acre in size, therefore, prior to the start of ground disturbing activities UCSB would be required to file a Notice of Intent to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit, and to develop and implement a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The primary objective of the SWPPP is to identify, implement and maintain appropriate best management practices to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges from construction sites. A General Permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on September 2, 2009 (Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ), and went into effect on July 1, 2010. The new requirements contain provisions for determining a project’s risk level, and specific project site implementation requirements based on the results of the risk determination.

In addition to the requirements of an approved SWPPP, policies of the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs require that a variety of erosion control best management practices be implemented at construction sites. The policy requirements are listed in Section 6.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this Initial Study and would be implemented as part of the proposed project. With the implementation of existing regulatory and policy requirements, the proposed project would result in less than significant short-term erosion impacts. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Upon the completion of construction activities, the project site would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project site would be a substantial long-term source of sediment discharges. However, please refer to Section 6.9.2a of this Initial Study, which concluded that the adequacy and effectiveness of long-term sediment control measures to be provided on the project site should be evaluated by
a project EIR. If long-term erosion control measures are not sized or sited adequately, the project could result in **potentially significant** long-term erosion-related impacts. Additional evaluation of this potential impact is to be provided in the water quality section of the project EIR.

c. *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

Similar to other structures that have been developed at UCSB, on the Storke Campus, and in surrounding urbanized areas, it is anticipated that potential liquefaction, subsidence, soil collapse and lateral spreading impacts will be reduced to a **less than significant** level through the implementation of existing building regulations. These regulations require that project-specific soils investigations be conducted and that the buildings foundation be designed to eliminate or minimize potential impacts. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

d. *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Existing building regulations and LRDP policy requirements to conduct project-specific soils investigations and to provide appropriate building foundations would minimize the possible effects of expansive soils on the proposed structures. Therefore, the project would have a **less than significant** impact associated with expansive soils and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

e. *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project would be connected to a sewer system and would not use an on-site septic system for the disposal of wastewater. Therefore, the project would have a **no impact** associated with the use of septic systems.

### 6.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to experience significant geologic hazard impacts. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The identified impacts include:

1. Potential for on-site faulting to adversely affect proposed buildings, and other project-related structures and infrastructure.
2. The potential for proposed structures to be adversely affected by ground shaking-related impacts.

The potential for significant long-term erosion-related impacts to water quality is to be evaluated in the water quality section of the project EIR.
6.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS –
Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? 

- **Yes**
- **No**

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- **Yes**
- **No**

6.7.1 Setting

**Background Information.** Greenhouse gases are referred to as such because they contribute to the “greenhouse effect,” which traps heat radiated from the Earth’s surface in the atmosphere. “Global climate change” describes changes in the earth’s climate, such as an increase or decrease in temperatures, or a shift in precipitation patterns.

Although there is not unanimous agreement regarding the occurrence, causes, or effects of global climate change, there is a substantial body of evidence that climate change is occurring due to an increase in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the Earth’s atmosphere. State law defines greenhouse gases to include the following: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. Another greenhouse gas is water vapor. Water vapor is not recognized in state law and climate change programs such as the Kyoto Protocol because there is no obvious correlation between water vapor concentration and specific human activities.

Greenhouse gases have varying global warming potential. The reference gas for global warming potential is carbon dioxide, which has been assigned a global warming potential of “1.” Methane gas is another gas that contributes to global warming and has been assigned a global warming potential of 21, which means that is has a greater global warming effect than carbon dioxide on a molecule per molecule basis. Sulfur hexafluoride has a global warming potential of 23,900. The most important greenhouse gas in human-induced global warming is carbon dioxide. While other greenhouse gases have higher global warming potential, carbon


dioxide is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for 85 percent of the global warming potential of all greenhouse gases emitted by the United States. Greenhouse gas emissions are typically measured in terms of mass carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e), which is the product of the mass of a particular greenhouse gas and its specific global warming potential.

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has published its conclusion that “warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level.” The IPCC also concluded that global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide have increased markedly as a result of human activities since 1750 and now far exceed pre-industrial values determined from ice cores spanning many thousands of years. Most of the observed increase in globally-averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations. It is likely there has been significant anthropogenic warming over the past 50 years averaged over each continent (except Antarctica). Continued greenhouse gas emissions at or above current rates would cause further warming and induce many changes in global climate systems during the 21st century that would very likely be larger than those observed during the 20th century.³

Climate change-related effects will likely include increased temperatures and changes in rainfall patterns including increased drought conditions. These effects can result in stress to trees and other vegetation, which could lead to an increase in the occurrence of wildfires. It is also likely that changes in weather patterns could result in more extreme precipitation events, which could result in an increase in the frequency and severity of floods. An increase in sea level is also a likely climate change-related effect. Estimates of future sea level elevations vary considerably based on assumptions regarding greenhouse gas emission control effectiveness and other factors. The California Climate Action Team has indicated that by 2100 sea level increases could range between 31 and 69 inches above 2000 baseline conditions (California, 2011). Short-term increases in sea level due to large storms are likely to be of greater concern to coastal infrastructure and development in coastal areas over the next several decades than long-term sea level rise rates (California, 2010).

**Legislative and Policy Requirements.** Numerous legislative requirements and University of California policies and programs have been adopted to reduce the effects of climate change. Several of the requirements applicable to the evaluation of the San Joaquin Apartments project are summarized below.

**Assembly Bill 32.** The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) requires the California Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to evaluate statewide greenhouse gas emissions, and then create a program and emission caps to limit statewide emissions to 1990 levels. The program is to be implemented in a manner that achieves

---

emissions compliance by 2020. AB 32 does not directly amend CEQA or other environmental laws, but it does acknowledge that emissions of greenhouse gases cause significant adverse impacts to human health and the environment.

**Senate Bill 97.** This bill was signed on August 24, 2007, and states that a failure to analyze the greenhouse gas impacts in CEQA documents prepared for transportation and levee projects funded by Propositions 1b and 1e would not result in a violation of CEQA. By enacting the requirements of SB 97, the State acknowledged that climate change analysis is to occur in conjunction with the CEQA process. The bill also required the Office of Planning and Research to develop, and the California Resources Agency to certify and adopt amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions. On December 30, 2009, the Secretary for Natural Resources adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines addressing greenhouse gas emissions, and those amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

**UC Policy on Sustainable Practices.** The University has adopted a policy program to minimize its impact on the environment and to reduce its dependence on non-renewable energy. The policy addresses a range of issue areas related to enhancing sustainable practices, including:

- Green Building Design
- Clean Energy
- Climate Protection
- Transportation
- Sustainable Operations
- Recycling and Waste Management
- Environmentally Preferred Purchasing
- Sustainable Foodservices

The Sustainable Practices Policy implements a variety of programs and requires that all new and renovation building projects outperform the California Building Code energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent and should strive for 30 percent or more. All new and building renovation projects are to achieve a minimum LEED certification of “Silver” and strive to achieve “Gold.” The University of California has committed to provide up to 10 megawatts of on-site renewable power by 2014 and will reduce consumption of non-renewable energy by using a portfolio approach that includes a combination of energy efficiency projects, the incorporation of local renewable power measures for existing and new facilities, green power purchases from the electrical grid, and other energy measures to reduce fossil fuel usage. Additionally, the University will pursue the expansion of Transportation Demand Management programs and projects to reduce environmental impacts from commuting.

**Campus Sustainability Plan.** The Campus Sustainability Plan describes major sustainability programs and actions to be implemented by UCSB over the next 20 years. Nine functional areas have been identified, including academics and research, built environment, energy, food, landscape/biotic environment, procurement, transportation, waste, and water.
Various campus groups have developed a series of recommendations, goals, objectives and benchmarks to be implemented over a one, five, and twenty year timeframe.

**2012 Climate Action Plan.** The UCSB 2012 Climate Action Plan (CAP) supersedes the UCSB 2009 CAP, and provides a guideline to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions as prescribed by the State of California, the University of California, and the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment. The goals of the CAP are to achieve the following greenhouse gas emission targets:

- 2000 emission levels by 2014;
- 1990 emission levels by 2020; and
- Carbon neutral by 2050.

UCSB has achieved its 2014 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target and is projected to achieve its 2020 emissions reduction target, primarily through the implementation of energy efficiency projects and through reducing business air travel by 10% by encouraging remote conferencing. After forecasting for planned reduction measures in energy conservation, on-site renewable energy production, energy efficiency projects and commuter and air travel reductions, UCSB’s 2020 projected emission level is approximately 89,791 MT CO$_2$e. This represents an emission reduction of 2,772 million tons of CO$_2$e from 2010 baseline conditions; a 16,966 million ton CO$_2$e reduction from 2020 business as usual projections, which account for campus growth; and 945 million tons of CO$_2$e below the CAP’s estimate of UCSB’s 1990 greenhouse gas emissions of 90,736 million tons of CO$_2$e.

The 2012 CAP identifies greenhouse gas reduction strategies for achieving adopted UCSB and California emission reduction goals. These strategies include:

- Reducing energy use in buildings
- Improved energy use and efficiency
- Reduced transportation emissions
- Participation in state and local government programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Obtaining offsets to achieve carbon neutrality

Specific implementation items identified by the 2012 CAP include avoiding emissions where possible through improved planning and reducing the carbon intensity of development; reducing emissions through improved efficiency in campus operations; and to replacing high-carbon energy sources with lower carbon sources. These strategies will be implemented through changes in new construction, retrofitting of existing sources, changes in policy and practices, and education and outreach to promote behavioral change.

**2010 LRDP EIR Analysis.** The 2010 LRDP EIR included an analysis of the potential for LRDP-related development to result in greenhouse emissions that would significantly
contribute to the effects of global climate change. That analysis concluded the LRDP’s climate change impacts would not be significant. This determination was based on conclusions that the LRDP and its proposed design features would be consistent with emission control measures described by the California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan; and that LRDP-related emissions of greenhouse gases would be substantially reduced when compared to “business as usual” impacts because LRDP-proposed housing located on or near the Main Campus would be provided for students and faculty population growth facilitated by the LRDP. By providing housing for new students and employees, LRDP-related vehicle miles traveled and associated air emissions would be substantially reduced. It was estimated that LRDP-proposed housing would reduce LRDP-related vehicle miles traveled and associated greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 43 percent when compared to emissions that would occur if no additional housing was provided.

6.7.2 Checklist Responses

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide a variety of design measures to reduce the project’s emission of greenhouse gases, such as: implementing design measures that would reduce energy use to 20% below Title 24 requirements, designing the proposed buildings and project site to achieve a LEED “Gold” designation, and the use of a transportation shuttle that would transport project residents to the Main Campus and other local destinations.

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.4 indicates that the significance of a project’s greenhouse gas emissions may be evaluated by estimating emissions using a model or other methodology and/or by providing a qualitative analysis of performance based standards. The 2010 LRDP EIR provides an evaluation of greenhouse gas emission impacts that would result from the build-out of the LRPD, and determined that the LRDP project would not result in a significant greenhouse gas emission impact. However, the LRDP EIR does not provide a project-specific evaluation of the San Joaquin Apartments project. A project-specific evaluation of the San Joaquin Apartments project greenhouse gas emission should be provided by a project-specific EIR so that the evaluation of the project’s greenhouse gas emissions complies with the requirements of CEQA and to determine if the project would have the potential to result in a potentially significant greenhouse gas emission impact.

As described above, the effects of global climate change may result in an increase in sea level, more frequent and severe floods, and an increase in wildfire hazards. New structures that would be provided on the project site would be located a minimum of approximately 13 feet above sea level, therefore, a rise in sea level of up to 69 inches by the year 2100 would not result in adverse direct effects to the project site. As described in Section 6.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this Initial Study, the project site is not
located within a 100-year floodplain, and the nearest designated floodplain area is the Storke Wetlands and adjacent low-lying areas. Due to the elevation of the proposed project structures (a minimum of approximately 13 feet above sea level), it is unlikely that an increase in the severity of flood events would result in significant flooding-related impacts at the project site. High fire hazard areas are generally located in areas with steep slopes and extensive areas of native or other fire-prone vegetation. The Project site and surrounding areas are not a high fire hazard area and would not be adversely affected by a climate change-related increase in wild fires. In conclusion, the San Joaquin Apartments project would not be significantly impacted by climate change-induced increases in sea level or increased flooding and wildfire events. Therefore, these effects of global climate change would have less than significant impact on the proposed project.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The UCSB 2012 CAP outlines a wide range of implementation measures intended to reduce campus-related emissions of greenhouse gases. Measures identified by the CAP most applicable to the proposed project are requirements that new building projects outperform the California Building Code energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent, and new buildings projects achieve a minimum LEED certification of “Silver” and strive to achieve “Gold.” As described in section 3.0 (Project Description) of this Initial Study, the San Joaquin Apartments project would implement these requirements. Additional evaluation of the proposed project should be provided to evaluate its consistency with other requirements of the UCSB 2012 CAP, and other greenhouse gas reduction measures adopted by UCSB and the University.

6.7.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to its emissions of greenhouse gases. The project EIR should provide the following project-related impact analysis.

1. Quantify project-related emissions of greenhouse gases.

2. Determine the potential for the project to result in a significant greenhouse gas emission impact. The project would result in a significant impact if it would interfere with the achievement of State, UCSB and University goals related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
6.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing
or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

□ □ □ □ ✓

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

□ □ □ ✓ □

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

□ □ □ ✓ □

6.8.1 Setting

The UCSB Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) has the primary responsibility for coordinating the management of hazardous materials on campus. Environmental Health and Safety also develops and assists in the implementation of compliance strategies for all federal and state regulations related to hazardous material and waste management.

The San Joaquin Apartment project site is a minimum of approximately one mile southwest of the western end of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport main runway, and is approximately 2,000 feet south of the main runway approach zone. The UCSB Storke Campus is not located within a designated high fire hazard zone.

The Ellwood Marine Terminal is located on the UCSB West Campus and is approximately 4,500 feet southwest of the project site. Until recently, the terminal was used to transfer crude oil produced by Platform Holly and treated by the Ellwood Onshore Facility onto barges for transport to refineries in Los Angeles and the Bay Area. The Ellwood Marine Terminal is now closed and the tanks have been cleaned and are empty. A demolition and reclamation permit is pending with Santa Barbara County Energy Division.
6.8.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

The residential units that would be provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project, and the associated food service and other accessory uses provided to serve the residents of the project (e.g., parking areas and recreation facilities that may be provided in the decommissioned dining commons) would not require or result in the use of hazardous substances that would have the potential to result in significant health and safety impacts to the public.

The types of hazardous materials most likely to be used at the project site would consist of small quantities of items such as cleaning agents, paints, garden supplies and other similar types of products. Facilities that would be used to store these types of materials, such as the proposed maintenance shop, would be inspected by the UCSB Fire Protection Division of the Environmental Health and Safety Department on an annual or more frequent basis as required by California Code of Regulations Title 19, Public Safety. Complying with existing University policies, and state and federal regulations related to the use, storage, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and waste would minimize the potential for a release to the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant hazardous material impacts. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

**On-Site Hazardous Material Sources.** An accidental release of construction materials, such as solvents, paints, fuels, lubricants, concrete, asphalt, etc. at a project site would have the potential to result in impacts to the environment. Compliance with existing regulations, such as the preparation and implementation of a construction site Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, would substantially reduce the potential for a substantial release of construction materials. Due to the low probability for an extensive release of hazardous materials, the potential for short-term impacts resulting from the use of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be less than significant. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

As described in response “a” above, only a limited amount of household-type hazardous materials would be used at the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant long-term impact related to the use of hazardous materials. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
No on-site structures would be demolished, however, the dining commons that currently serves the Santa Catalina residence hall would be decommissioned, which would facilitate the future establishment of new uses in the released floor space. The dining commons is located in the “podium” structure provided between the two residential tower buildings and was constructed in 1966. Due to the building’s age, it is possible that remodeling of the dining commons could encounter building materials that contain asbestos. Exposure to asbestos-containing materials has the potential to result in health impacts to construction workers and other persons at the project site. The management of asbestos-containing waste is regulated by a number of local, state and federal agencies. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulates the potential for work-place exposures to asbestos; the U.S. Department of Transportation regulates the transportation of asbestos-containing waste; and the disposal of asbestos materials is regulated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) also issues permits for building renovation/demolition projects that involve the removal of asbestos-containing materials. APCD Rule 1001, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants – Asbestos, provides notification and reporting requirements related to potential emissions of asbestos fibers. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce potential asbestos exposure impacts to a less than significant level and no further analysis of this potential impact is required.

Off-Site Hazardous Material Sources. The 2010 LRDP EIR indicated that operations at the Ellwood Marine Terminal on the UCSB West Campus had the potential to result in significant impacts to public safety due to the potential for a hydrogen sulfide vapor release from storage tanks or other equipment at the terminal facility. Although measures to reduce safety impacts associated with the Ellwood Marine Terminal were identified by an EIR prepared for a request by Venoco, the operator of the terminal, to continue terminal operations, the LRDP EIR concluded that implementation of those measures was beyond the jurisdiction of UCSB. Consequently, the LRDP EIR determined that the previously identified potential safety impacts were significant and unavoidable in regard to future development proposed by the 2010 LRDP.

The Ellwood Marine Terminal was developed to load crude oil produced from Platform Holly in the South Ellwood Oil Field, located offshore from the community of Isla Vista, onto barges for transportation to Los Angeles and Bay Area refineries. The Ellwood Marine Terminal is now closed and an onshore oil transportation pipeline (Line 96 Modification Project) that transports oil previously delivered to the terminal became operational 2012. The terminal operated on the West Campus under a lease agreement with UCSB. The lease agreement also requires that the site be restored to its natural condition.

Venoco is now required to apply for a Demolition and Reclamation permit from the County of Santa Barbara for the abandonment of the Ellwood Marine Terminal. Approval of abandonment activities must also be approved by the UC Regents and California
Coastal Commission. Abandonment activities will include the identification of equipment that is to be removed and any equipment that will remain, and the remediation of contamination.

With the cessation of barge transportation activities and the pending abandonment of the Ellwood Marine Terminal, the significant and unavoidable safety impact identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR regarding terminal operations is no longer applicable to proposed 2010 LRDP development or the San Joaquin Apartments project. Consequently, the Ellwood Marine Terminal would have no impact on the proposed project.

The 2010 LRDP EIR also indicates that build-out of the 2010 LRDP, along with other existing and future development in the project region (particularly the Ellwood Marine Terminal), would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to an increase in the transportation and use of hazardous materials. As described above, oil transportation operations at the Ellwood Marine Terminal have been discontinued and the use of hazardous materials by the San Joaquin Apartments project would generally be limited to household-type substances. Therefore, the proposed project’s cumulative contribution to this previously identified impact would not be cumulatively considerable and the project would result in less than significant hazardous material impacts. No additional analysis of this impact or mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The Isla Vista Elementary School is located adjacent to the project site on the south side of El Colegio Road. As described in responses “a” and “b” above, only a limited amount of household-type hazardous materials would be used at the project. Therefore, the project would not result in long-term hazardous emissions, use acutely hazardous materials, or use substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant long-term impact related to the use of hazardous materials.

Short-term construction activities on the San Joaquin Apartments project site would require the use of diesel-powered construction equipment, which could result in health impacts to occupants of the school. This impact was previously identified by this Initial Study in Section 6.3.3 (Air Quality) and additional analysis of this potentially significant impact will be required as part of an EIR evaluation of potential air quality impacts.

As described in section 6.3.3d (Air Quality) above, the proposed project includes the installation of two diesel-powered emergency generators. The installation and operation of emergency generators is regulated by the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District. The District requires that any emergency generator located within 500 feet of a school (K-12) be prohibited from any non-emergency use between 7:30 am and 3:30 pm on days
when school is in session. It is possible that a generator installed on the project site could be located within 500 feet of the Isla Vista Elementary School, however, compliance with APCD rules, including requirement regarding the installation location of the generator, would ensure that potential diesel particulate matter emission impacts that could result from periodic testing of the generators would be less than significant at the Isla Vista Elementary School.

d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

A recent query of the DTSC Envirostor data base (www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov) indicated that there are no hazardous contamination site listings included on the “Cortese” list, or hazardous contamination sites regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board, located on the project site, on the Storke Campus, or near the project site.

In the unlikely event that excavations at the project site were to uncover any suspected waste product or residue, the campus office of Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) would be contacted. EH&S would conduct the necessary assessments of the site to determine if the suspected material was hazardous, and if necessary, the material would be removed or remediated in accordance with federal, state and University regulations and policies. With the implementation of suspected contamination response procedures by UCSB, potential impacts would be less than significant and no additional evaluation or mitigation measures are required.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The San Joaquin Apartments project site is located approximately one mile southwest of the western end of the main runway at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and approximately 2,000 feet south of the runway approach zone safety area that has been established for properties west of the runway. Most of the UCSB Campus is located within the Airport’s Restrictive Surfaces boundary, which means that proposed buildings are restricted to a maximum height of 150 feet above the runway surface (UCSB, 2010). The Santa Barbara Airport runway is at an elevation of approximately nine feet above sea level, therefore, the height restriction would result a maximum structure height at the project site of approximately 159 feet above sea level. The tallest proposed structure at the project site would be six stories and approximately 75 feet in height. When added to a maximum site elevation of approximately 32 feet above sea level, the maximum total building height above sea level would be approximately 107 feet. As a result, the San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in structure height conflicts with aircraft operations. In addition, the project would not provide lights or reflective surfaces that
would adversely affect aircraft operations. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant airport-related safety impacts.

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

There are no private airstrips located in the vicinity of the UCSB Campus. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to airstrip operation safety.

g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

UCSB maintains a campus-wide Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that establishes emergency response procedures, including evacuation of the campus. The EOP establishes a chain of command during emergencies, and provides requirements for individual departments to prepare their own EOPs for immediate response to emergency situations.

During an emergency situation, the UCSB Office of Environmental Health and Safety will direct people on campus to “shelter in place” if it is safe to do so. By keeping the campus population on site, congestion on roads leading to/away from the campus is minimized. If an evacuation were to be required, Campus Police and Parking Services personnel would direct traffic along appropriate exit roads after evacuees are informed of the situation through established emergency response procedures. Access to the San Joaquin Apartments project during an emergency would be provided by two major roadways: El Colegio Road and Storke Road, therefore, adequate access to the site by emergency personnel would be provided. With the implementation of existing emergency response procedures, the proposed project’s potential to result in emergency response/evacuation impacts would be less than significant. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

There are no areas on or near the project site that present a substantial wildland fire risk, such as dense vegetation, steep slopes, difficult access and/or inadequate fire suppression water supplies. Areas with native vegetation are located on the open space parcel east of and adjacent to the project site, however, vegetation (fuel) density in this area is relatively low. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact related to wildfire safety.
6.8.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in significant hazards or hazardous material impacts. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.9.1 Setting

#### Surface Water Resources

**Project Site.** The San Joaquin Apartments project site encompasses approximately 13 acres and has been extensively developed with the two residential towers and the connecting podium structure; paved vehicle and bicycle parking areas; and recreation facilities such as tennis courts, a swimming pool and deck area. Undeveloped areas on the project site generally consist of mowed turf, including the approximately two-acre turf area on the eastern portion of the project site; and the 1.5-acre turf area on the west side of Storke Road that would be used to develop a new parking lot. Most stormwater runoff from the project site is directed to the open space parcel and wetland area located east of and adjacent to the project site. This open area ultimately drains to the Storke Wetlands, which are hydrologically connected to the Goleta Slough. The turf area located on the west side of Storke Road drains northward to an earthen channel adjacent to Storke Road.
Adjacent Areas. Surface water resources in the vicinity of the project site include the wetlands located east of the project site, the Storke Wetlands, Goleta Slough and the Devereaux Slough.

Adjacent Wetlands. The open space area and associated wetlands east of and adjacent to the project site receive stormwater runoff from the proposed project site. The area also receives runoff from areas in Isla Vista south of El Colegio Road via a culvert under the roadway. Stormwater is directed through the wetlands by a series of swales and ponds. Runoff from the open space area adjacent to the project site drains through a culvert beneath an access road to the Storke Wetlands.

Storke Wetlands. The Storke Wetlands cover approximately 20 acres and are located along the northern perimeter of the Storke Campus, a minimum of approximately 800 feet northeast of the project site. The wetlands extend in an east-west direction and are bisected by Los Carneros Road. Runoff from a 347-acre watershed, including areas located in the northern portion of Isla Vista, the Storke Campus, and a narrow segment of the City of Goleta adjacent to Tecolotito Creek, is directed to the Storke Wetlands. The wetlands are hydrologically connected to the Goleta Slough.

Goleta Slough. The Goleta Slough is a 430-acre area that sustains salt marsh, seasonal freshwater wetlands and upland habitats. The slough is located north and northeast of the Storke Campus, a minimum of approximately 3,000 feet northeast of the project site. Several creeks and their tributaries drain into the slough, including Tecolotito, Carneros and Atascadero Creeks. The slough ultimately drains to the Pacific Ocean. Sources of runoff into the slough include the UCSB Storke Campus, the northern portion of the Main Campus, and the More Mesa area east of UC Santa Barbara. Sedimentation from upland sources is a substantial problem within the slough as small changes in the ground surface elevation affect tidal flushing within the saltmarsh. Littoral drift beach sands also close the mouth of the slough, which limits tidal flushing and causes oxygen depletion of slough waters.

The Clean Water Act requires states to adopt water quality standards for receiving water bodies and to have those standards approved by the EPA. Water quality standards consist of designated beneficial uses for a particular receiving water body (e.g., wildlife habitat, agricultural supply, fishing etc.), along with water quality criteria necessary to support those uses. When designated beneficial uses of a particular receiving water body are being compromised by water quality, Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires identifying and listing that water body as “impaired.” Once a water body has been deemed impaired, a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) must be developed for the impairing pollutant(s). A TMDL is an estimate of the total load of pollutants from point, non-point, and natural sources that a water body may receive without exceeding applicable water quality standards. The Goleta Slough is listed as a water quality limited segment by the 2010 Clean Water Act 303.d list. Pollutants affecting the Slough include pathogens and priority organics. A TMDL standard for pathogens is to be prepared in 2013 and a TMDL for organics is due in 2021 (U.S. EPA, 2010).
Devereux Slough. The Devereux Slough is located on the UCSB West Campus, on property controlled primarily through the University’s Coal Oil Point Reserve. The Slough is approximately 45 acres in area and remnant habitats of a formerly larger lagoon are located to the north of the present Slough boundaries. The Slough empties into the Pacific Ocean through a tidal channel and narrow lagoon that is frequently closed by a sand berm. When freshwater runoff is sufficient to breach the berm, the entire slough empties rapidly. The Devereux Slough is fed primarily be Devereux Creek. Devereux Creek drains a 2,240-acre watershed and enters the northern end of the Slough. The lower portion of the Devereux Creek watershed is substantially urbanized, and the upper portion consists primarily of native vegetation and agricultural lands. Approximately 60 percent of the watershed area has been developed with urban uses. The Devereux Slough is not included on the 2010 Clean Water Act 303.d list, however, Devereux Creek has been listed for pathogen and nutrient impacts. (U.S. EPA, 2010).

100-Year Flood Areas. The Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map for the Project area indicates that a 100-year flood area has been designated in low-lying areas near the project site, including the Storke Wetlands and Goleta Slough. The 100-year flood plain area located closest to the project site is in the Storke Wetlands, approximately 800 feet northeast of the site (UCSB, 2010).

Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater at UCSB occurs primarily as perched groundwater and is not a potable resource. Perched groundwater is created when water percolates through permeable terrace deposits until it encounters relatively impermeable siltstone and shale bedrock formations. The quality of this groundwater is generally poor, with very high levels of total dissolved solids that exceed drinking water standards. Groundwater at the project site was encountered at depths of approximately 15 to 20 feet below the ground surface during recent geological investigations (Fugro, 2012).

Storm Water Management

UCSB has been designated by the State Water Resources Control Board as a non-traditional small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) under the State’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for stormwater discharges. As a small MS4, the Campus is required to enroll in the State’s General NPDES Permit for stormwater discharges, and must prepare a Storm Water Management Plan that meets criteria specified by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

UCSB has prepared a Storm Water Management Plan (March, 2010) that addresses six general control measures: 1) public education and outreach on stormwater impacts; 2) public involvement and participation; 3) illicit discharge detection and elimination; 4) construction site stormwater runoff control; 5) post-construction stormwater management in new development and redevelopment; and 6) pollution prevention/good housekeeping for facilities operation and
maintenance. The Storm Water Management Plan also identifies the following pollutants of concern associated with residential projects:

- Sediment
- Pathogens
- Hydrocarbons (oil and grease, lubricants)
- Pesticides
- Toxics (organics, hazardous wastes)
- Nutrients
- Gross pollutants (litter, trash, debris)

Under the requirements of the post-construction stormwater management control measure, UCSB is participating in the “Joint Effort” process with other MS4s in the Central Coast Region to develop hydromodification control criteria. Urban development often results in an increase in impervious surface areas, which changes the project site’s storm water runoff characteristics. These effects are referred to as “hydromodification” and can result in increased stormwater runoff volume, velocity, temperature, and discharge duration. Hydromodification can also result in increased erosion and sedimentation, and may also contribute to increases in nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, metals, hydrocarbons, organic debris and litter contained in runoff water. The purpose of the hydromodification control criteria are to protect beneficial uses and promote the desired conditions of healthy watersheds to the maximum extent practical, including:

- Maximize infiltration of clean stormwater and minimize runoff volume and rate.
- Protect riparian areas, wetlands and their buffer zones.
- Minimize pollutant loading.
- Provide long-term watershed protection.

In addition to the construction site stormwater control requirements of the UCSB Storm Water Management Plan, UCSB is required to file a Notice of Intent to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit, and develop and implement a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for individual construction projects are one acre or more in size. The SWPPP has two major objectives: (1) to help identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that affect the quality of storm water discharges; and (2) to describe and ensure the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate sediment and other pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. The SWPPP must include BMPs that address source control, BMPs that address pollutant control, and BMPs that address treatment control. The current General Permit for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity (Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ) also contains provisions for determining a project’s risk level, and specific project site implementation requirements based on the results of the risk determination.
LRDP Requirements

Water quality protection policies provided by the 2010 LRDP require that construction projects minimize and contain sediment and other pollutants during construction projects. Similar measures are provided by the 1990 LRDP. Water quality protection policies applicable to the San Joaquin Apartments project are listed below.

ERO-1 North and West Campus construction projects shall be scheduled during the dry months of the year (May through October), whenever possible.

ERO-2 If grading occurs during the rainy season (November through April), sediment traps, barriers, covers or other methods shall be used to reduce erosion and sedimentation.

ERO-3 A site-specific erosion control and landscape plan shall be prepared for all new construction.

ERO-5 Excavated materials shall not be deposited or stored where the material can be washed away by high water or storm runoff.

ERO-6 Grading operations on-campus shall be conducted so as to prevent damaging effects of sediment production and dust on the site and on adjoining properties.

ERO-7 When vegetation must be removed on-campus, the method shall be one that will minimize the erosive effects from the removal.

ERO-8 Exposure of soil to erosion by removing vegetation shall be limited to the area required for construction operations. The construction area should be fenced to define project boundaries.

ERO-9 Removal of existing vegetation on campus is to be minimized wherever possible.

ERO-10 Temporary mulching or other suitable stabilization measures shall be used to protect exposed areas during construction or other land disturbance activities on campus.

ERO-11 Topsoil removed from the surface in preparation for grading and construction on-campus is to be stored on or near the site and protected from erosion while grading operations are underway, provided that such storage may not be located where it would cause suffocation of root systems of trees intended to be preserved. After completion of such grading, topsoil is to be restored to exposed
cut and fill embankments of building pads so as to provide a suitable base for seeding and planting

**ERO-12** Slopes, both cut and fill, on campus shall not be steeper than 2:1 unless a geological and engineering analysis indicates that steeper slopes are safe and erosion control measures are specified.

**ERO-13** Slopes on campus shall not be constructed so as to endanger or disturb adjoining property.

**ERO-14** Sediment basins, sediment traps, or similar sediment control measures shall be installed before extensive clearing and grading operations begin for campus development.

**ERO-15** Neither wet concrete, nor slurries thereof, shall be permitted to enter any campus wetlands.

**ERO-16** Projects shall be designed to minimize soil erosion and, where possible, to direct surface runoff away from coastal waters and wetlands, according to the following policies:

(a) North, West and Storke Campus site development is to be accomplished, wherever feasible, in a manner that will maximize percolation and infiltration of precipitation into the ground.

(b) During campus development, sediment shall be retained on the site.

(d) Projects shall be designed to conduct storm water drainage away Devereux Slough and Storke Campus Wetlands, wherever feasible.

(e) If storm water can only be feasibly discharged into campus wetlands it shall comply in all respects to all applicable standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

(k) New development adjacent to the required 100-foot building setback surrounding the upland limit of the wetland shall not result in significant adverse impacts due to additional sediment, nutrients, pollutants, and other disturbances.

(l) All sewage from campus development shall be disposed of in sanitary sewer lines or approved septic tank system subject to design and performance requirements of the Regional Water Quality Board.

**ERO-17** Drainage and runoff shall not significantly adversely affect campus wetlands.

**ERO-18** If feasible, the near slopes along the edge of the wetlands shall remain an undisturbed buffer area.
ERO-19 Pollutants which have a significant adverse effect on coastal resources shall not be allowed to enter the area through drainage systems.

ERO-20 The sediment load in runoff from campus properties into wetlands shall be minimized through the use of bioswales, bio filters and other devices as appropriate.

FIL-1 Fills shall not encroach on Devereux Slough, Storke Campus Wetlands, Campus Lagoon or any other natural watercourses or constructed channels on campus.

6.9.2 Checklist Responses

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Standards for the protection of water quality are provided by the UCSB Stormwater Management Plan. The Plan’s minimum control measures most applicable to the San Joaquin Apartments project are construction site stormwater runoff control; and post-construction stormwater management in new development and redevelopment. The latter control measure includes requirements to minimize hydromodification impacts and encourages the use of low impact development measures to minimize long-term discharges of pollutants.

**Short-Term Impacts.** Short-term, construction-related water quality impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to the maximum extent possible by complying with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, implementing a site-specific SWPPP, and complying with LRDP erosion control and water quality protection policies. Additional information regarding construction-related impacts of the proposed project is provided in response “c” below.

**Long-Term Impacts**

**Pollutant Discharges.** The UCSB Storm Water Management Plan identifies pollutants of concern associated with residential development that have the potential to adversely affect water quality on the UCSB campus. The potential for the San Joaquin Apartments project to result in long-term discharges of pollutants of concern and the potential for those discharges to result in significant water quality impacts are evaluated below.

**Sediment.** Sediment is a common component of stormwater and is considered a pollutant of concern because it can harm aquatic life and transport other pollutants that are attached to it, such as trace metals, nutrients and hydrocarbons. After completing the construction of the San Joaquin Apartments project, the project site would be covered by structures, impervious surfaces or landscaping, which would reduce the potential for the site to be a substantial long-term source of sediment discharges. In addition, the proposed project would include the use of bioswales to treat storm water prior to off-site discharge, and
bioswales are an effective treatment mechanism to reduce the sediment load in runoff water. Although it is unlikely that the proposed project site would be a substantial long-term source of erosion and sediment, discharges of sediment could result in **potentially significant impacts** to the wetland areas adjacent to the site, as well as the Storke Wetlands and the Goleta Slough. Therefore, the potential for the project site to be a source of sediment production, and the adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed sediment control measures should be evaluated by a project EIR.

**Pathogens.** Sources of pathogens such as bacteria and viruses typically include animal wastes, human encampments, and overflows from wastewater systems. The residential units and other facilities that would be provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project would not facilitate keeping domestic pets, therefore, the Project would not be a substantial source of animal waste in runoff water. All domestic wastewater from the Project site would be discharged to the sewer system through pipes installed to serve the project. Therefore, the project would not be a substantial source of pathogens that could adversely affect receiving waters, including the Goleta Slough, which has been designated as being impaired by pathogens. The proposed project would not be a substantial source of pathogen discharges and the project’s impact to water quality related to this pollutant would be **less than significant**. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

**Hydrocarbons.** Hydrocarbons such as oil and grease include a wide array of compounds, some of which are toxic to aquatic organisms at low concentrations. Hydrocarbons in runoff water can also include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), which can be toxic depending on concentration levels, exposure history and organism sensitivity. Parking areas currently provided at the project site would be a source of hydrocarbon discharges.

The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the removal of the existing surface parking lots currently provided on the project site, however, a new 1.5-acre parking lot would be developed on the west side of Storke Road. The use of existing parking capacity provided by the Parking Lot 50 structure would not result in a substantial new source of hydrocarbon pollution. The project-related reduction in existing parking lot area would have a beneficial effect on the quality of runoff leaving the project site by reducing the size of an area source for oil and grease pollution. The potential for substantial runoff water quality impacts resulting from the use of a new parking lot on the west side of Storke Road would be minimized by the proposed parking lot design, which would include bioswales and filtration planters. Although it is unlikely that the proposed project would be a substantial long-term source of hydrocarbons, discharges from the project site could result in **potentially significant impacts** to receiving waters. Therefore, the potential for the project site to be a source of hydrocarbon discharges, and the adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed hydrocarbon control measures should be evaluated by a project EIR.
Pesticides. The presence of pesticides in water sources has the potential to result in a wide range of impacts, including elevated levels of pesticides in organisms and concerns related to human health. Pesticide use (including the use of insecticides, rodenticides, herbicides, fungicides and growth regulators) on the UCSB campus has been substantially reduced and UCSB has adopted an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program for the inside and outside of all on-campus structures (UCSB Use of Pesticides Policy 5435). IPM is a set of principles developed to reduce or eliminate pesticide use while minimizing pest damage, and an IPM Committee reviews and approves on-campus uses of pesticides. The UCSB Department of Housing and Residential Services has also implemented programs to limit pesticide use. Based on existing pesticide use practices implemented at UCSB, the proposed project site would not be a substantial source of pesticide-related pollutants. Discharges of pesticides from the Project site would be less than significant and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Toxics (organics, hazardous wastes). The UCSB Stormwater Management Plan indicates that the primary source of toxic materials from on-campus residential facilities would be from the use of household hazardous wastes. The use of hazardous materials at the San Joaquin Apartments project would be very limited, and would generally consist of items such as cleaners, paints and other similar substances. The Stormwater Management Plan describes a variety of “good housekeeping” best management practices that are implemented on the UCSB campus to minimize the release of toxic substances, including indoor and outdoor maintenance requirements, staff training, and hazardous waste management procedures. With the continued implementation of these requirements, the San Joaquin Apartments project would not be a substantial long-term source of toxic material discharges that could adversely affect receiving waters, including the Goleta Slough, which has been designated as being impaired by priority organics. “Priority organics” are generally chemicals such as chlorinated hydrocarbons or volatile organic compounds used in industrial or manufacturing process, or commonly found in pesticides. The proposed project would not be a substantial source of toxic substances and would have a less than significant impact to water quality in the project area resulting from toxic pollutants. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Nutrients. Nitrogen and phosphorus are the major plant nutrients used for fertilizing landscapes and can result in excessive or accelerated growth of aquatic vegetation. Other sources of nutrients in runoff water include the reclaimed water used on the UCSB Campus for landscape irrigation, leaking sewage pipes, animal wastes and discharging detergents to the ground surface (e.g., car washing). The UCSB Storm Water Management Plan identified measures that have been implemented at UCSB to reduce fertilizer use and the discharge of nutrients in runoff. These measures include:

- Designing and maintaining irrigation systems to ensure that minimal irrigation is applied to prevent runoff and conserve water.
• Implementation of a UCSB campus policy that prohibits pooling or discharge of irrigation water to storm drain inlets. This policy results in the reduction or elimination of runoff into receiving waters.

• Reductions in or the elimination of fertilizer use. Recycled water distributed by the Goleta Water District is used extensively for landscaping irrigation on campus. The recycled water contains background levels of nitrogen and other salts, which eliminates the need for applying additional fertilizer to ornamental plants.

With the implementation of existing landscape practices, the application of fertilizers and non-storm runoff from landscaped areas at the project site would be minimized. Although it is unlikely that the proposed project would be a substantial long-term source of nutrients, discharges of nutrients could result in potentially significant impacts to the wetland areas adjacent to the site, as well as the Storke Wetlands and the Goleta Slough. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in nutrient discharge-related impacts, and an evaluation of the adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed nutrient control measures, should be evaluated by a project EIR.

Gross pollutants. Gross pollutants can include items such as litter, trash, and vegetative matter. These materials can transmit other pollutants, result in unsightly conditions, and depress dissolved oxygen levels in water bodies. The UCSB Storm Water Management Plan indicates that UCSB implements a variety of “good housekeeping” best management practices to reduce accumulations of gross pollutants, including monthly sweeping of parking lots, inspections of storm drain inlets, daily removal of trash collected in receptacles, and providing receptacles with covers or lids. Although it is unlikely that the proposed project site would be a substantial long-term source of gross pollutants, discharges could result in potentially significant impacts to receiving waters. Therefore, the potential for the project site to be a source of gross pollutants and the adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed control measures should be evaluated by a project EIR.

Hydromodification. The UCSB Storm Water Management Plan includes requirements for new development to implement measures that minimize the effects of hydromodification. These measures can include providing facilities that temporarily retain or slow runoff from leaving the site, which can also enhance percolation of rainfall into the ground; minimizing effects on sensitive habitats by reducing water quality impacts and changes to existing hydrologic conditions; reducing the amount and/or concentration of pollutants in runoff water; reducing the area of impermeable surfaces on the project site; and “disconnecting” large continuous areas of impermeable surfaces.

The project site is predominately covered with impervious surfaces, with the exception of the turf areas along the eastern project border and the proposed parking lot area on the west side of Storke Road. Most of the proposed apartment units would be developed in
existing parking areas, however, some units would be provided in the eastern turf area and a new parking lot would be provided in a turf area west of Storke Road. The project would not result in a substantial increase in total impervious surface area, however, some additional impervious area would be provided, which could result in an increase in runoff rate and volume discharged from the project site. To minimize the potential for hydromodification impacts, the project would provide a variety of low impact development design features. Low impact development design is an approach to stormwater management that uses small scale controls and on-site treatment so that post-development hydrologic conditions are similar to pre-development conditions. Low impact development practices are often implemented using project design features that filter, detain, infiltrate and evaporation runoff water close to its source. These types of features can include vegetated swales, detention basins and numerous other design features. Low impact design features that would be provided on the project site include bioswales, bio-filtration planters, vegetated buffers, pervious paving materials, and bioretention areas. Although these features would likely reduce project-related impacts to stormwater runoff characteristics, a substantial change in existing conditions could result in potentially significant hydromodification impacts on and adjacent to the project site, particularly to the wetland areas east of and adjacent to the site. The adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed low impact development/hydromodification reduction measures should be evaluated by a project EIR.

b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in direct withdrawals of ground water or result in a substantial increase in impervious surface area that would reduce groundwater recharge. In addition, the UCSB Campus is located south of the Goleta Groundwater Basin, which is a source of groundwater in the project region. The southern extent of the Goleta Groundwater Basin is located along the North Branch of the More Ranch fault, which is north of the UCSB campus. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact to the recharge of local groundwater supplies.

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Short-Term Impacts. Construction activities required to implement the San Joaquin Apartments project, such as the removal of asphalt paving, the removal of landscaping, and the excavation of trenches and the temporary storage of soil, would result in ground disturbing activities that have the potential to result in erosion and sedimentation impacts.
A temporary increase in erosion and sedimentation would have the potential to result in significant water quality impacts. The proposed project would affect an area of more than one acre, therefore, existing regulations require that the project contractor file a Notice of Intent to obtain coverage under the NPDES State Construction General Permit, and prepare and implement a SWPPP that has been reviewed and approved by the UCSB Office of Environmental Health and Safety. The plan must contain appropriate best management practices to control erosion, sedimentation and the discharge of other construction materials (e.g., solid and sanitary wastes; fertilizers; oil, grease or other hydrocarbons; concrete truck washout wastewater; construction chemicals and construction debris). The plan must also include provisions for conducting inspections during construction, and for reporting to the Central Coast RWQCB. Coverage under the Construction General Permit, the implementation of a project-specific SWPPP prepared for the proposed project, and compliance with LRDP erosion control measures would be adequate to substantially reduce the potential for short-term water quality impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, the project’s short-term water quality impact would be less than significant and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Long Term Impacts. Please refer to response “a” provided above. That analysis concluded it is unlikely that the proposed project would not be a substantial long-term source of erosion and sediment, however, discharges of sediment could result in potentially significant impacts to the wetland areas adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the potential for the project to be a long-term source of sediment production, and the adequacy (i.e., size) and effectiveness of proposed sediment control measures should be evaluated by a project EIR.

d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Several areas subject to flooding during a 100-year storm have been identified in the vicinity of the project site. These areas include: the Storke Wetlands and adjacent low-lying areas located approximately 500 feet east of the project site; areas adjacent to Devereux Creek and Devereux Slough, approximately 1,500 feet west of the project site; and a small drainage channel on the Ocean Meadows golf course, approximately 700 feet northwest of the project site. The 100-year floodplain for the Storke Wetland area is located adjacent to the UCSB Storke Family Housing and Santa Ynez Apartment housing projects (UCSB, 2010).

Although it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in a substantial increase in runoff directed to an area subject to flooding during a 100-year storm, a project-related change in existing hydrologic conditions, particularly in the Storke Wetland area, could result in potentially significant flooding-related impacts to adjacent development. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in or contribute to flooding impacts, and
an evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of proposed runoff management measures, should be evaluated by a project EIR.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The proposed project would result in the development of new residential units on a portion of the mowed turf area on the east side of the project site, and would also result in the development of a new parking lot on the west side of Storke Road, which is also presently covered with turf. A project-related increase in existing stormwater discharge characteristics could result in potentially significant impacts to drainage systems located on and adjacent to the project site. The adequacy of stormwater control measures/existing and proposed drainage systems should be evaluated by a project EIR.

Please refer to response “a” above regarding the potential for the project to result in additional sources of polluted runoff.

f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Short- and long-term water quality impacts of the San Joaquin Apartments project are evaluated in items “a” and “c” above.

g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

Designated 100-year flood hazard areas in the project area are described in response “d” provided above. The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in the development of any housing, or the placement of any structures in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to flooding of proposed structures. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in the development of any structures in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to flooding of proposed structures. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
i. *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project site is not located within 100-year floodplain area. There are no drainage courses on or near the project site that would be affected by flooding caused by the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to flooding of proposed structures. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

Please refer to response “e” above regarding the potential for flooding-related impacts to structures located adjacent to the project site.

j. *Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

The California Emergency Management Agency has prepared Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning (2009) that identify areas that could be affected by a tsunami. The hazard map prepared for the Goleta area indicates that areas near the UCSB campus that could be affected by a tsunami include the Goleta Slough, Campus Lagoon and the Devereaux Slough. The designated Devereux Slough hazard area is approximately 1,000 feet west of project site, and is the hazard area closest to the site. The portion of the Devereux Slough hazard area closest to the project site has an elevation of approximately seven feet above sea level, while the elevation of the project site closest to the Slough is approximately 32 feet above sea level. Water bodies near the project site, such as the Devereux Slough, are too shallow to result in a significant seiche impact, and there are no slopes on or near the project site that would have the potential to result in a significant mudflow impact. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to inundation hazards. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

### 6.9.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant hydrology and water quality impacts. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The items to be evaluated by the EIR include:

1. Potential long-term increases in discharges of pollutants of concern from the project site, including sediment, hydrocarbons, nutrients and gross pollutants. This analysis should also evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of proposed low impact development project design features that are intended to reduce pollutant discharges.

2. Potential for project-related hydromodification impacts and the adequacy and effectiveness of proposed low impact development project design features intended to reduce hydromodification impacts.
3. Potential project-related impacts related to an increase in flooding hazards in the project area, and the adequacy and effectiveness of proposed low impact development project design features intended to minimize possible off-site flooding impacts.

4. Potential impacts to the capacity of existing and proposed stormwater drainage systems.
### 6.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the LRDP, general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.10.1 Setting

Land use planning requirements for the UCSB campus are provided by the 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which was approved by the Regents in September 2010. The LRDP identifies and describes the physical development needed to achieve the campus’s academic goals through 2025; is a land use plan for the development of future campus facilities; and addresses the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976. The California Coastal Commission has not yet certified the 2010 LRDP and must determine that it is consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act before it can be certified. After certification by the Coastal Commission, the 2010 LRDP will serve as the UCSB Local Coastal Plan and proposed development projects must be consistent with the land use designation and policies provided by the Plan. Until the 2010 LRDP is certified, proposed projects that require a Notice of Impending Development from the Coastal Commission must be found to be consistent with the requirements of the previously adopted 1990 LRDP.

**2010 LRDP.** The 2010 LRDP identifies five major goals and identifies how elements of the LRDP implement each of the goals. The five goals of the 2010 LRDP are:
• Mature the academic programs
• Strengthen the campus form
• House students, faculty and staff
• Integrate sustainable practices
• Contribute to regional solutions

The 2010 LRDP applied a “Housing” land use designation to the project site, including the area west of and adjacent to Storke Road that would be used for project-related parking. Parking is an allowed use under the “Housing” land use designation. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the land use requirements of the 2010 LRDP.

The LRDP indicates that the project site would be used for the development of the “Santa Catalina (FT) Addition,” which was estimated to provide 168 units for 600 undergraduate students. The proposed project would revise the 2010 LRDP to transfer 400 planned student beds spaces to the project site from the dormitory area located on the east side of the Main Campus. The project would also result in the development of 191 residential units on the project site (167 student units and 24 units for staff, faculty and visitors), which is 23 more units than was identified by the 2010 LRDP. To accommodate the increase in total units on the project site, the project includes a request that the UC Regents revise the 2010 LRDP to transfer 23 residential units to the project site from the units planned for the West Campus Family Apartments. By shifting bed spaces and units to the project site from other planned housing sites, the total number of additional bed spaces and residential units to be provided on the UCSB campus will not exceed the development goals specified by the 2010 LRDP.

1990 LRDP. The 1990 LRDP does not address the proposed project site as the Santa Catalina property was obtained by UCSB in 2003, after the 1990 LRDP was prepared. However, the 1990 LRDP indicates that “the role of the Storke Campus is to support the academic, recreational, housing and parking needs of the Main Campus.” UCSB has requested that the Coastal Commission amend the 1990 LRDP to reflect the land use and policy requirements of the 2010 LRDP. If the Coastal Commission has not approved the requested amendment to the 1990 LRDP before their action on the San Joaquin project, UCSB may request that the Coastal Commission consider a separate amendment to the 1990 LRDP to add the San Joaquin project to the existing 1990 LRDP and to apply a “Student Housing” land use designation the site.

Prior to the University’s acquisition of the Santa Catalina residence hall, the Goleta Community Plan (County of Santa Barbara 1993) applied a “Multiple Residential” land use designation to the project site. The land use designation required a minimum land area of 1,450 square feet per unit, and allowed a maximum density of 30.0 units per acre.

Adjacent Land Uses. Existing land uses adjacent to the project site include the Storke Ranch residential community to the north; Storke Road and the UCSB West Campus Family
Apartments to the west; El Colegio Road and the Isla Vista Elementary School to the south; and an open space parcel to the east.

6.10.2 Checklist Responses

a. Physically divide an established community?

The San Joaquin Apartments project site has been previously developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall (formerly known as Francisco Torres). The development of additional residential units on this site, and providing project-related parking on the west side of Storke Road, would have no impact regarding this significance criterion. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the LRDP, general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would be consistent with the “Housing” land use designation applied to the project site by the 2010 LRDP. A revision to the LRDP would be required to provide more residential units and bed spaces than were estimated for the site by the LRDP. The project EIR will evaluate potential impacts that would result from shifting 400 bed spaces and from the planned expansion of the dormitory area on the eastern portion of the Main Campus to the project site, and potential impacts from shifting 23 residential units from the planned expansion of the West Campus Family Apartments to the project site. The “Housing” land use designation applied to the project site by the 2010 LRDP will not become effective until the 2010 LRDP has been certified by the California Coastal Commission. Until the 2010 LRDP is certified, the Coastal Commission will require that the project be found to be consistent with the requirements of the previously adopted 1990 LRDP. Amendments to the 1990 LRDP would be required because the project site was not part of UCSB when the 1990 LRDP was prepared.

The 1990 LRDP and the 2010 LRDP contain numerous policies that implement the requirements of the California Coastal Act. The project’s consistency with all applicable policies of the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs cannot be evaluated until the environmental impact analysis of the project is completed. Therefore, a determination regarding the project’s consistency with the applicable policies of the LRDP cannot be made at this time and the project could result in potentially significant policy consistency impacts.

The Isla Vista Master Plan has been adopted by Santa Barbara County and includes policies and actions to improve the interface between Isla Vista and the Main Campus. Although the University is not subject to local land use controls, the San Joaquin
Apartments project will be evaluated to determine how it implements the UCSB/Isla Vista interface objectives of the Isla Vista Master Plan.

c. *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans have been adopted for the UCSB Campus. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to this significance criterion. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

### 6.10.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The EIR will evaluate potential impacts from shifting additional bed spaces and residential units to the project site from other development sites identified by the 2010 LRDP. A determination regarding the San Joaquin Apartments project’s consistency with policies of the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs cannot be completed at this time. Additional evaluation of the project’s relationship to applicable policies in an EIR is required. An analysis of the project’s consistency with applicable policies of the Isla Vista Master Plan will also be provided.
6.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

-- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? □ □ □ □ ✔

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? □ □ □ □ ✔

6.11.1 Setting

There are no mineral resources or existing mineral resource recovery operations located on or near the UCSB campus.

6.11.2 Checklist Responses

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

See response provided below under item “b.”

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not limit the availability of mineral resources to the project area or region, or interfere with mineral resource recovery operations. Therefore, the project would have no impact on mineral resources.

6.11.3 Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have no impacts related to the production of mineral resources. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.12 NOISE - Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in any applicable plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (including construction)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.12.1 Setting

**Noise Characteristics.** Noise may be described as “unwanted or objectionable sound.” It is common to measure sound magnitude in decibels (dB), which is a logarithmic scale. A doubling of sound intensity is represented by a 3 dB increase in sound level. Generally, a 1 dB increase is barely perceptible to the human ear, a 3 dB increase is clearly noticeable, and a 10 dB increase is perceived as a doubling in sound.

One method that is used to express a measured noise value is the “equivalent noise level” (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady noise level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating noise levels over a period of time. Typically, Leq is summed over a period of approximately one-hour. Another method to express a noise measurement is to use a day-night average sound level (Ldn). Ldn is the time average of noise levels for a 24-hour period with a 10 dB addition to noises occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. This adjustment accounts for the increased sensitivity of people to nighttime noise. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is similar to the Ldn, except the CNEL adds 5 dB to evening noise levels (7:00 PM to 10:00 PM).

**Existing Noise Sources.** Existing sources of noise on the project site include general activities of the 1,325 undergraduate student occupants of the existing Santa Catalina residence hall, and noise from the parking lots currently provided on the project site. Other existing sources of noise that affect the project area include traffic noise generated by Santa Catalina residents and other traffic that occurs on project area roadways, on- and off-campus construction activities, and aircraft operation associated with the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

**Noise Sensitive Receptors.** Land uses or receptors located on or near the proposed project site considered to be sensitive to elevated noise levels include: project site residents; residents of the Storke Ranch residential area; residents along Storke Road, including the UCSB West Campus Family Apartments; residents along El Colegio Road, including the UCSB San Clemente project, the UCSB Santa Ynez Apartments, and residents in the community of Isla Vista; the Isla Vista Elementary School; and residents of the UCSB Storke Family Housing project.

6.12.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in any applicable plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

The potential for the San Joaquin Apartments project to result in short-term construction-related noise impacts in excess of established standards is evaluated in response “d” provided below.
The potential for the San Joaquin Apartments project to result in long-term noise impacts to land uses adjacent to and in the vicinity of the project site is evaluated in response “c” provided below.

b. Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the construction of 17 new buildings and a new parking lot located near existing residential uses and the Isla Vista Elementary School. Construction projects have the potential to be a short-term source of vibrations that can cause potentially significant impacts, such as structural damage or annoyance to building occupants. Additional analysis of potential vibration impact to residential buildings adjacent to the project site is required.

c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

New residential units and other uses that would be provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in activities (i.e., outdoor recreation, socialization among residents, vehicle operation, etc.) that are similar to the activities that currently result from the occupancy of the Santa Catalina residence hall. The project would also remove a large parking lot, a potentially significant noise source, from the northern portion of the project site. The proposed project, however, would result in a substantial increase in the on-site resident population and would provide additional outdoor recreation facilities. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant noise impacts to nearby land uses. Potential noise-related impacts would be most likely to result from the following project-related components:

- 14 of the proposed residential building would be provided on the northern portion of the project site in an area that is presently used to provide parking for the Santa Catalina residence hall. Possible noise sources in this project area would include activities by project residents and mechanical equipment that serves the new units. Changes in existing noise characteristics resulting from proposed development on this portion of the project site would have the greatest potential to affect residents in the Storke Ranch community, which is north of and adjacent to the project site. Noise from this project area could also affect future residents of the Sierra Madre Family Housing project, which is located northwest of the proposed project site; and the West Campus Family Apartments, which are located west of the project site.

- Two six-story buildings would be provided on the western portion of the project site. This project area is currently used as a parking lot. Changes in existing noise characteristics resulting from proposed development on this
portion of the project site would have the greatest potential to affect residents of the UCSB West Campus Family Apartments; future residents of the Sierra Madre Family Housing project; and the Isla Vista Elementary School, which is located south of the project site.

- A four-story building would be provided in the eastern portion of the project site near El Colegio Road. This project area is currently occupied by a bicycle parking area and a mowed turf area. Changes in existing noise characteristics resulting from development on this portion of the project site would have the greatest potential to affect the Isla Vista Elementary School and nearby residences in Isla Vista that are also adjacent to El Colegio Road.

- A new 224-space parking lot that would serve both the existing Santa Catalina and the proposed San Joaquin Apartments projects would be provided in an area currently occupied by a mowed turf area on the west side of Storke Road. Changes in existing noise characteristics resulting from development of a new parking lot would have the greatest potential to affect the West Campus Apartments.

The proposed project would utilize available parking capacity provided in in Parking Lot 50, a five-story structure located at the northeast corner of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road on the Storke Campus. The project would also facilitate the re-use of floor space currently use as a dining commons in the existing podium building, which is located between the two residential towers. Project-related use of the existing parking structure would have a less than significant noise impact to nearby residences, and potential future use of interior floor space within the existing podium building would have no impact to existing noise conditions in the project area.

A potentially significant project-related noise impact could also occur if existing or future traffic conditions along El Colegio Road or Storke Road would cause the proposed residences to be exposed to exterior noise levels in excess of 65 dBA, or if interior noise levels within the proposed residences were to exceed 45 dBA. A significant noise impact would also occur if traffic generated by the San Joaquin Apartments project were to cause existing residences, such as those adjacent to El Colegio Road and Storke Road, to experience ambient noise levels in excess of adopted standards. Additional analysis is required to determine if existing, existing plus project, or cumulative traffic noise levels along El Colegio Road and Storke Road in the project vicinity would result in a significant traffic noise impact to residences adjacent to those roadways.
d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Development of the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in construction operations, such as the removal of existing paving, grading, general building construction activities, and construction-related traffic on roadways near the project site. Construction-related noise could result in potentially significant short-term noise impacts to nearby on-campus and off-campus land uses.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that the San Joaquin Apartments project site is approximately 1,600 feet south of the 60 dBA CNEL contour line that results from aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, aircraft noise would result in less than significant noise impacts to the proposed project. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The UCSB campus is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact to the proposed project resulting from noise generated by aircraft operations at a private airstrip. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

6.12.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant noise impacts to sensitive receptors located on and near the project site. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The items to be evaluated by the EIR include:

1. Short-term construction activity and traffic noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.

2. Construction-related vibration impacts to adjacent land uses.

3. Long-term project-related noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.

4. Long-term traffic noise impacts to on-site residences and residences adjacent to El Colegio Road and Storke Road.
6.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING –
Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

   □   □   □   □   ✓   □

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

   □   □   □   □   □   ✓

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

   □   □   □   □   □   ✓

6.13.1 Setting

The project site has been developed with the Santa Catalina residence hall, which provides 1,325 bed spaces primarily for UCSB freshman.

The 2010 LRDP proposes to increase student enrollment at UCSB from 20,000 to 25,000 over a fifteen year period at a rate of approximately one percent per year, and to provide housing for all of the additional students. The 2010 LRDP EIR concluded that since UCSB would provide housing for the planned increase in enrollment, implementation of the 2010 LRDP would not result in significant direct housing impacts in the project region. A significant and unavoidable housing impact could occur, however, if housing proposed by the 2010 LRDP was not provided at a rate commensurate with enrollment growth. The 2010 LRDP EIR also concluded that implementation of the 2010 LRDP had the potential to result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative housing impact resulting from an increased demand for housing that could result from combined growth at UCSB and other job/population growth in the region.
6.13.2 Checklist Responses

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide 1,000 bed spaces for undergraduate students at UCSB, which would be approximately 20 percent of the 4,766 net additional on-campus bed spaces proposed by the 2010 LRDP. With the implementation of the proposed project, on-campus housing opportunities would be provided in the near-term at a rate that exceeds planned student enrollment growth. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts related population growth and regional housing supply.

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not be a substantial source of additional employment at UCSB or result in substantial off-campus job or population growth. Therefore, the project’s cumulative contribution related to an increased demand for housing in the region would not be cumulatively considerable and a less than significant impact.

Urban infrastructure, such as roadways, water and sewer service, are located on the project site to serve the Santa Catalina residence hall. Therefore, new urban infrastructure would not be extended to the project site and the San Joaquin Apartments project would have no impact related to growth inducing effects resulting from infrastructure extensions.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

See response “c” below.

c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in the removal of any residential units or result in the displacement of any people. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to the need for replacement housing.

6.13.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in significant impacts to housing or result in an increase in the population of the project region. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
6.14 PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?
☐ ☐ ☐ ✓ ☐

b) Police protection?
☐ ☐ ☐ ✓ ☐

c) Schools?
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

d) Parks?
☐ ☐ ✓ ☐ ☐

e) Other public facilities?
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

6.14.1 Setting

Fire Protection. UCSB is located within the service area of the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, and the Santa Barbara County Fire Department provides fire prevention and suppression services to the UCSB Campus. There are two fire stations in the vicinity of the proposed housing project. Fire Station No. 17 is located on the UCSB Main Campus, near the intersection of Mesa and Stadium Roads, and is approximately 1.1 miles northeast of the project site. Fire Station No. 11 is located off-campus on Storke Road north of Phelps Road, and is approximately 0.6 of a mile from the project site.

The review and approval of campus development plans for compliance with fire protection-related requirements is the responsibility of the UCSB Fire Protection Division of the Environmental Health and Safety Department. An employee of the on-campus Fire Protection Division has been designated as a “Campus Fire Marshall” by the State Fire Marshall’s Office. The Campus Fire Marshall reviews development plans for compliance with applicable fire codes,
and coordinates with the County of Santa Barbara Fire Department on design-related issues such as access and hydrant locations.

**Police Protection.** The UCSB Police Department is responsible for the safety and security of the UCSB campus as well as properties owned, controlled or occupied by the University. The Police Department is open 24 hours a day and is located in the Public Safety Building, which is approximately 1.1 miles northeast of the project site. University Police officers, Santa Barbara County Sheriffs Deputies and California Highway Patrol officers also work together to staff the Isla Vista Foot Patrol, whose office is located in Isla Vista along the western edge of the Main Campus.

**Schools.** UCSB is located within the Goleta Union School District and the Santa Barbara High School District.

**Parks.** Numerous and varied recreation facilities for UCSB students, faculty and staff, and the public are provided on the UCSB Campus. Other park facilities are provided in the project region by the cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta, the County of Santa Barbara and the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District.

### 6.14.2 Checklist Responses

*Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

a) **Fire Protection**

As reported by the 2010 LRDP EIR, Santa Barbara County has indicated that Fire Station 17 is currently deficient and is overburdened because only three firefighters staff the station. Based on the County’s minimum service standard for fire protection of one firefighter per 4,000 people, the station is designed to serve a population up to 12,000 residents. Isla Vista’s population is approximately 18,344 and the UCSB on-campus resident population was estimated to be 9,144 by the 2010 LRDP EIR. Therefore, the area served by Station 17 is approximately 27,488 people, more than twice as many as the station is designed to serve. Station 11, which is located off-campus, can also provide service to UCSB, however, this option is usually reserved in the event of simultaneous emergencies, as Station 11 has its own service area.

The 2010 LRDP EIR identified mitigation measures for LRDP-related impacts to fire protection services and facilities, including: UCSB would provide land adjacent to Fire Station 17 that the County could use to expand the fire station, or UCSB would pay its proportionate share of the cost of mitigating significant environmental effects resulting
from the construction of a fire station at a different site; and UCSB would continue to require that all new campus buildings over 5,000 square feet in area be sprinklered, which reduces the demand for fire suppression services. However, the expansion of Fire Station 17 or the construction of a new fire station cannot be implemented by the UCSB. Since a new fire station or the expansion of Station 17 were the only measures considered by the 2010 LRDP EIR to be adequate to reduce the identified service impact to a less than significant level, the EIR determined that impacts to fire protection resulting from the implementation of the 2010 LRDP would be significant and unavoidable.

Subsequent to the 2010 LRDP EIR’s analysis of the LRDP-related impacts to fire protection services, UCSB and the County of Santa Barbara entered into the 2010 Cooperative Agreement for Fire Protection, Emergency Response and Paramedic Services. This agreement indicates that the County will maintain adequate fire protection service levels commensurate with County standards, and UCSB will pay its fair share of the cost for additional fire personnel. The agreement does not require the expansion of Station No. 17. Based on the requirements of the agreement, fire protection service will be provided to UCSB adequate to serve land uses proposed by the 2010 LRDP, and as a result, the significant fire protection impact identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR would not occur.

With the implementation of the cooperative agreement requirements to provide adequate fire protection personnel to serve UCSB and the project area, the 1,000 bed spaces provided by the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in less than significant project-specific and cumulative fire protection impacts related to the expansion of facilities for fire protection services.

b) Police Protection

Additional on-campus population that would result from the occupancy of the San Joaquin Apartments project would increase service demands on the UCSB Police Department. The 2010 LRDP EIR indicates that the current facilities occupied by the UCSB Police Department have been identified as being inadequate to meet the current needs of the Department, and that additional public service building area proposed by the 2010 LRDP could be allocated for Police Department use. It is also anticipated that environmental impacts resulting from the development of the proposed public service building space could be reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures proposed by the 2010 LRDP EIR. As a result, the 2010 LRDP EIR concluded that the facilities required by the Police Department to serve the on-campus population after buildout of the 2010 LRDP would not result in significant environmental impacts on a project-specific or cumulative basis. The 2010 LRDP EIR also concluded that the 2010 LRDP would not result in a service demand increase to the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department such that physical effects on the environment would occur resulting from the need for additional facilities. Therefore, the San Joaquin Apartments
project would result in less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to the expansion of facilities for law enforcement services.

c) **Schools**

The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide housing primarily for single, undergraduate students while attending UCSB. As a result, occupants of the project would not have school-age children, and it is unlikely that on-site resident assistants or faculty members that would also reside on the project site would have school age children. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to an expansion of school facilities necessary to serve the proposed project.

d) **Parks**

An evaluation of impacts to park facilities in the San Joaquin Apartments project area is provided in section 6.15 (Recreation) of this Initial Study. That analysis concluded that the project’s impacts to on- and off-site recreation facilities can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures provided by the 2010 LRDP EIR.

e) **Other public facilities.**

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have no impact on other public facilities, such as libraries.

**6.14.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in significant public service impacts. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.
6.15 RECREATION - Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

   □   □   ✓   □   □

   |

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

   □   □   □   ✓   □

6.15.1 Setting

Numerous recreation facilities and opportunities exist on the UCSB Campus, including the Recreation Center, ball fields; tennis, basketball and volleyball courts; swimming pools; and open space areas that can be used for active and passive recreation activities. Numerous bicycle and pedestrian pathways and trails also provide access throughout the campus, and to adjoining beaches and other areas throughout the region. Other park facilities are provided by the Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta, the County of Santa Barbara and the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District.

The 2010 LRDP provides the following policy to address the demand for on-campus recreational resources:

REC-3 New housing projects, including those adjacent to coastal bluff-top parks and open space recreation areas, will contain recreational facilities and open space so that ocean-front recreational areas will not be burdened.
6.15.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project would facilitate an increase in the student population at UCSB, which could result in a corresponding increase in the demand for on- and off-site recreation facilities, including beach and coastal access ways. A project-related increase in the demand for existing on- and off-campus recreation facilities would be minimized by recreation facilities that are and would be provided on the project site. Existing recreation facilities include a swimming pool, tennis courts, turf areas for active and passive activities, and indoor gym facility. The proposed project would provide new volleyball and basketball courts, indoor recreation rooms, and would result in the removal of the existing tennis courts. The amount of turf area on the project site would be reduced, but a turf area suitable for active and passive recreation opportunities would be constructed as part of the proposed project. Other possible future recreation facilities that may be provided at the project site could include uses such as an expanded gym and a new movie theater. The potential to provide additional recreation facilities on the project site in the future is dependent upon funding opportunities and such facilities are not part of the proposed project at this time. In addition to existing and on-site recreation facilities that would be provided by the proposed project, UCSB provides a wide variety of other on-campus recreation facilities and opportunities.

UCSB currently maintains existing on-campus recreation facilities, therefore, an project-related incremental increase in the demand for on-campus recreation facilities would not result in a substantial deterioration of their condition. As described by the 2010 LRDP EIR impact REC-2, the University also maintains on-campus beach coastal access ways, which could experience increased use with the implementation of the proposed project, and 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measure REC-2B requires that the University continue to do so. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, potentially significant project-specific impacts to the physical condition of existing on-campus recreation facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The residents of the San Joaquin Apartments project may also use off-campus recreation facilities. However, given the extensive and varied recreation opportunities provided on-site and on the UCSB campus, the project-related demand for off-campus facilities is not expected to be substantial. To ensure that potential impacts (i.e., a substantial physical deterioration of facilities caused by a project-related increase in demand) to off-campus recreation facilities do not become significant, 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measure REC-2C requires that on-campus housing projects provide on-site recreation facilities. The recreation facilities that would be provided by the San Joaquin
Apartments project are described above. By providing on-site active and passive recreation opportunities, the demand for off-site facilities would be minimized and the potential for substantial physical deterioration impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. With the implementation of mitigation measure REC-2C and the requirements of LRDP policy REC-3, project-specific impact to off-campus recreation facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The 2010 LRDP EIR concluded that population growth facilitated by the 2010 LRDP, along with other population growth throughout the project region, would have the potential to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to on- and off-campus recreation facilities. The 2010 LRDP EIR also concluded that the LRDP’s contribution to this impact would result primarily from induced off-campus population growth, and that on- and off-campus projects that include recreation facilities would be less likely to contribute to cumulative recreation facility impacts. As described above, the San Joaquin Apartments project would not be a substantial source of additional employment at UCSB or result in substantial off-campus population growth; and the project would provide on-site recreation facilities. Therefore, the project would not substantially contribute to the region-wide cumulative recreation facility impact identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR, and the potential for the project to result in impacts to recreation facilities would be minimized by the implementation of LRDP policy REC-3 and EIR mitigation measures REC-2B and 2C. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts to on- and off-campus recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and would be reduced to a less than significant level.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Recreation facilities provided by the proposed project would include items such as basketball and volleyball courts, turf areas for active and passive activities, and indoor recreation rooms. The provision of these project components would not result in additional environmental impacts above those described by this Initial Study. No additional evaluation of recreation-related facility impacts is required.

6.15.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments project has the potential to result in project-specific and cumulative impacts to on- and off-site recreation facilities. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. The mitigation measures provided below were provided by the 2010 LRDP EIR as measures REC-2B and REC-2C, although mitigation measure REC-2C (measure 1b below) has been modified to be more applicable to the proposed project. No additional EIR analysis or mitigation measures are required.
1a. UCSB will continue to maintain adjacent beaches and coastal access trails for the use of all members of the public. These trails include:

- UCSB Sands Beach
- Depressions Beach
- West Campus Beach
- West Campus Bluffs Trail
- Dune Pond Trail
- Lagoon Trail
- Campus Point access “unnamed trail” near the Marine Science Building and REEF (Lagoon Berm Road)

1b. To reduce the demand upon nearby off-site parks, UCSB will provide appropriate recreation facilities in new housing developments.
### 6.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.16.1 Setting

Project Area Streets and Intersections. El Colegio Road and Storke Road are major streets in the vicinity of the San Joaquin Apartments project site and would provide access to the project. El Colegio Road is south of and adjacent to the project site and has been recently widened to four lanes. El Colegio Road serves as the main entrance to the western portion of the UCSB Main Campus and the UCSB West Campuses. Roadways that connect to the south side of El Colegio Road provide access into the community of Isla Vista. Storke Road is a two- to four-lane roadway located along the western perimeter of the project site and provides access between El Colegio Road and the City of Goleta to the north. Other major region-serving roadways in the project vicinity include U.S. Highway 101, State Route 217, Los Carneros Road and Hollister Avenue.

As reported by the 2010 LRDP EIR, most of the roadways in the project area operate at acceptable levels of service, however, the following roadway segments and sections of U.S. 101 exceed adopted standards for acceptable operation conditions:

- El Colegio Rd: Storke Rd to Los Carneros Rd
- Los Carneros Road: El Colegio Rd to Mesa Rd
- Los Carneros Rd: Mesa Rd to Hollister Ave
- Southbound 101 Just east of Hwy 217
- Northbound 101 Just east of Hwy 217

The 2010 LRDP EIR also indicates that most of the intersections in the project area operate at acceptable levels of service, however, the following intersections exceed adopted standards for acceptable operations:
### Intersection Impacts and Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Goleta Intersections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Ave/Storke Rd</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 NB Ramps/ Storke Rd, Glen Annie</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 SB Ramps/Storke Rd, Glen Annie</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Ave/Calle Real</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Ave/US 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Santa Barbara Intersections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Colegio Rd/Camino Del Sur</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Colegio Rd/Camino Pescadero</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Colegio Rd/Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Colegio Rd/Embarcadero Del Norte</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound On-Ramp at Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Off-Ramp at Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound On-Ramp at Los Carneros Rd</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Off-Ramp at Fairview Ave</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound On-Ramp at Fairview Ave</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound On-Ramp at Fairview Ave</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound On-Ramp at Patterson Ave</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Off-Ramp at Patterson Ave</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities
UCSB provides an extensive bicycle and pedestrian network on campus, and bicycling and walking are the two most popular modes for students traveling to campus. A regional system of bicycle routes is provided in the project area, and pathways that link the Storke Campus to the Main Campus are also provided.

### Transit System
The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) provides local bus service for the region, and operates six bus routes on and near the UCSB campus. UCSB provides a transit loop centrally located in the Main Campus along Ocean Road. Travel surveys have reported that approximately six percent of all students commute to UC Santa Barbara using transit, and approximately seven percent of all faculty and staff typically commute to campus using transit.

### LRDP Requirements
Policies included in the 2010 LRDP address a variety of coastal access and visitor parking issues. Transportation-related policies applicable to the San Joaquin Apartments project include:

**TRANS-13.** Site planning shall create pedestrian connections between existing and proposed residential areas and the surrounding coastal open space areas to enhance pedestrian circulation and maximize existing and future residents’ enjoyment of the area’s coastal resources. Public trails shall be provided within development areas to allow public access to public open areas and
beaches. All public trails will be clearly signed to ensure that campus visitors are aware of coastal access availability.

**TRANS-14.** The University shall provide additional bike parking facilities as part of all building projects, and monitor use and add facilities as needed.

**ACC-1.** Motor vehicle traffic generated by new development shall not restrict or impede public access to or along the coast by exceeding the roadway capacity of existing coastal access routes on campus.

**ACC-5.** UCSB shall work with the County of Santa Barbara and others to create a comprehensive network of trails throughout the “Greensward” - including the section on County-owned land – to link the University’s housing developments to each other and to the Devereux Slough, the Ellwood-Devereux Mesa, and the Goleta Slough tributaries.

**Santa Barbara County Settlement Agreement.** In conjunction with the University’s adoption of the 2010 LRDP, UCSB and Santa Barbara County entered into a Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement related to off-campus traffic-related impacts. The objective of the Agreement is to avoid PM peak hour trip impacts to local roadways and intersections resulting from the implementation of LRDP development projects. The agreement requires UCSB to conduct long-term traffic monitoring of traffic conditions at specified locations in the vicinity of the campus, and to pay specified County and City of Goleta traffic impact fees for the improvement of certain roadways and intersections, including improvements to Storke Road. The timing for the implementation of the specified improvements is to be determined by the County and City of Goleta.

**6.16.2 Checklist Responses**

a. **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

The 2010 LRDP EIR evaluated traffic impacts that would result from the buildout of the 2010 LRDP, but did not evaluate project-specific traffic impacts that could result from individual development projects. As described in Section 6.16.1 above, several roadways and intersections in the vicinity of the project site currently do not operate at acceptable levels of service, therefore, traffic generated by the San Joaquin Apartments project could result in **potentially significant** traffic impacts. A project-specific evaluation of traffic impacts that considers the trip generation and distribution characteristics of the San Joaquin Apartments project is required. Traffic-related characteristics of the proposed project that should be evaluated are described below.
Traffic counts conducted for the 2010 LRDP EIR determined that the 1,325 student residents at the Santa Catalina Residence Hall generate 2.16 vehicle trips per student on a daily basis, 0.06 trips per student during the AM peak hour, and 0.15 trips per student during the PM peak hour. Trip generation characteristics of the San Joaquin Apartments project could be reduced by the project-related proposal to provide a shuttle that would provide transportation service between the project site and the Main Campus. Estimates of project-generated traffic are to be provided by the project EIR.

The 2010 LRDP estimated that the proposed project site would be used for the development of 600 bed spaces for undergraduate students, however, the San Joaquin Apartments project would provide new residential units for 1,000 undergraduate students, plus 24 additional units for staff, faculty and visitors. The proposed revision to the 2010 LRDP would shift bed spaces and residential units from other on-campus housing sites to the San Joaquin Apartments site. Therefore, the total number of student bed spaces and residential units proposed by the 2010 LRDP would not be increased and the total number of student-generated trips that were evaluated by the 2010 LRDP EIR would not be increased by the project. However, the proposed LRDP amendment could result in a small, but potentially significant change in the trip distribution characteristics of student-generated vehicle trips that would occur on on-campus roadways and off-campus roadways near the project site. The trip distribution impacts of the proposed project are to be evaluated by the project EIR.

The evaluation of traffic impacts resulting from the buildout of the 2010 LRDP included vehicle trips that would be generated by faculty and staff that would commute to and from the UCSB campus from off-campus locations. Therefore, the 2010 LRDP EIR included an evaluation of impacts to roadways, intersections, and U.S. Highway 101 facilities located throughout the project region. For the San Joaquin Apartments project, however, it is likely that the majority of the project-related trips generated by the undergraduate residents would occur on roadways and intersections located in the vicinity of the project site.

Intersections identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR as being significantly impacted during the p.m. peak hour by the buildout of the 2010 LRDP, and that are located in the vicinity of the San Joaquin Apartments project site, are denoted in the intersection list provided below by an “*”. Project-related impacts to those intersections during the PM peak hour should be evaluated by the project EIR. The 2010 LRDP EIR also determined that the only intersection in the vicinity of the San Joaquin Apartments project that would be impacted during the AM peak hour by LRDP buildout was the Mesa Rd/Los Carneros intersection, and that impact would occur due to an LRDP proposed roadway project that would connect Mesa Road with Phelps Road. The San Joaquin Apartments project would not result in the connection of Mesa and Phelps Roads, and would not result in or substantially contribute to the previously identified AM peak hour traffic impact to the Mesa Road/Los Carneros intersection. Therefore, the San Joaquin Apartments project...
would not result in AM peak hour impacts to intersections located in the vicinity of the project site and no additional analysis of project-related AM peak hour impacts is required.

Based on the general traffic generation and trip distribution characteristics that are likely to be associated with the San Joaquin Apartments project, the project has the potential to result in significant traffic impacts to roadways and intersections adjacent to and in the vicinity of the project site. The roadways and intersections identified below have the potential to be impacted by project-generated traffic and should be evaluated by the project EIR. The project EIR should also provide an evaluation of the traffic impact scenarios that are also identified below.

Traffic Impact Evaluation Scenarios

1. Existing Plus Project Conditions - PM peak hour impacts
2. Future (Year 2025) Conditions with LRDP Buildout- PM peak hour impacts
3. Future (Year 2025) Conditions with the Proposed Project - PM peak hour impacts

City of Goleta Intersections. The following intersections are to be evaluated using City of Goleta impact thresholds.

1. Hollister Ave/Storke Rd*
2. Phelps Rd/Storke Rd*
3. Storke Rd/Marketplace Dr
4. Hollister Ave/Los Carneros Rd*

Santa Barbara County Intersections. The following intersections are to be evaluated using County impact thresholds.

5. Mesa Rd/Los Carneros Rd*
6. El Colegio Rd/Storke Rd
7. El Colegio Rd/Camino Corto
8. El Colegio Rd/Camino del Sur*
9. El Colegio Rd/Los Carneros Rd
10. El Colegio Rd/Camino Pescadero
11. El Colegio Rd/Embarcadero del Mar
12. El Colegio Rd/Embarcadero del Norte

(Intersections denoted with an “*” were identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR as being significant impacted by building out the 2010 LRDP during the PM peak hour).
On-Campus Intersections. The following intersection is to be evaluated using thresholds used by the 2010 LRDP EIR.

13. El Colegio/Stadium Rd*

Future Intersections. The following intersection is proposed by the 2010 LRDP to serve proposed on-campus housing projects. The future intersection is to be evaluated using County of Santa Barbara (instead of UCSB) impact thresholds.

14. Storke Road/San Joaquin Housing Site/West Campus Family Apartments Site

Roadway Segments. The following roadway segments are to be evaluated County/City of Goleta impact thresholds.

1. El Colegio Rd: Storke Rd to Los Carneros Rd
2. El Colegio Rd: Los Carneros Rd to Embarcadero del Norte
3. El Colegio Rd: Embarcadero del Norte to Stadium Rd
4. Los Carneros Road: El Colegio Rd to Mesa Rd
5. Los Carneros Rd: Mesa Rd to Hollister Ave
6. Storke Rd: El Colegio Rd to Phelps Rd
7. Storke Rd: Phelps Rd to Hollister Ave
8. Hollister Avenue: Storke Rd to Los Carneros Rd
9. Camino Corto: South of El Colegio Rd
10. Camino del Sur: South of El Colegio Rd
11. Camino Pescadero: South of El Colegio Rd
12. Embarcadero del Mar: South of El Colegio Rd
13. Embarcadero del Norte: South of El Colegio Rd

In addition to long-term traffic impacts to roadways and intersections located in the vicinity of the project site, project-related construction activities could result in potentially significant short-term traffic impacts resulting from construction traffic that would occur primarily on Storke Road and El Colegio Road. The project EIR will also provide an evaluation of short-term, construction traffic-related impacts.

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for Santa Barbara County monitors traffic operations at certain intersections and freeway facilities, and requires a detailed analysis of projects that would cause intersection operations to exceed specified thresholds.
Intersections identified in response “a” above as having the potential to be adversely affected by project-generated traffic and that are included in the CMP program include:

1. Hollister Ave/Storke Rd
2. Hollister Ave/Los Carneros Rd

The San Joaquin Apartments project could result in potentially significant impacts to the identified CMP intersections. Therefore, the project EIR will evaluate the project’s impacts to those intersection using CMP evaluation standards.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The San Joaquin Apartments project and construction of undergraduate student housing on the UCSB campus would have no impact on existing air traffic patterns.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Short-Term Impacts. Project-related construction activities have the potential to result in significant safety impacts to traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians that occur on or near the project site. The implementation of standard construction site safety measures, such as the installation of temporary fencing around construction areas and staging areas, temporary closure or re-routing of bicycle and pedestrian paths, the use of warning signs, barricades, flag persons, etc., would reduce potential short-term construction site safety impacts to students, the public, faculty and staff to a less than significant level. No additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for this short-term impact.

Long-Term Impacts. Pedestrian and bicycle paths are located adjacent to the project site that extend between the project site and the Main Campus, and are part of or connect to a regional system of bike paths. The residents of the proposed project would increase the use of existing bicycle and pedestrian paths, and project-related traffic on area roadways and at project driveways could adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle safety. These are potentially significant impacts that should be evaluated by the project EIR.

The proposed project would result in the elimination of existing parking facilities that currently serve the Santa Catalina facility, and would provide a new parking lot on the west side of Storke Road adjacent to the project site. Project site resident access to and from the parking lot would require crossing Storke Road. It is anticipated that the proposed project would provide crosswalks between the project site and parking lot, however, a potentially significant safety impact could result from additional pedestrians crossing Storke Road. This potential impact is to be evaluated by the project EIR.
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Short-Term Impacts. Development proposals on the UCSB Campus are reviewed by the UCSB Fire Protection Division of the Environmental Health and Safety Department. Review and approval of project development plans prior to the start of construction activities would ensure that project-related construction activities do not result temporary roadway, bike lane or pedestrian path closures or other construction-related activities that would result in significant short-term emergency access impacts. With the implementation of existing on-campus development review procedures, the proposed project would result in less than significant emergency access impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term Impacts. Access to the San Joaquin Apartments project site is provided by two major roadways, Storke Road and El Colegio Road. These roadways provide adequate primary and secondary access routes to the project site. Consistent with the roadway and bicycle circulation plans provided by the 2010 LRDP, the proposed project would provide an on-site driveway/bicycle/pedestrian path that extends eastward from Storke Road to the eastern portion of the project site, and then turns southward to El Colegio Road to align with Camino Corto on the south side of El Colegio Road (Figure 3.3-1). The proposed on-site access way would be closed to general traffic, but would provide emergency access through the project site. The final design of the roadway, such as the road width and hydrant locations along the roadway, would be reviewed and approved by the UCSB Fire Protection Division of the Environmental Health and Safety Department, with input from the County of Santa Barbara Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed project’s design would provide adequate emergency access and would result in less than significant emergency access impacts.

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The MTD provides local bus service for the UCSB campus and project region, and maintains three bus stops located adjacent to or near the project site. The residents of the San Joaquin Apartments project would increase the demand for transit service, although the project’s demand for public transit may be reduced somewhat by the proposed shuttle that would provide service between the project site, the Main Campus and other destinations in the project area. Potential transit-related impacts and the effects of the proposed shuttle service cannot be evaluated at this time, therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to existing transit service. This potential impact should be evaluated by the project EIR.

A large paved bicycle parking area is currently provided near the southeast corner of the project site, and that parking area would be removed by the proposed project. To replace the removed bicycle parking facilities, the project would provide approximately 2,576
bicycle parking spaces distributed throughout the project site to serve to the existing Santa Catalina resident population of 1,325 students, and the San Joaquin Apartments project population of 1,000 students. As proposed, approximately 250 more bicycle parking spaces would be provided than project site residents. The additional spaces would provide flexibility regarding where on-site residents can park their bicycles, and provide additional capacity of visitors and guests. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts related to the provision of adequate facilities that promote bicycle use and transportation.

The potential for the project to result in short- and long-term bicycle or pedestrian safety impacts was evaluated in response “d” provided above.

6.16.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant transportation and traffic impacts. Additional evaluation of the potentially significant impacts identified by this Initial Study in an EIR is required. The items to be evaluated by the EIR include:

1. Evaluate the potential for project-related traffic impacts during the PM peak hour at identified intersections located in the vicinity of the project site.

2. Evaluate the potential for project-related traffic impacts to identified roadway segments located in the vicinity of the project site.

3. Evaluate the potential for project-related traffic impacts to identified CMP intersections located in the vicinity of the project site.

   The analysis of items 1, 2 and 3 should also include a qualitative evaluation of traffic impacts that could result from potential uses that may be established within the dining commons release space in the future.

4. Evaluate the potential for short-term construction traffic impacts to roadways adjacent to the project site.

5. Evaluate the ability of existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities along El Colegio Road to accommodate project-related use characteristics.

6. Evaluate impacts to pedestrian and bicycle safety resulting from a project-related increase in vehicle traffic and project site residents that must cross Storke Road for access to and from the proposed parking lot.

7. Evaluate potential impacts to existing transit services.
### 6.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.17.1 Setting

Wastewater Treatment and Disposal. Wastewater collection services for the San Joaquin Apartments project would be provided by the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), which provides service for Isla Vista, the UCSB North, West and Storke Campuses, and portions of the City of Goleta. The GWSD sends wastewater to the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant, and owns a 40.08 percent share of the plant’s permitted treatment capacity, which is equivalent to 3.12 million gallons per day (MGD). Current flows from the GWSD to the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant are 2.40 MGD (UCSB, 2010). Therefore, the GWSD has approximately 0.72 MGD of remaining treatment capacity at the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Wastewater from the UCSB Main Campus is sent directly to the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant. UCSB has a contractual capacity ownership of 7.09% of the treatment plant’s permitted capacity, which is equivalent to 0.54 MGD.
The Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) operates the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is located southeast of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The treatment plant has a design capacity of 9.72 million gallons per day (MGD), however, the NPDES permit for the plant’s ocean outfall established a permitted plant capacity of 7.64 MGD. The daily flow into the treatment plant is approximately 5.35 MGD (UCSB, 2010).

**Water Supply.** The Goleta Water District provides approximately 1,460 acre-feet of water to approximately 80,000 customers, including UCSB, annually. Most of the water provided by the District is from Lake Cachuma and the State Water Project. Additional supply sources include groundwater from the Goleta North/Central Groundwater Basin and recycled water. The *Goleta Water District Water Supply Management Plan* (2011) indicates that under average water supply conditions, the total water supply available to the District is 16,472 acre feet per year (AFY). Comparing existing water supplies and demands indicates that under existing conditions during normal rainfall years, the Goleta Water District has a water supply surplus of 1,872 AFY. Under drought conditions, the water supply available to the District is 14,434 AFY, which would result in a water supply deficit of 166 AFY. The *Water Supply Management Plan* provides a hybrid management strategy to be used by the District to manage its various water sources during drought conditions.

UCSB also uses recycled water for landscape irrigation. In April 1998, UCSB entered into an agreement with the Goleta Water District for the “first right of refusal” to 280 AFY of recycled water from the Goleta Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Plant. UCSB uses an average of 143 AFY of recycled water for approximately 90% of its irrigation needs.

**Solid Waste Disposal.** Solid waste generated on the UCSB campus is collected by the Marborg Company and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill for disposal. The Tajiguas Landfill is operated by the County of Santa Barbara, and is located approximately 20 miles west of the UCSB campus. The landfill accepts solid waste primarily from the cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta and unincorporated Santa Barbara County south coast areas. Final approvals by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and California Integrated Waste Management Board were obtained in 2003 to expand the landfill, and minor changes to the landfill’s waste disposal area were approved in 2009. Based on current solid waste disposal trends, it was estimated that the landfill expansion would provide solid waste disposal capacity until 2021.

The County of Santa Barbara is evaluating a proposal to develop a Resource Recovery Project to process municipal solid waste from the communities served by the Tajiguas Landfill. The project would be located at the landfill and would include a materials recovery facility to recover recyclable material, a dry fermentation anaerobic digestion facility to process organic waste into biogas, and an energy facility that would generate electricity using the produced biogas fuel.
The University of California and UCSB has taken a very active approach towards reducing the amount of generated solid waste and the amount of waste that is sent to a landfill for disposal. The University’s 2009 Policy on Sustainable Practices established waste disposal diversion goals of 50 percent to be achieved by 2008, 75 percent by 2012, and 100 percent by 2020. During the 2011-2012 fiscal year, UCSB achieved an overall solid waste diversion rate of approximately 70 percent (UCSB, 2012).

**LRDP Requirements.** California Coastal Act policy requires that there be no new development until there are sufficient utilities and public works facilities to serve that development. Policies provided by the 1990 and 2010 LRDPs limit development at UCSB to what can be adequately served by water and waste water treatment resources and facilities. 2010 LRDP policy PWK-1, and 1990 LRDP policy 302541.1 require that “development of water mains, recycled water distribution systems, water treatment facilities, sewage lines, telephone transmission lines, and parking lots and structures will be designed and constructed to meet campus needs. Future development provided for in the LRDP land use plan will only be permitted by the University after it has been demonstrated that adequate water and sewer services are available to supply the existing and proposed development. The program for monitoring current levels of water and sewage services shall be continued to ensure a reserve of water and sewer capacity to serve the campus.”

### 6.17.2 Checklist Responses

a. *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

Wastewater that would be generated by the San Joaquin Apartments project would be domestic sewage. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** related to wastewater treatment requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b. *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

As described in response “d” below, adequate water supplies are available to serve the proposed project. Therefore, no new region-serving water supply or treatment facilities are required.

As described in response “e” below, adequate waste water treatment capacity can be provided to serve the proposed project. Therefore, no new region-serving waste water treatment facilities are required.

As described in section 3.3.8 above, existing water and wastewater service mains are located adjacent to the project site. The installation of water and wastewater service
line connections, or the replacement of the existing water and service lines on the project site, would contribute to short-term, construction-related impacts previously identified by this Initial Study. For example, trenching activities and the temporary storage of soil stockpiles would have the potential to result in erosion and water quality impacts. Compliance with LRDP policies regarding erosion control and water quality protection; and the implementation of existing regulatory requirements for construction projects, (such as the preparation and implementation of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan), would ensure that potential short-term erosion and water quality impacts caused by utility line installation would not be significant. Potential safety-related impacts to students, bicyclists and pedestrians would also be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of standard construction site safety measures.

Potential impacts to cultural resources that may result from utility line construction would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures CUL-1a through 1e. The potential for construction-related impacts to nesting birds, either as a result of tree removal, construction noise or other disturbances, would be reduced to a less than significant level by proposed mitigation measures BIO-2a through 2c. The installation of utilities to serve the proposed project would have the potential to contribute to short-term, construction-related impacts related to air quality, off-site sensitive habitats, traffic and noise. These short-term impacts were identified as potentially significant by this Initial Study and additional evaluation will be required by the project EIR.

The installation of water and waste water service line connections, or the replacement of the existing water and service lines on the project site would have the potential to be affected by movement along a fault on the project site. This potential long-term impact was identified as potentially significant by this Initial Study and additional evaluation will be required by the project EIR.

c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

As described section 3.3.8 above, stormwater drainage facilities are provided on and adjacent to the project site, and those facilities would be used by the proposed project. As described in Section 6.9.2e above, a project-related increase in existing stormwater discharge characteristics could result in potentially significant impacts to drainage systems located on and adjacent to the project site. The adequacy of stormwater control measures/existing and proposed drainage systems are to be evaluated by a project EIR. The modification of existing drainage facilities to serve the proposed project would have the potential to contribute to short-term, construction-related impacts related to air quality, off-site sensitive habitats, traffic
and noise. These short-term impacts were identified as **potentially significant** by this Initial Study and additional evaluation will be required by the project EIR.

d. *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

**Project-Specific Impacts.** Potable water use by the San Joaquin Apartments project was estimated based on water demand factors provided by the Goleta Water District’s *2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update*, which indicates that dorm rooms have an estimated water demand of 0.055 acre feet per year per bed, and that faculty and staff units have an estimated water demand of 0.21 acre feet per year per unit. The San Joaquin Apartments project would have student resident population of 1,000 people, and would provide 24 staff, faculty and visitor units. Water use by the proposed project is estimated on Table 6.17-1. Based on the applicable water demand factors, the project’s annual potable water demand would be approximately 60 AFY.

**Table 6.17-1**
San Joaquin Apartments Project
Estimated Water Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Provided</th>
<th>Water Demand Factor (AFY)</th>
<th>Estimated Water Use (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Beds</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, Faculty, Visitor Units</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFY = Acre feet per year

Based on existing potable water supplies of 16,472 AFY available to the Goleta Water District, and an existing demand of approximately 14,600 AFY, approximately 1,872 AFY of potable water is available to the District to serve future uses throughout its service area. Available water supplies would be adequate to meet the 60 AFY water demand of the San Joaquin Apartments project, and approximately 1,812 AFY would remain available to the District after the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in a **less than significant** water supply impact.

**Cumulative Impacts.** To estimate cumulative water use that would result from reasonably foreseeable development on the UCSB Campus, the projects identified on Table 2.5-1 were grouped into three water use categories: instruction, research and other uses; housing; and uses that would not result in a substantial long-term increase in water use. Water demand factors for each of these types of uses were derived from the Goleta Water District’s *2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update*. The water use estimate provided on Table 6.17-2 indicates that the cumulative water
demand resulting from reasonably foreseeable development projects on the UCSB campus would be approximately 161.9 AFY. Added to the 60 AFY water demand of the San Joaquin Apartments project, the total reasonably foreseeable cumulative water demand by UCSB would be approximately 222 AFY, which would not exceed the AFY 1,872 AFY currently available to the Goleta Water District to serve future uses throughout its service area.

### Table 6.17-2
UCSB Cumulative Development - Potable Water Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Water Demand Factor (1)</th>
<th>Potable Water Demand (afy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Faculty Housing</td>
<td>161 units (2)</td>
<td>0.21 afy/unit</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre Housing</td>
<td>151 units</td>
<td>0.21 afy/unit</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Club Expansion</td>
<td>30 additional guest rooms</td>
<td>0.055 afy/room</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Road Housing</td>
<td>543 units</td>
<td>0.21 afy/unit</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITP Residences</td>
<td>41 units</td>
<td>0.055 afy/unit</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction, Research and Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson Library Addition</td>
<td>40,884 ASF</td>
<td>0.233 afy/1,000 ASF</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Science Education Building</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>0.233 afy/1,000 ASF</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering Building</td>
<td>48,690 ASF</td>
<td>0.233 afy/1,000 ASF</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>30,000 ASF</td>
<td>0.233 afy/1,000 ASF</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Substantial Long-Term Increase in Water Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvement</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon Rd./Ocean Rd. Storm Drain</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Complex</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Water Loop</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Greenhouse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Source: Goleta Water District, 2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update
(2) 22 of these units have been developed and are now occupied

The 2010 LRDP EIR also assessed various water supply and demand scenarios affecting the Goleta Water District service area and provided an evaluation of water supply impacts resulting from the buildout of the 2010 LRDP along with other future development throughout the Goleta Water District service area. That analysis concluded that buildout of the District’s service area could increase the cumulative demand for potable water beyond the total supplies available to the District in a normal rainfall year. The 2010 LRDP EIR provided mitigation measures to reduce this significant impact to a less than significant level. Those mitigation measures included a variety of water demand reduction measures to be implemented by UCSB, and are provided in Section 6.17.3 of this Initial Study. The 2010 LRDP EIR also included water supply mitigation measure W-3G, which requires the following:
“If sufficient additional water supplies cannot be acquired from GWD, the State Water Project or other available supply for all of the development envisioned under the 2010 LRDP the University shall halt further development under the LRDP in the affected campus water service area so that water demand remains within the available supply for that service area unless and until additional supplies can be acquired. Additional development shall be halted when either of the following circumstances exist:

1. When potable water demand is projected to be within 50 AFY of the available supply for the areas subject to the 1991 Water Reclamation Agreement.

2. When potable water demand is projected to be within 10 acre feet of available supplies for the Santa Catalina residence hall water service area.

This measure shall be administered by conducting project-specific water availability analyses for each proposed new building. At the time a new UCSB building is proposed, and before environmental review is complete, the University shall meet with GWD and ascertain that supplies are available from the District.”

The 1991 Water Reclamation Agreement between UCSB and the Goleta Water District provides 944.5 AFY of potable water for use on the Main Campus, West Campus, and portions of the Storke Campus (excluding the Santa Catalina Residence Hall and the proposed project site, and the El Dorado and Westgate Apartments), and the West Campus. Table 14-3 (Authorized Future Demand) of the Goleta Water District’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update indicates that as of 2009, water use at UCSB was just under 700 AFY, leaving approximately 250 AFY under the requirements of the 1991 Water Reclamation Agreement. Water service for the San Joaquin Apartments project would not be provided under the requirements of 1991 Water Reclamation Agreement, and instead would be provided through the existing on-site water meter or a new meter obtained from the District. Therefore, with the implementation of the project approximately 250 AFY would continue to remain for future uses on the UCSB campus, and the project would not cause the requirements of mitigation measure W-3G item No. 1 to be exceeded.

Water service for Santa Catalina residence hall is provided by the Goleta Water District, and service for the San Joaquin Apartments project would also be provided by the District. As indicated by the project-specific analysis provided above, after the implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments project, approximately 1,816 AFY would remain available to District. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause the requirements of mitigation measure W-3G item No. 2 to be exceeded.

Based on the water availability analysis criteria specified by 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measure W-3G, the water use impacts of the San Joaquin Apartments project would not be cumulatively considerable, and the project’s cumulative water
supply impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of water demand reduction mitigation measures provided by the 2010 LRDP EIR and that are included in this Initial Study.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

**Project-Specific Impacts.** The amount of wastewater that would be generated by the San Joaquin Apartments project was estimated using a residential unit generation factor of 180 gallons/day, which was the wastewater generation factor used by the 2010 LRDP EIR. The San Joaquin Apartments project would provide a total of 191 residential units (including units for students, staff, faculty, and visitors), resulting in a wastewater flow of 0.034 MGD. Based on an existing wastewater treatment capacity of 3.12 MGD available to the GWSD at the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant; existing flows of 2.40 MGD delivered to the treatment plant from the GWSD; and a remaining contracted treatment capacity of 0.72 MGD available to the GWSD, the GWSD has adequate capacity to accept the 0.034 MGD of wastewater that would be generated by the San Joaquin Apartments project. Therefore, the project-specific wastewater treatment impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Cumulative wastewater impacts to the GWSD resulting from reasonably foreseeable development on the UCSB campus were evaluated by calculating wastewater flows from the projects identified on Table 2.5-1 that would be located within the GWSD service area (i.e., on the Storke, West and North Campuses). The cumulative wastewater generation estimate provided on Table 6.17-3 indicates that the cumulative wastewater generated by reasonably foreseeable UCSB development projects would be approximately 0.063 MGD. Added to the 0.034 MGD of wastewater that would be generated by San Joaquin Apartments project, reasonably foreseeable cumulative wastewater flows from UCSB would be approximately 0.097 MGD, which would not exceed the 0.72 MGD of wastewater treatment capacity currently available to the GWSD to serve future uses throughout its service area.
Table 6.17-3

UCSB Cumulative Development – Goleta West Sanitary District
Service Area Wastewater Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Waste Water Generation Factor</th>
<th>Waste Water Generation (mgd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Faculty Housing (1)</td>
<td>161 units</td>
<td>180 gallons/unit/day</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre Housing (North Campus)</td>
<td>151 units</td>
<td>180 gallons /unit/day</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITP Residences (Storke Campus)</td>
<td>41 units</td>
<td>180 gallons /unit/day</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 22 of these units have been developed and are now occupied.

The 2010 LRDP EIR also evaluated wastewater treatment impacts that would result from the buildout of the 2010 LRDP along with the buildout of the GWSD and Goleta Sanitary District service areas. That analysis concluded:

- Cumulative wastewater flows to the Goleta Sanitary District would exceed the remaining permitted treatment plant capacity available to the District.

- Cumulative wastewater flows from UCSB (i.e., flows from future development on the Main Campus) would exceed the University’s remaining share of the treatment plant’s design and permitted treatment capacity.

- Cumulative wastewater flows to the GWSD would be within the District’s share of the treatment plant’s design and permitted capacity.

Although future cumulative development would cause the Goleta Sanitary District and UCSB to exceed their treatment plant capacity allocations, future development within the GWSD service area would not cause the treatment capacity available to the GWSD to be exceeded. The 2010 LRDP EIR estimated that after buildout of the GWSD service area, including the 2010 LRDP, the District would continue to have approximately 0.33 MGD of treatment capacity at the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant. Since the GWSD has adequate treatment capacity at the treatment plant to accommodate the San Joaquin Apartments project and other future cumulative growth within its service area, the proposed project’s cumulative wastewater flows would not be cumulatively considerable and the project’s wastewater treatment impact would be less than significant.

The 2010 LRDP estimated that 168 units for 600 students would be developed on the Santa Catalina project site. The San Joaquin Apartments project would revise the 2010 LRDP to transfer 400 bed spaces from residential projects proposed by the 2010 LRDP for the Main Campus to the San Joaquin Apartments project site on the Storke Campus. The requested LRDP Amendment would incrementally decrease the
2010 LRDP EIR’s estimate of cumulative wastewater flows sent directly to the Goleta Wastewater Treatment Plant by UCSB resulting from buildout of the Main Campus as proposed by the 2010 LRDP; and would incrementally increase the amount of wastewater sent to the GWSD resulting from the buildout of projects on the Storke Campus as proposed by the 2010 LRDP. As indicated by the cumulative analysis provided above, the minor increase in wastewater flows from the Storke Campus to the GWSD could be adequately accommodated by the remaining 0.33 MGD of treatment capacity available to the District after buildout occurs within its service area. Therefore, the proposed revision to the 2010 LRDP would have a less than significant project-specific and cumulative impact to future wastewater flows sent to the GWSD by UCSB.

f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Construction of the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the short-term generation of construction and demolition waste, which would be recycled to the maximum extent possible. For example, the Bren Hall building on the Main Campus was constructed on a former parking lot and 100 percent of the asphalt and concrete waste generated by that project was recycled. Recent UCSB construction projects, such as the Bren Hall and Engineering II addition, recycled at least 90 percent of other construction waste that was generated. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to short-term waste disposal impacts in the project region.

The occupancy of the San Joaquin Apartments project would result in the generation of solid waste that requires disposal at the Tajiguas Landfill. UCSB is not subject to local zoning and land use controls, however, since solid waste generated by the project would be sent to a County disposal facility, the County’s significance threshold standard of 196 tons of solid waste disposal per year was used for analysis purposes.

The UCSB 2012 Waste Diversion Plan reported that for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, UCSB recycled 5,566 tons of solid waste and disposed of 2,416 tons of solid waste at the Tajiguas landfill. This equals a total of 7,982 tons of generated solid waste, and a recycling rate of almost 70 percent. With a 2011-2012 student population of 21,685 and a faculty/staff population of approximately 5,000, the UCSB per capita waste generation rate for 2011-2012 was 0.299 tons per person (7,982 tons of generated waste divided by a total campus population of 26,685). This per capita waste generation rate is similar to the waste generation rate reported by the 2010 LRDP EIR of 0.298 tons per student. That analysis determined that in 2005, a UCSB student population of 20,000 generated 5,966 tons of solid waste.
The San Joaquin Apartments project would have a total on-site population of approximately 1,032, including students (1,000 bed spaces), faculty (four units with an average occupancy of two persons), resident advisors (four units with an average occupancy of two persons) and visitors (three units with an average occupancy of one person). An on-site average population of approximately 1,032 people would result in a waste generation rate of approximately 309 tons per year (1,032 project occupants multiplied by a waste generation rate of 0.299 tons/person). With an existing solid waste diversion/recycling rate of 70 percent, the project would generate approximately 93 tons of solid waste per year that requires landfill disposal.

To facilitate on-site recycling efforts, floor area would be provided in each of the proposed residential building for various infrastructure purposes, including area designated for the temporary storage of recyclable and waste materials. UCSB dining commons currently divert 94 percent of their waste from landfill disposal through recycling and composting of food waste. Commingled recycling, electronic waste, and landfill disposal containers would be located throughout the project for use by residents. Other items recycled from on-campus housing facilities include light bulbs, hazardous waste, metals, appliances, landscape waste, grease and clothing.

The campus-wide and project-specific disposal rates are expected to decrease even more in the near future as UCSB implements additional recycling programs to achieve the University’s Policy on Sustainable Practices goal of generating zero waste by 2020. Therefore, long-term solid waste generation of the proposed project would be less than the Santa Barbara County significance threshold and would result in a less than significant impact.

g. Would the project comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1991 (AB 939) required that local agencies divert 25 percent of generated solid waste from landfill disposal by 1995, and divert 50 percent of generated solid waste by 2000. As indicated in Section 6.17.1 above, UCSB currently has a solid waste diversion rate of approximately 70%, and University’s 2009 Policy on Sustainable Practices established waste disposal diversion goals of 75 percent by 2012 and zero waste by 2020. The San Joaquin Apartments project would not adversely affect the ability of UCSB to maintain or further reduce existing waste diversion rates. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant effect regarding the implementation of this solid waste disposal regulation.
6.17.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The installation of new water and wastewater service connections, and the installation of new stormwater drainage infrastructure to serve the San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant short-term, construction-related environmental impacts. Construction-related impacts (e.g., air quality, noise, traffic, etc., would be evaluated in the corresponding issue area evaluations to be provided by a project-specific EIR. New underground utilities on the project site have the potential to be adversely affected by fault movement. This potential impact would be evaluated by the geology impact analysis that is to be provided by the project EIR.

Potential erosion-related impacts would be minimized with the implementation of existing regulatory requirements and no additional mitigation measures are required. Potential impacts to public safety resulting from construction impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard construction site safety practices, and no mitigation measures are required. Impacts to cultural resources that may result from utility line construction would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures CUL-1a through 1e. Potential short-term impacts to biological resources, such as impacts to nesting birds, resulting from the installation of utilities connections would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures BIO-2a through 2c.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative potable water use in the project region to a less than significant level.

IMPACT W-1. Potable water use by the San Joaquin Apartments project would incrementally contribute cumulative water demand impacts that would result from buildout of the 2010 LRDP and other development in the Goleta Water District service area.

W-1a. New UCSB development shall make use of recycled water to the maximum extent feasible. Recycled water will be used for bathroom fixtures and/or irrigation.

W-1b. Individually meter and/or sub-meter all new UCSB living units or buildings and institute water charges on a per unit basis with a graduated fee structure.

W-1c. The University shall install water saving devices in all buildings and facilities, new or existing that do not currently have them, and shall continue to use existing water saving devices. The water saving devices that will be installed shall include, but will
not be limited to, the following: shower heads, toilets, urinals, washing machines and irrigation systems.

**W-1d.** The University shall maintain a public awareness campaign on campus and in campus residential facilities for saving water. All dormitory residents shall be required to receive annual training on water conservation.

**W-1e.** The University shall develop a UC Santa Barbara Water Conservation Program for managing its water demand that includes:

1. Measures that reduce current and future water demand, including the measures set forth in Mitigation Measures W-1b through W-1d.

2. Measures for systematic water use reductions during multiple dry years.

**W-1f.** The University shall work to identify and acquire additional water supplies beyond those currently available to the Goleta Water District as necessary to serve UCSB potable water demand independently or with the Goleta Water District as appropriate.
6.18 **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE** – The lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment and thereby require an EIR to be prepared for the project where there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that any of the following conditions may occur. Where prior to commencement of the environmental analysis a project proponent agrees to mitigation measures or project modifications that would avoid any significant effect on the environment or would mitigate the significant environmental effect, a lead agency need not prepare an EIR solely because without mitigation the environmental effects would have been significant (per Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in LRDP EIR</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The San Joaquin Apartments project site has been previously developed with student housing and parking areas, and the only on-site habitat that would be disturbed by the project consists of moderately-sized trees that could potentially be used by nesting birds. The project would not result in on-site impacts that would reduce wildlife habitat, impact a plant or animal community, or reduce the range of a sensitive plant or animal species. Construction-related impacts of the proposed project to nesting birds can feasibly be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant short- and long-term indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, such as wetland areas located adjacent to the project site. The project’s potential impacts to off-site habitat areas will be evaluated in the project EIR.

Ground disturbing operations required to construct the proposed project have a low potential to encounter significant cultural resources. In the unlikely event that cultural resources are encountered during construction operations, impacts to potentially significant resources can feasibly be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures CUL-1a through e. No further analysis of this potential impact is required.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts to the following environmental issue area: aesthetics, air quality, biologic resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation/traffic.
c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The San Joaquin Apartments project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to humans resulting from air quality emissions of diesel particulate matter (air quality) and faulting/groundshaking (geology and soils).
6.19 FISH AND GAME DETERMINATION

Based on consultation with the California Dept. of Fish and Game, there is no evidence that the project has a potential for a change that would adversely affect wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends.

___ Yes (No Effect)

✓ No (Pay fee)
7.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIO-1. Construction activities at the project site have the potential to result in inadvertent impacts to wetland buffer areas located on and adjacent to the project site.

BIO-1a. Temporary construction/safety fencing shall be erected and maintained along the project site’s eastern perimeter throughout the duration of the proposed Project’s construction period. The fencing shall be provided at a location that ensures construction-related activities do not occur within designated wetland buffer areas.

BIO-2. Proposed construction activities could cause the abandonment of active bird nests located near the Project site.

The following mitigation measures implement the requirements of 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures BIO-3a, 3b and 3c.

BIO-2a. To avoid disturbance or loss of active bird nests during development of the proposed project, to the extent feasible the removal of any tree that provides nesting habitat for birds shall be conducted between September 15 and February 15, outside of the typical nesting season.

BIO-2b. If tree removals are determined to be necessary during the typical nesting season (February 15 to September 15), a nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approximately one week prior to the proposed action. Surveys shall follow standard protocols as established by CDFG and/or CCC. If the biologist determines that a tree is being used for nesting at that time, disturbance shall be avoided until after the young have fledged from the nest and achieved independence. If no nesting is found to occur, necessary tree removal can proceed.

BIO-2c. To avoid indirect disturbance of active bird nests by project construction occurring within the typical nesting season, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct one or more pre-construction surveys per standard protocols approximately one week prior to construction, to determine presence/absence of active nests adjacent to the project site. If no breeding or nesting activities are detected within 200 feet of the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed. If breeding/nesting activity is confirmed, work activities within 200 feet of the active nest shall be delayed until the young birds have fledged and left the nest.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

CUL-1. Ground disturbing activities that occur in conjunction with the development of the San Joaquin Apartments project have the potential to result in significant impacts to previously undetected cultural resources.

CUL-1a. At the commencement of project construction, an archaeologist shall provide a brief cultural resources orientation to the construction crew on the types of prehistoric and/or historic resources that might become exposed during earth disturbing activities, and the steps to be taken in the event that such a find is encountered.

CUL-1b. An archaeologist shall be retained to monitor initial grading activities conducted on portions of the project site that have not been previously disturbed or only minimally disturbed by previous construction activities. These areas include:

- The proposed parking lot area on the west side of Storke Road.
- The grass area on the eastern side of the project site, and
- Any disturbance of the ground surface required to construct the proposed pedestrian/bike paths and bridge that would extend from the project site across the open space area east of and adjacent to the project site.

Results of this initial monitoring shall determine if any additional construction monitoring or subsurface testing is warranted.

CUL-1c. The archaeologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or redirect project construction in the event that potentially significant cultural resources are exposed. Based on monitoring observations and the actual extent of project disturbance, the lead archaeologist shall have the authority to refine the monitoring requirements as appropriate (i.e., change to spot checks, reduce or increase the area to be monitored) in consultation with the UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design. Upon completion of the monitoring program a monitoring report shall be presented to the UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design and to the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC).

CUL-1d. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within the vicinity of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. A Chumash representative should monitor any mitigation work associated with Native American cultural material.
CUL-1e. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission. If avoidance of the remains is not feasible, they should be excavated and removed by a qualified archaeologist in the presence of the Most Likely Descendent. Repatriation of the exhumed remains and all associated items shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Health and Safety Code 8010-8011).

RECREATION

REC-1. Residents of the San Joaquin Apartments project would increase the demand for on- and off-campus recreation facilities, including beach and coastal access ways.

1a. UCSB will continue to maintain adjacent beaches and coastal access trails for the use of all members of the public. These trails include:

- UCSB Beach
- Depressions Beach
- West Campus Beach
- West Campus Bluffs Trail
- Dune Pond Trail
- Lagoon Trail
- Campus Point access “unnamed trail” near the Marine Sciences Building and REEF (Lagoon Berm Road)

1b. To reduce the demand upon nearby off-site parks, UCSB will provide appropriate recreation facilities in new housing developments.
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

W-1. Potable water use by the San Joaquin Apartments project would incrementally contribute cumulative water demand impacts that would result from buildout of the 2010 LRDP and other development in the Goleta Water District service area.

W-1a. New UCSB development shall make use of recycled water to the maximum extent feasible. Recycled water will be used for bathroom fixtures and/or irrigation.

W-1b. Individually meter and/or sub-meter all new UCSB living units or buildings and institute water charges on a per unit basis with a graduated fee structure.

W-1c. The University shall install water saving devices in all buildings and facilities, new or existing that do not currently have them, and shall continue to use existing water saving devices. The water saving devices that will be installed shall include, but will not be limited to, the following: shower heads, toilets, urinals, washing machines and irrigation systems.

W-1d. The University shall maintain a public awareness campaign on campus and in campus residential facilities for saving water. All dormitory residents shall be required to receive annual training on water conservation.

W-1e. The University shall develop a UC Santa Barbara Water Conservation Program for managing its water demand that includes:

1. Measures that reduce current and future water demand, including the measures set forth in Mitigation Measures W-1b through W-1d.

2. Measures for systematic water use reductions during multiple dry years.

W-1f. The University shall work to identify and acquire additional water supplies beyond those currently available to the Goleta Water District as necessary to serve UCSB potable water demand independently or with the Goleta Water District as appropriate.
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