

## 4.15 OTHER RESOURCE TOPICS

---

### 4.15.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes all other environmental topics, including agricultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and mineral resources that would either not be affected by the proposed project or that the impacts of the project would be clearly less than significant. It also addresses the impacts of the related Porter and Rachel Carson dining facilities expansion project on agricultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and mineral resources.

This section is largely the same as the section in the Draft EIR, because the revised project would be located on the same two project sites that were evaluated in the Draft EIR and would involve the same land uses as before – student housing and a childcare facility. The section is revised to include additional explanation to address the comments received on the Draft EIR. No comments related to agriculture and forestry resources, and minerals were received. All of the comments related to hazards and hazardous material were reviewed and the key issues raised in the comments are summarized below:

- An environmental review, such as a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, should be conducted to determine whether there has been a release or threatened release of a hazardous material on the project site or whether a naturally occurring hazardous material is present.
- The older structures present on the site may contain lead-based paint, asbestos, or PCBs. These potential concerns should be investigated and mitigated.
- If the site was previously used for agricultural operations, pesticides and fertilizers are likely to be present in the site soils, which should be investigated and mitigated. If any of these conditions are present, the EIR must disclose the impacts and mitigation measures to address the impacts.
- What happens if there is a fire or an earthquake? How will you evacuate this number of students?

These comments are addressed in the revised analysis presented in this section.

### 4.15.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and the 2005 LRDP EIR, the impacts of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects related to agriculture and forestry resources would be considered significant if the projects would:

- 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 California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;

- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
- conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526);
- result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

**Impact AG-1:           The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland or timberland. In addition, the proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. (*Less than Significant*)**

The Heller site is designated as Campus Student Housing (CSH) in the 2005 LRDP and is developed with the FSH complex, which comprises 199 residential units, as well as a childcare facility. The Hagar site is designated Campus Resource Land (CRL) and is currently undeveloped. The designation maintains that, while not planned for development within the timeframe of the 2005 LRDP, the land is intended for eventual development. The Hagar site is located at the southeastern end of the East Meadow, where the nearest agricultural site is the UC Santa Cruz Center for Agroecology and the Sustainable Food Systems (CASFS), approximately 0.14 miles west across Hagar Drive. The Center manages the UC Santa Cruz Farm and the Alan Chadwick Garden, as well as the offices of Life Lab, a non-profit that develops nutrition and garden-based curricula for grade school students. Finally, the sites of the proposed dining facilities expansion project are located on west side of Rachel Carson College and on the southern end of Porter College. Both of these sites are designated CSH.

Neither site is currently utilized for agriculture and are not designated as Important Farmland on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (DOC 2016). In addition, none of the sites are designated or zoned for agricultural use, forestland, or timberland. Finally, no Williamson Act contract is applicable to any site or its vicinity (DOC 2016). Therefore, implementation of the proposed SHW and dining facilities projects would not conflict with existing agricultural, forestland, or timberland zoning or with a Williamson Act contract, and the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would have no impact on agricultural or forest resources.

Although the Heller site is not used for growing timber, the definition of timber under Public Resources Code 4526 is broad enough to include areas where commercial species trees such as redwoods, are growing within developed areas of campus, including some of the trees on the Heller site. Therefore, a timberland conversion permit from CAL FIRE would be required for the proposed development. However, neither of the project sites is zoned Timberland Production Zone; the Campus does not use any of the sites for growing timber; and commercial timber production would not be compatible with the 2005 LRDP land use designation or with the surrounding academic and residential land uses. Therefore, the SHW project and the dining facilities expansion project would not conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause the rezoning of, forest land or timberland. The impacts from tree removal are addressed in other sections of this EIR and are determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

### 4.15.3 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the 2005 LRDP EIR, the impacts of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects related to hazards and hazardous materials would be considered significant if the projects would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials
- 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
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school
- Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
- 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

**Impact HAZ-1:**           **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (*Less than Significant*)**

Although hazardous materials, including fuel, lubricants, and cleaning products, would be used on each site during project construction, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations would minimize risks associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during project construction.

The operation of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, other than cleaning products and maintenance materials. Propane would be stored in fuel tanks and used to operate the emergency generators on the Heller site only in the event that the natural gas supply to the generators is interrupted. Consequently, there would not be any routine use of propane on the project site. Due to the nature of the materials and the quantities used, impacts with regard to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-2:**           **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not 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. (*Less than Significant*)**

As the time the 2005 LRDP EIR was prepared, there are no known sites with soil or ground water contamination of the main campus (UCSC 2006). According to the Envirostar database, which is the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's system for tracking hazardous waste sites, no sites with soil or ground contamination have been reported on the campus (DTSC 2017). As a result, construction activities associated with the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater. Due to the age of the FSH complex, which was built in 1969-70, hazardous materials, such as lead-based paint and/or asbestos-containing materials could be encountered during demolition of the existing structures on the Heller site, and disturbance of these materials during demolition could pose a hazard to the public and the environment. The proposed project is required to implement LRDP Mitigation HAZ-7, which stipulates that the buildings on the Heller site be surveyed for potential contamination before any

demolition work is performed. Compliance with LRDP mitigation, federal and state regulations, and campus policies and procedures related to demolition would minimize the potential for construction workers, nearby receptors, and the environment to be exposed to contaminated building materials. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.

Propane would be stored in fuel tanks and used to operate the emergency generators on the Heller site only in the event that the natural gas supply to the generators is interrupted. The propane tanks would be placed securely on appropriately designed pads and enclosed by a secure enclosure. All fuel storage would comply with state laws governing the storage of propane. Consequently, there would be a minimal potential to result in a release of propane that could affect nearby receptors.

Small amounts of chemicals and fuel would also be stored on the Heller and Hagar sites for use in the MBR plants to treat wastewater. The storage of these chemicals would comply with applicable state laws focused on spill prevention and spill containment. The storage areas would also be secured. Therefore, there would be a minimal potential to result in a release of chemicals and fuels that could affect nearby receptors. The impact related to an accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

The expanded dining facilities at Porter and Rachel Carson Colleges would not involve the storage of any hazardous chemicals or fuel. There would be no impact related to an accidental release of hazardous materials.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-3:**            **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (No Impact)**

Existing schools within one-quarter mile of the main campus boundary include Santa Cruz Waldorf School, located northwest of the campus in the Cave Gulch neighborhood, and Westlake Elementary School, located southeast of the campus on High Street (UCSC 2006). The proposed SHW project consists of student and small family residences, and the dining facilities expansion project consists of expanded kitchen and dining facilities. Neither project involves sources or activities that would emit hazardous emissions that could affect nearby schools. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-4:**           **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not 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, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (No Impact)**

The project sites are not located on or near properties associated with a hazardous site listed under Government Code Section 65962.5, also known as the Cortese List. Furthermore, the two SHW project sites and the sites of the dining facilities expansion project were not used for any agricultural operations in the past, which could have resulted in the presence of pesticides and heavy metals (from the use of fertilizers and pesticides) in the site soils. As a result, the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-5:**           **The proposed SHW project and dining facilities expansion project would not be 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, and the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (No Impact)**

As stated in the 2005 LRDP EIR, the campus is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport is the Watsonville Municipal Airport, approximately 15 miles east of the main campus. Given the distance, the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not result in a safety hazard associated with a public airport. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-6:**           **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (No Impact)**

As stated in the 2005 LRDP EIR, the campus is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The closest private airstrip is the Bonny Doon Village Airport, located approximately seven miles northeast of the main campus (UCSC 2006). Given the distance, the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not result in a safety hazard associated with a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-7:**           **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)**

Construction of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not interfere with Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) for the main campus through construction-related road closures. Under current campus policy, contractors must complete work with the least possible obstruction to traffic, and must keep fire hydrants accessible at all times. In addition, the Campus must be notified of all road closures in writing at least two weeks in advance (UCSC 2006). Both projects are required to implement LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9A, which requires that construction work be conducted to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic, contractors notify a University representative at least two weeks prior to any road closure, alternatives route be clearly marked, fire hydrants be kept accessible, and alternative routes be reported to campus police and fire. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Regarding the potential effect of the increased on-campus population on evacuation from the campus in an emergency, the students that the project would house would be on the campus during daytime and evening hours regardless of whether the project is built. Therefore, the project would not increase the number of persons on the campus that would be involved in an evacuation during daytime hours. Furthermore, the Campus EOP will be expanded to cover the new housing and procedures for safe and orderly evacuation will be communicated to the student residents. Therefore, the project would not interfere with any evacuation plan. The impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

**Impact HAZ-8:**            **The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not 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. (*Less than Significant*)**

The Heller site is located adjacent to a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Cal Fire 2007). The Hagar site, as well as the dining facilities expansion sites, are located in areas that are not mapped for wildland fire hazards. Current Campus procedures have been successful at controlling fires on the campus in the past. The Campus Fire Marshall routinely performs annual inspections of buildings for internal (i.e., improper use of extension cords) and external (i.e., vegetation) fire hazards. In addition, the Fire Marshall reviews and approves all building plans. Finally, the Campus adheres to building component protection as prescribed in the International Uniform Wildland Interface Code (UWIC) where appropriate. Furthermore, the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would implement LRDP Mitigations HAZ-10A and HAZ-10D, which would require the continuation of annual inspections and the continued adherence to requirements outlined in the UWIC. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

#### 4.15.4 MINERAL RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the 2005 LRDP EIR, the impacts of the proposed SHW project and the dining facilities expansion project related to mineral resources would be considered significant if the projects would:

- result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state; or
- 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.

**Impact MR-1:**            **The proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (*Less than Significant*)**

As stated in the 2005 LRDP EIR, the entire UC Santa Cruz campus is situated in an area designated as a Mineral Resource Zone due to the presence of subsurface limestone marble. The area is classified as Zone 3, which is defined as an area where mineral resources are known to exist, but where insufficient information is available to determine the value of those resources. According to the California Division of Mines and Geology, development within a Class 3 zone is not considered a significant impact under CEQA (UCSC 2006). Therefore, the implementation of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would have a less than significant impact on mineral resources.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

---

#### 4.15.5 REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation (DOC). Division of Land Resource Protection. Farmland Mitigation and Monitoring Program (FMMP). 2016. Santa Cruz County Important Farmland 2014. Available at: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/scr14.pdf>, accessed December 11, 2017.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2017. Envirostor website. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>, accessed December 2017.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). 2007. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA [Santa Cruz County]. Available at: [http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/santa\\_cruz/fhszs\\_map.44.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/santa_cruz/fhszs_map.44.pdf), accessed December 19, 2017.
- University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). 2006. UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan 2005-2020 Final Environmental Impact Report, SCH No. 2005012113.