

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potentially significant environmental effects that could result from the implementation of the proposed Student Housing West project (“SHW project” or “proposed project”). The SHW project is an approximately 3,000-bed student housing project put forth by UC Santa Cruz (“Campus”) to satisfy the requirements of the Settlement Agreement between the University, the City of Santa Cruz and other parties; replace existing housing that is functionally obsolete and not a viable candidate for renovation; relieve overcrowding in on-campus student housing; address the current and projected demand for student housing; and provide sufficient and affordable, on-campus student housing under the UC President’s Housing Initiative. The proposed project consists of the construction of a housing complex for undergraduate and graduate students on an approximately 13-acre site adjacent to Heller Drive (Heller site) in the western portion of the campus, and the construction of a family student housing complex and a childcare center on an approximately 17.3-acre site adjacent to Hagar Drive (Hagar site) in the southeastern portion of the campus.

In March 2018, the University of California, acting as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), published the Student Housing West Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), which assessed and disclosed the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed SHW project. The Draft EIR was circulated for agency and public comment for an initial period of 45 days that ended on May 11, 2018. In response to requests for an extension of the review period, the University extended the review period an additional 47 days. The second review period ended on June 27, 2018. The University also conducted four public hearings during the Draft EIR review period.

During the time that the Draft EIR was circulating and in the ensuing months, the University revised the design of the project at the Heller site so that the needed number of beds could be provided in buildings that would be five to seven stories high instead of the five to 10-story buildings included in the previous proposal. Furthermore, additional geotechnical data related to the Heller site became available which resulted in some changes to the proposed storm water management system for the Heller site. Similarly, the design of the project at Hagar site was revised, including changes to grading plans, changes to the storm water management system, and the inclusion of a wastewater treatment facility and a second driveway to serve the site. In addition, the number of student beds at both sites changed slightly from the numbers analyzed in the Draft EIR. Also during the Draft EIR circulation period, the University received numerous comments requesting, among other things, additional analysis and clarification regarding the visual effects and the hydrology and water quality impacts of the Hagar site development; clarification regarding the project’s traffic impacts; and the evaluation of additional alternatives to the proposed

project. In light of these revisions to the project and the comments received, especially related to aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, traffic, and alternatives, the University has determined that it will publish a revised Draft EIR for the revised project for agency and public review. This Revised Draft EIR replaces in full the previously published Draft EIR.

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Revised Draft EIR (1) assesses the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project, including cumulative impacts of the proposed project in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable development; (2) identifies feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative.

In addition to the evaluation of the SHW project impacts, the Draft EIR included a new analysis of the impacts of campus growth under the UC Santa Cruz 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) on water supply, and population and housing. That supplemental analysis is also included in this Revised Draft EIR.

The University is the “lead agency” for the project evaluated in this Revised Draft EIR. The Board of Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed SHW project.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The University has prepared this EIR for the following purposes:

- To satisfy the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21178), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 4, Chapter 14, Sections 15000–15387), and the University of California Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA;
- To inform the general public, the local community, responsible and interested public agencies, and The Regents of the nature of the proposed project, its potential environmental effects, measures to mitigate those effects, and alternatives to the proposed project;
- To enable The Regents to consider environmental consequences of approving the proposed project; and
- To supplement the 2005 LRDP EIR’s water supply and population and housing analysis so that the University can complete a streamlined review of subsequent projects proposed for development under the 2005 LRDP, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168.

As described in CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects, where feasible. In discharging this duty, a

public agency has an obligation to balance the project's significant effects on the environment with its benefits, including economic, social, technological, legal, and other benefits. This Revised Draft EIR is an informational document, the purpose of which is to identify the potentially significant effects of the proposed project on the environment and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or significantly lessened; to identify any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated; and to identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects or reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

The lead agency is required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decisions on the proposed project. Although the EIR does not determine the ultimate decision that will be made regarding approval of the proposed project, CEQA requires the University to consider the information in the EIR and make findings regarding each significant and unavoidable effect identified in the EIR. The Regents will review and consider certification of the Final EIR prior to any decision on whether to approve the proposed SHW project.

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND NEED

In September 2006, The Regents certified the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP EIR (SCH #2005012113) and approved the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP. The 2005 LRDP provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the UC Santa Cruz campus (which includes the 2,030-acre main campus and the 18-acre University-owned property at 2300 Delaware Avenue) to accommodate an on-campus three-quarter-average enrollment of 19,500 full time equivalent (FTE)¹ students by 2020-21, or an increase of approximately 5,100 students from the 2003-04 baseline.

The 2005 LRDP includes a building program to accommodate UC Santa Cruz's academic, research, and public service mission as enrollment grows, and a land use plan that assigns elements of the building program to designated land-use areas, and describes general objectives that will guide development within those areas. The building program identifies a total of about 3,175,000 gross square feet of net new building space, including 1,196,000 gross square feet of student and employee housing.

¹ For quarter system campuses, including UC Santa Cruz, a full-time equivalent (FTE) student is defined as (1) an undergraduate student who enrolls for 45 credit hours per academic year; or (2) a graduate student (master's level or doctoral student not yet advanced to candidacy) enrolled in 36 credit hours per year; or (3) a graduate doctoral student who has been advanced to candidacy. Since not all students take full course loads, the number of FTE students is generally somewhat lower than the actual total number of students enrolled. However, for UC Santa Cruz, the number of FTE students is very close to the headcount, which is the actual total number of students enrolled. Therefore, the formula 1 FTE= 1 Headcount was utilized.

The 2005 LRDP includes a land use plan which identifies areas where development is allowed versus areas that will be preserved, and assigns land use categories/designations to all lands on the campus. The land use plan assigns the land use category Colleges and Student Housing (CSH) to 288 acres of land to the east, north, and west of the academic core in the central campus. This land use category is intended to accommodate the construction of new colleges, expansion of existing colleges through infill, new undergraduate and graduate student housing, and family student housing.

With respect to student housing, the 2005 LRDP set forth targets to house 50 percent of undergraduate students and 25 percent of graduate students in on-campus housing. However, as part of a 2008 Comprehensive Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”) that resolved lawsuits by the City and County of Santa Cruz and 11 citizens, the University agreed that the Campus will provide housing to accommodate 67 percent of new student enrollment above a baseline of 15,000 three-quarter average FTE within four years of reaching the new enrollment level. The four-year lag time is reduced to two years after 2018. In addition, the University agreed that housing development in the area west of Porter College will be initiated before new bed spaces are developed in the north campus area.

The Campus initiated the planning that led to the proposed SHW project in 2014 with an evaluation of a large area in the western portion of the campus for the development of additional student housing. The study area encompassed approximately 113 acres extending from the West Entrance to the North Remote Parking lot, primarily to the west of Heller Drive. The area included the existing Family Student Housing complex, Porter College, Kresge College, the Campus Park, and undeveloped areas west of Porter College. In January 2016, UC President Janet Napolitano announced the UC system-wide Housing Initiative, the two overarching goals of which are to (1) ensure that each of UC's campuses has sufficient housing for its growing student population; and (2) to keep housing as affordable as possible for UC students. The Campus decided to pursue development of student housing in the 50-acre area south of Kresge College utilizing the new system-wide public-private partnership (P3) delivery process established under the President's Housing Initiative to provide approximately 3,000 additional student beds on the campus to relieve overcrowding, to satisfy the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, and address the projected demand for student housing.²

Given the timeframe in which the housing needed to be completed and based on the experience of other UC campuses with student housing projects, the Campus determined that the best method of delivery for the proposed housing project would be via a private-public partnership (P3) agreement. In March 2017, the Campus issued a request for proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from private development teams to

² A more recent study of student housing demand conducted by the Campus has revealed the need for as many as 4,650 additional beds.

design, construct and maintain the proposed SHW project. The P3 developer selection process was undertaken between March and September, and the preferred development team was selected in mid-September.

Implementation of the SHW project will enable the Campus to increase its student housing stock, eliminate some overflow bed spaces³ in existing housing, replace aging housing, and meet its commitments under the Settlement Agreement.

1.3 TYPE OF CEQA DOCUMENT

The CEQA concept of "tiering" refers to the evaluation of general environmental matters in a broad program level EIR, with subsequent focused environmental documents for individual projects that implement the program. CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered environmental documents to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(d) provides for simplifying the preparation of environmental documents for individual parts of the program by incorporating by reference analyses and discussions that apply to the program as a whole. Where an EIR has been prepared or certified for a program or plan, the environmental review for a later activity consistent with the program or plan should be limited to potentially significant effects on the environment that were not analyzed as significant in the prior EIR, that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d]), or were not adequately addressed in the prior EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[f]).

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15168 and Public Resources Code Section 21094, the environmental analysis in this Revised Draft EIR is tiered from the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP EIR. As noted above, the 2005 LRDP is a comprehensive land use plan for guiding physical development on the campus through 2020 in a way that enhances the quality of the campus environment. The proposed project is within the scope of the growth that was anticipated in the 2005 LRDP and evaluated in the 2005 LRDP EIR.

By tiering from the 2005 LRDP EIR, this Tiered Revised Draft EIR relies on the 2005 LRDP EIR for the following:

- A discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas;
- Overall growth-related issues;

³ "Overflow" bed spaces refers to student bed spaces provided by converting lounges into bedrooms and converting double rooms into triple rooms. Currently, the Campus has approximately 9,400 beds of student housing, which include about 900 overflow bed spaces and about 130 in off-campus facilities.

- Issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 2005 LRDP EIR for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis; and
- An assessment of cumulative impacts.

As a project-level EIR tiered from the 2005 LRDP EIR, the Revised Draft EIR relies on the cumulative impact analysis contained in the 2005 LRDP EIR. However, because the Santa Cruz County Superior Court determined the 2005 LRDP EIR's analysis of water supply and population and housing impacts to be inadequate and the Settlement Agreement does not allow the University to rely on the LRDP EIR for these two analyses, the Revised Draft EIR does not rely on the 2005 LRDP EIR for those analyses. Rather, in compliance with the court order,⁴ the University has completed a new analysis of the impacts of campus growth under the 2005 LRDP on water supply, and population and housing. That supplemental analysis is included in this Revised Draft EIR.

This Revised Draft EIR is therefore a project-level EIR for the proposed SHW project and a Supplement to the 2005 LRDP EIR with respect to 2005 LRDP growth impacts related to water supply and population and housing.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

1.4.1 Notice of Preparation and Scoping

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this project EIR was initially prepared and distributed by the Campus to the State Clearinghouse, trustee agencies, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on August 31, 2017.⁵ Distribution of the NOP established a 30-day review period for the public and agencies to identify environmental issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIR. During the scoping period, a public meeting was held on September 28, 2017, at the Loudon Nelson Community Center at 301 Center Street, Santa Cruz to solicit comments on the scope of the EIR from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations. The August 31 NOP, comments on the August 31 NOP, and the scoping meeting transcript are included in **Appendix 1.0** in this Draft EIR.

⁴ The certification of the 2005 LRDP Final EIR was challenged in 2007 by several entities, including the City of Santa Cruz. A ruling by the Santa Cruz County Superior Court in *City of Santa Cruz et. al. v. Regents of the University of California et. al.* (CV155571, consolidated with Case No. CV155583) concluded that additional analyses relating to water supply, housing, and traffic mitigation were required. For more information on the court order, see **Section 7.0**.

⁵ An NOP was issued by the Campus in April 2017 for the preparation of an EIR for an LRDP Amendment to facilitate the development of housing on the west campus. That NOP is no longer pertinent to this EIR as an LRDP amendment is not needed for the implementation of the proposed project on the selected site on the west campus. However the comments received in response to that NOP were reviewed and all applicable comments were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIR.

Following the selection of the P3 developer, who put forth a project that would develop the proposed housing on two sites, with the majority of the housing on a site west of Heller Drive and a small number of student housing units on a second site at the intersection of Coolidge and Hagar Roads, on November 1, 2017, the Campus issued a revised NOP for the project EIR, and initiated another 30-day scoping period to obtain public and agency comments. The Campus also held another scoping meeting for the EIR on November 29, 2017 at the Oakes College Academic and Administration Building on the UC Santa Cruz campus. The November 1 NOP, comments on the November 1 NOP, and the second scoping meeting transcript are included in **Appendix 1.0** in this Revised Draft EIR.

Issues that were raised during the NOP review periods by the public and agencies are addressed in the analysis in each subsection of **Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation**.

1.4.2 Publication of Revised Draft EIR

As stated above, in March 2018, the University published the Student Housing West Project Draft EIR, which was circulated for agency and public comment for an initial period of 45 days that ended on May 11, 2018, and then was extended for an additional 47 days, which ended on June 27, 2018. All of the comments received during the circulation of the Draft EIR as well as at the hearings were reviewed and all pertinent comments were taken into account in the preparation of this Revised Draft EIR. (Note that CEQA does not require a lead agency to respond to comments received on a Draft EIR when the previously published Draft EIR is replaced by a Revised Draft EIR. Therefore the University will not prepare responses to comments on the March 2018 Draft EIR).

This Revised Draft EIR is being circulated for review and comment to the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day review period as required by California law. During the review period, copies of the Draft EIR will be available for review at the Downtown Branch of the Santa Cruz City/County Library in downtown Santa Cruz. Copies of this Draft EIR and studies prepared for this EIR will be available for review during normal business hours at the UC Santa Cruz Physical Planning, Development and Operations (PPDO), Barn G, UC Santa Cruz.

As this Revised Draft EIR replaces in full the previously published Draft EIR, reviewers are requested to submit new comments on this Revised Draft EIR. In reviewing the Revised Draft EIR, reviewers should focus on the document's adequacy in identifying and analyzing significant effects on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. To ensure inclusion in the Final EIR and full consideration by the lead agency, comments on the Draft EIR must be received during the public review period, which ends at 5:00 PM on November 1, 2018. Written comments on the Revised Draft EIR may be emailed to eircomment@UCSC.edu or sent to:

Director of Campus Planning
Physical Planning and Construction
University of California, Santa Cruz
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
Attn: EIR Comment

1.4.3 Publication of Final EIR

Following the public hearing, and after the close of the written public comment period on the Revised Draft EIR, responses to written and recorded comments will be prepared and published. The Final EIR, which will consist of the Revised Draft EIR, comments on the Revised Draft EIR, written responses to those comments, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), will be forwarded to The Regents for their consideration.

To consider approval of the proposed SHW project, Section 15090 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires The Regents to certify that:

- The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- The Final EIR was presented to The Regents, and that The Regents reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and
- The Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

In conjunction with their certification of the Final EIR, The Regents must also adopt written findings that address each significant adverse environmental effect identified in the Final EIR, consistent with Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The Regents must also adopt the MMRP to ensure implementation of mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project to reduce or avoid significant effects during project construction and/or implementation.

If feasible mitigations are not available to reduce significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level, those impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. If The Regents elect to approve the proposed project, and the proposed project would have significant and unavoidable impacts, The Regents will also be required to identify the specific reasons for approving the amendment, based on the Final EIR and any other information in the public record. This "Statement of Overriding Considerations" would be incorporated into the Findings and would provide the specific reasons why the benefits of implementing the proposed project outweigh the significant unavoidable environmental effects that would result from its implementation.

1.5 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

Three uses are envisioned for this document. The Regents will use this EIR to review and consider the environmental implications of approving the proposed SHW project. Secondly, the LRDP-level Supplemental analysis included in this EIR will be used, along with the 2005 LRDP EIR, to focus environmental review of subsequent campus development projects proposed under the 2005 LRDP. Lastly, this document may be used as a source of information by responsible agencies with permitting or approval authority over the SHW project.

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This Revised Draft EIR is organized in two volumes (Volumes I and II). Volume I presents the potential project-level environmental impacts of the proposed SHW project and also contains the LRDP-level Supplemental analysis, while Volume II provides technical appendices. The contents of Volume I include the following:

Chapter 1.0, Introduction – provides an overview of the purpose of the EIR, the type of EIR, the EIR review process, the intended uses of the EIR, and an overview of the format and contents of the EIR.

Chapter 2.0, Executive Summary – presents a brief synopsis of the proposed project and project objectives, community/agency issues, and an overview of project alternatives. This chapter also provides a table that summarizes environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project; LRDP mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts, and the level of significance of impacts both before and after mitigation.

Chapter 3.0, Project Description – provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including its location, background information, objectives, and physical characteristics.

Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation – presents an analysis of environmental impacts for each environmental factor. Each subsection in **Chapter 4.0** contains a description of the environmental setting (or existing conditions); identifies the threshold of significance used to determine whether impacts would be significant or less than significant; discusses the impacts; describes LRDP mitigation measures to reduce significant environmental impacts; and describes cumulative impacts. The “Approach to Project Impact Analysis,” at the beginning of the chapter, provides an overview of the approach to the tiered environmental analysis. Based on a preliminary review of the project by the University, the comments received in response to the NOPs, and the changes in CEQA requirements since 2005, this EIR evaluates the following environmental factors in detail:

Aesthetics	Land Use and Planning
Agriculture and Forest Resources	Noise
Air Quality	Population and Housing
Biological Resources	Public Services

Cultural Resources	Transportation and Traffic
Geology and Soils	Utilities and Service Systems
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Tribal Cultural Resources
Hydrology and Water Quality	Energy

Because the proposed project would clearly not alter the conclusions of the impact analysis in the 2005 LRDP EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, and recreation, these environmental factors are not evaluated in detail in this EIR, although substantial evidence is presented in **Section 4.15** of the EIR as to why these factors are not evaluated in detail.

Chapter 5.0, Alternatives – describes potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project that may be capable of attaining most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening any of its significant effects. The analysis evaluates the environmental effects that would result from implementation of each of the alternatives, compares these effects to the effects that would result from implementation of the proposed project, and describes the relationship of each alternative to the project objectives.

Chapter 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations – summarizes impacts that would result from the proposed project, including significant environmental effects, significant and unavoidable environmental effects, irreversible changes to the environment, and growth-inducing impacts.

Chapter 7.0, Supplement to the 2005 LRDP EIR – presents the LRDP-level analyses of the impacts of campus growth under the 2005 LRDP on water supply, and population and housing.

Chapter 8.0, List of Preparers/Consultation – identifies lead agency staff and consultants who prepared the EIR under contract to the University. It also identifies all federal, state, or local agencies, and individuals consulted during the preparation of the Revised Draft EIR.

The contents of Volume II include the following:

Appendix 1.0 – Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments

Appendix 3.0 – Student Housing Demand Final Report

Student Housing Demand Analysis Findings Presentation

Appendix 4.2 – Air Pollutant and GHG Emissions Modeling and Construction Cancer Risk Assessment and CalEEMod Output

Appendix 4.3 – Lists of Special-Status Species with Potential to Occur on or in the Vicinity of the Project Sites

Hagar Site Plant Surveys

Appendix 4.7 – Post Construction Storm Water Control Plan – Heller Site

Post Construction Storm Water Control Plan – Hagar Site

Drainage Basin Area Rainfall Runoff & Recharge

SHW Recycled Water Model

Appendix 4.9 – Noise Technical Memorandum

Appendix 4.11 – Intersection Operations and Multimodal Site Access Evaluation Memorandum

Transit Analysis Memorandum

Construction Impact Analysis Memorandum

Historical On-Campus Traffic Count Summary Memorandum

Trip Generation Analysis Memorandum

Appendix 4.14 – Construction Diesel and Petroleum Fuel Consumption Tables

Appendix 7.1 – Water Supply Evaluation

Revised Potable and Recycled Water Demand Estimates Memo