

Addendum #1 to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Merrill College Residence Halls Capital Renewal Project (SCH No. 2012062017)

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1.	Project title:
	Merrill Residence Halls Capital Renewal Project, Design Modifications
2.	Lead agency name and address:
	The Regents of the University of California 1111 Franklin Street Oakland, CA
3.	Contact person and phone number:
	Alisa Klaus, 831-459-3732 UC Santa Cruz Physical Planning and Construction 1156 High Street Santa Cruz, CA 95064
4.	Project location:
	Merrill College, UC Santa Cruz main campus, Santa Cruz, California
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: (See #3)
6.	Custodian of the administrative record for this project (if different from response to #3 above.):
	UC Santa Cruz Physical Planning and Construction
7.	Identification of previous EIRs relied upon for tiering purposes (including all applicable LRDP and project EIRs) and address where a copy is available for inspection.)
	1) UCSC 2005-2020 Long Range Development Plan EIR, certified September 21, 2006, SCH No. 2005012113. This document is available at the office of UC Santa Cruz Physical Planning and Construction, Barn G, UC Santa Cruz main campus, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064

II. PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM

In January 2013, the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz campus (“UC Santa Cruz”) adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and the Initial Study (IS) prepared for the proposed Merrill Residence Halls Capital Renewal Project (Project) (State Clearinghouse No. 2012062017), and approved the Project. The Initial Study is tiered from the Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) prepared for the UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan 2005-2020 (2005 LRDP).

The approved Project consists of two major components. The first component consists of major maintenance and renovation of Residence Halls A, B, C and D; and Guzman Suites student apartments (formally known as Merrill College Staff Apartments)¹, and improvements to interior building accessibility. The second component consists of improvements to the pedestrian circulation system and outdoor gathering spaces within Merrill College to meet accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and to enhance the outdoor spaces within the college center. These improvements would provide accessible routes throughout the Merrill College center and between the buildings in the

¹ The building was originally constructed as housing for residential staff but now is used for student housing.

college center to the Crown College Dining Commons; improved community spaces; and enhanced visual and physical connectivity within the college. In order to achieve the gradients required for ADA-compliant paths of travel, the taqueria and Student Activities building will be demolished and replaced with a single building (the Plaza Building) in a slightly different location. Construction will be in two phases. Phase 1, which consists of major maintenance and renovation of Residence Halls A and B, demolition of the taqueria/Student Activities building, and a portion of the site work, is currently under construction. As described in the IS/MND and approved by the Chancellor in January 2013, Phase 2 was to include major maintenance on Residence Halls C and D and the Guzman Suites, construction of the new Plaza Building, and the completion of the site improvements.

In Fall 2013, the UC Santa Cruz Chancellor will consider approval of design modifications to include the demolition of the Staff Apartments. Since the Project design was approved, the process of finalizing the construction documents for Phase 2 has resulted in refinements to the Project. These refinements include the decision to demolish, rather than renovate, the Guzman Suites Staff Apartments building and associated utilities, asphalt path, and wooden decks. There are no other changes to the Project as described in the IS/MND.

This addendum was prepared in accordance with CEQA to inform the Chancellor's consideration of and action on the design modifications for the Merrill Residence Halls Capital Renewal Project. The purpose of the addendum is to evaluate whether changes to the Project since the Chancellor adopted the IS/MND in January 2013, as described below, trigger the need for additional environmental review. Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq) sets forth the circumstances under which a project may warrant a subsequent EIR or negative declaration:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Under Section 15164, an addendum to a previously adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

Based on the following assessment of environmental factors potentially affected, the Addendum concludes that the Project would not cause any new significant environmental effects that were not considered in the IS/MND for the Merrill Residence Halls Capital Renewal Project, nor increase the severity of any impact previously found significant therein, and that no new information of substantial importance that was not known at the time the MND was adopted, has become available. Accordingly, the University determines that an Addendum to the MND is the appropriate level of environmental review for the proposed design approval.

III. CHANGES TO THE PROJECT

The Staff Apartments/Guzman Suites is a 3,411-sf wood-frame and stucco building that houses three apartment units that provide housing for a total of up to 12 students. As described in the IS/MND, the Project would include major maintenance and renovation of the Guzman Suites, including: replacement or upgrade of selected elements of the building mechanical, plumbing, electrical, and IT systems; replacement of roofs and single-paned windows; interior and exterior painting; carpet replacement; and miscellaneous other interior repairs and improvements. The Project as described in the IS/MND also included a new ADA-compliant parking space adjacent to the Guzman Suites, which would be created by re-grading and re-stripping the existing roadway and parking area, and replacement of the existing path with a new, ADA-compliant path.

During the detailed design of Phase 2 of the Project, the Campus performed a seismic review of the Guzman Suites building in compliance to ensure compliance with the University's seismic policy. Based on this review, the Campus determined that the building does not meet current seismic standards. Under the University's policy, the Campus must prepare a plan and set a date for correcting the seismic deficiencies. The Campus has concluded that assuming the cost of the seismic corrections in addition to the cost of the planned major maintenance and renovation would not be financially viable, given the small number of student beds affected. Therefore, the Campus is proposing to demolish the building and restore the site to a natural condition.

The Guzman Suites building is located at the northeastern corner of Merrill College, on a north-facing slope above the steep, forested drainage channel known as Gully H. Access to the building from the Merrill parking lot is by way of an asphalt path and three wooden decks that bridge the grade change between the parking lot and the building. The building structure, with the exception of the concrete foundation piers, which would be cut off a few feet below the ground surface. The asphalt path and the decks would be removed and utilities serving the building would be cut and capped. The existing roadway and parking area adjacent to the building would not be re-graded or re-stripped. Following demolition of the building, the slope would be re-graded, consistent with the recommendations of the Project geotechnical engineer, to create a maximum 3-to-1 slope. Native-species ground cover plants and shrubs would be planted in the disturbed area, and temporary irrigation installed to allow the new plants to become established.

The demolition of the building would result in approximately 2,000 sf of ground disturbance not analyzed in the IS/MND; however, with elimination of the grading of the adjacent roadway and parking area, the total area of disturbance would be approximately the same as analyzed in the IS/MND.

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building would reduce the number of new student beds provided by the Project from 61 to 49.

Changed Conditions Since Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration

The IS/MND analysis took into account cumulative impacts of the proposed Project and the Infrastructure Improvements Project Phase 2 (IIP 2), which could involve grading and other construction activities in the Project vicinity concurrent with those of the Merrill Project. The current schedule of the IIP 2 Project is consistent with that analyzed in the IS/MND. In addition, the Hay Barn Reconstruction Project, whose schedule was not known at the time the Merrill Project was approved, is planned for construction

beginning in the spring or summer of 2014.

The University is not aware of other changed conditions since adoption of the MND that could alter the conclusions of the IS/MND.

Construction Schedule

Demolition of the Guzman Suites would take place during the summer of 2014. It would be incorporated into the construction schedule for Phase 2 and would not increase the total length of the construction period.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

V. DETERMINATION: (TO BE COMPLETED BY LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project could have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, and that these effects have not been adequately analyzed by an earlier EIR or negative declaration. A TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment but all potentially significant effects (1) have been addressed adequately in an earlier environmental document pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) either no changes or no substantial changes to the project are proposed, and no new information of substantial importance has been identified. An ADDENDUM and FINDINGS will be prepared.

Sarah C. Latham

9/19/13

Sarah C. Latham
Vice Chancellor - Business and Administrative Services

Date

VI. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

“Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required” applies where the project may result in an environmental impact that was not considered in an earlier document, or not considered in sufficient detail, and/or substantial project changes, changed circumstances, or new information of substantial importance triggering CEQA Section 15162 has occurred since certification of the earlier document.

“Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document” applies where the potential impacts of the proposed project were adequately addressed in an earlier environmental document and either no changes or no substantial changes to the project are proposed, and no new information of substantial importance has been identified.

Impact Questions and Responses

	(A)	(B)
Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) The IS/MND (pp. 20-21) determined that the Project would not have a significant impact related to degradation of the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings, or with respect to light and glare, because the Project incorporates 2005 LRDP EIR mitigations AES-5A, AES-5C, AES-5F, AES-6B, AES-6C and AES-6E, which require review of project design by the UCSC Design Advisory Board and evaluation for their aesthetic value of trees that would be removed, and define standards for lighting.

Changes to the Project

As described in the IS/MND, the renovation of the Guzman Suites would not result in any changes to the mass or exterior appearance of the building and would not remove existing vegetation. As currently

proposed, the Project would demolish the existing building and the associated pedestrian path and decks. The site would be restored to a natural condition by grading to create a stable slope, and planting with native ground cover and shrub species.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-d) The changes to the Project would remove an existing building, which would expand views into the forest from the adjacent parking lot. Existing trees and other vegetation would be protected during demolition. No new lighting would be added. The changes to the Project would not increase the severity of any of the less-than-significant aesthetic impacts of the Project and would not result in new adverse impacts on aesthetics that were not previously analyzed in the IS/MND.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project would not result in any adverse aesthetic effects. The project would not introduce any new potential aesthetic impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained in those documents. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address aesthetic impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
<p>1. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the CA Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>		
<p>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 California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
Code 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-e) The Initial Study (pp. 22-23) determined that the proposed Project would have no impact related to agricultural resources. The impacts of converting approximately 0.4 acre of land defined as timberland under Public Resources Code 4526 to non-timberland uses would not result in a significant agricultural impact related to forest conversion.

Changes to the Project

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building would not result in any additional tree removal.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-e) The demolition of the Guzman Suites and restoration of the site would not increase the severity of the Project’s less-than-significant impact on timberland and would not result in any impacts on agricultural resources.

Conclusions

The proposed changes to the Project would not introduce any new potential agricultural impacts or increase the severity of the Project’s impact to timber resources, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions of the IS/MND. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address agricultural and forestry impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
2. 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:		
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
violation?		
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-e) The IS/MND (pp. 24-28) determined that the Project would have no impact related to conflict with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan or objectionable odors. Emissions of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants associated with project construction and operations would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to air quality standards and exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants, because the Project incorporates 2005 LRDP EIR Mitigations AIR-1, AIR-2A, and AIR-6, which require measures to control construction-related emissions of fugitive dust and toxic air contaminants, and to conserve natural gas and/or minimize air pollutant emissions from space and water heating.

The proposed Project as described in the IS/MND would not result in an increase in stationary source emissions of criteria air pollutants. The increase in natural gas consumption for space heating in the new Plaza Building would be offset by an estimated 10- to 15-percent reduction in natural gas for space heating in the existing buildings by installing “cool” roofs on residence halls A and B, and replacing single-glazed windows with doubled-glazed windows. Although the Project would add up to 61 new bed spaces in residence halls A and B, the residents of those buildings will be lower-division students who are not permitted to have cars on the campus. Therefore, the Project would not result in an increase vehicle traffic and would not have the potential to result in significant operational emissions of either criteria pollutants or toxic air contaminants (TACs). After consulting with MBUAPCD, the University determined that the proposed Project would be consistent with the AQMP because Project operations would not result in an increase in criteria air pollutant emissions. The Merrill Project as described in the IS/MND does not include any potential sources of odors.

Changes to the Project

The proposed demolition of the Guzman Suites and restoration of the site to its natural condition would not add any new operational emissions of air pollutants, either mobile or stationary. The demolition would not increase the total area of subject to grading in Phase 2 of the Project. Demolition of the building would generate approximately 569 cy of demolition waste, that would require approximately 28 truck trips to offhaul over a period of two to four weeks.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a) The changes to the Project would not result in an increase in the emissions of criteria pollutants associated with Project operations. The Project would still be consistent with the AQMP and no impact would occur.

b, c, d) **Construction PM₁₀ Emissions.** As analyzed in the IS/MND, the phase of construction with the worst-case emissions of construction PM₁₀ was the Phase 1 work planned for the summer of 2013, which includes demolition of the taqueria, grading for the new Plaza Building, and excavation for the elevators at residence halls A and B. The IS/MND assumed that excavation for the new detention vaults in the nearby Stevenson parking lot, as part of the Infrastructure Improvements Phase 2 Project could coincide with the Phase 1 construction at Merrill. Even with the demolition and grading at the Guzman Suites building site, the area of disturbance, the extent of major grading, and number of truck trips for Phase 2 would still be less than in Phase 1. As analyzed in the IS (pp. 25-26), cumulative emissions of PM₁₀ in Phase 1, in conjunction with excavation for the Gully G detention vault would be below the significance threshold. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not result in PM₁₀ emissions exceeding the significance threshold and the impact would remain less than significant.

Operational Emissions of Criteria Pollutants and Toxic Air Contaminants. The changes to the Project would remove an existing boiler and would not create any new sources of operational emissions. Therefore, the changes to the Project do not have the potential to cause a new impact related to operational emissions of air pollutants or toxic air contaminants.

e) The Project as revised would not create new sources of odors. Additional analysis is not required.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project would not introduce any new potential air quality impacts and would not increase the severity of the Project’s less-than-significant construction air quality impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained in the IS/MND. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address aesthetic impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>e) Conflict with any applicable policies protecting biological resources?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable habitat conservation plan?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

Previous Analysis

a-d) The IS/MND (pp. 29-31) determined that the Project would have no impact on sensitive natural communities or federally protected wetlands. Consistent with LRDP Mitigations BIO-6, which is included in all campus construction contracts that involve ground disturbance, the project would implement measures during construction to avoid the spread of noxious weeds. Because the project incorporates LRDP Mitigations BIO-11 (to identify and avoid nesting birds) and BIO-13A and -13B (to identify and avoid bat maternity roosts), all biological impacts of the project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

e-f) There are no policies protecting biological resources, Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) or Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) applicable to the project vicinity and therefore the project would not conflict with the provisions of such plans.

Changes to the Project

The proposed revision to the Project would remove the Guzman Suites building and associated pedestrian decks and path, and cap all utilities that serve the building. The Project includes the Campus’ standard contract requirements for protection of existing trees.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-f) The land disturbance associated with the demolition of the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure, which was not described in the Initial Study, would be limited to existing developed areas and would not take any natural habitat. Although no additional trees would be removed, the noise and human activity associated with demolition in close proximity to forested areas could disturb nesting birds. However, previously adopted LRDP Mitigation BIO-11, which requires pre-construction surveys and buffers to avoid disturbance to active nests, is applicable to and incorporated into the Project. The Project incorporates the Campus’ standard contract provisions requiring protection of existing trees and vegetation adjacent to the building. re are no new policies protecting biological resources, HCP or NCCP applicable to the project vicinity. No additional analysis is required.

Conclusions

The proposed changes to the Project would not introduce any new potential biological resources impacts or increase the severity of previously identified biological resources impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions of the IS/MND. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address biological resources impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:		
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) Cultural resources literature review indicated that there are no previously recorded archaeological or historical resources within the areas that would be subject to ground disturbance for the project. Archaeological survey of the project’s area of potential effects revealed no archaeological materials, deposits or features, nor were any such materials uncovered during the extensive prior development of the site. Since the presence on the project site of undiscovered archaeological features or deposits, or of human remains, is considered unlikely, the project is not expected to result in any impacts to archaeological resources or human remains (Staub Forestry and Environmental Consulting, 2012)

Nonetheless, there is a slight chance that undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources or human remains could be present on the site. Consistent with LRDP Mitigation CULT-1B, contractors involved in the project will be required to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving regarding how to recognize archaeological sites and artifacts that might be turned up in excavations. Further, consistent with LRDP Mitigation CULT-1G, the construction contract will include the specification that if an archaeological resource is discovered during construction, all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease and the campus will provide for a qualified archaeologist to plan and carry out appropriate investigations to assess the significance of the resource, provide avoidance measures, and/or implement data recovery to mitigate any significant impacts. Consistent with LRDP Mitigation CULT-4C, construction contract documents also would include provisions for work stoppage in the event of discovery of human remains, and subsequent protection and treatment that is compliance with the state Public Resources Code. Because the Project includes previously adopted LRDP mitigation measures, the potential for impacts to undiscovered archaeological materials and human remains is less than significant.

There are no buildings or structures more than 45 years old within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Thus, the project would not result in any impacts to significant historic structures or buildings.

Changes to the Project

The Campus is proposing to demolish the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure rather than performing major maintenance and renovation. The changes to the Project would not expand the limits of work within the vicinity of the Guzman Suites.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-d) The area of disturbance associated with demolition of the Guzman Suites and associated infrastructure would affect areas previously disturbed for construction of the building, and was included in the limits of work analyzed in the IS/MND. There are no known archaeological or historical resources within the Project area, and the building is less than 50 years old. Previously adopted LRDP Mitigations CULT-1B, CULT-1G, CULT-5C and CULT-5D, which are incorporated into the Project, would be applicable to the demolition activities, and would ensure proper handling and treatment of unknown archaeological or paleontological resources encountered during construction. Therefore, the potential for impacts to undiscovered archaeological materials and human remains would still be less than significant.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project would not introduce any new potential cultural resources impacts or increase the severity of the less-than-significant impacts identified in the IS/MND, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient to address cultural resource impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
5. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-e) The IS/MND (pp. 34-35) determined that the Project would result in no impact related to rupture of a known earthquake fault or the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Impacts of the Project related to seismic shaking, soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and construction on an unstable geologic unit or on expansive soil would be less than significant because the Project incorporates 2005 LRDP Mitigation GEO-1, which requires that the Campus perform and implement the recommendations of detailed geotechnical studies for projects located on sites where existing geotechnical data is insufficient.

Changes to the Project

The Campus is proposing to demolish the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure rather than performing major maintenance and renovation on the building. The foundation piers would be cut off at a depth of a few feet, as specified by the Project geotechnical engineer. The remainder of the building foundation and structure would be removed. The Guzman Suites building site would be stabilized by grading according to the recommendations of the Project geotechnical engineer and planting with ground cover and shrub species.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-e) The changes to the Project do not involve construction of any new structures and therefore would not have the potential to result in impacts related to construction on an unstable geologic unit or on expansive soil, or construction of alternative wastewater systems. The Project includes grading to create a slope of no more than 3 to 1, according to the specifications of the Project geotechnical engineer. This would ensure that the demolition does not result in an increase in the risk of landslide at the site.

Conclusions

The minor changes to the project do not have the potential to result in new significant effects related to geology or soils or to increase the severity of the less-than-significant impacts identified in the IS/MND. No changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained

therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient to address geology and soils impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
6. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:		
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a, b) The IS/MND (pp. 38-42) determined that the Project would not result in greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) that could have a significant effect on the environment and would not result in a significant impact related to conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The IS/MND analysis uses a threshold of 900 MT CO₂e per year to determine whether the Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. This threshold was proposed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in a white paper published in January 2008, examining approaches that local governments might take to assess GHG emissions under CEQA. This threshold would capture approximately 90 percent of residential projects in the state.

As described in the Initial Study, Project operations are not expected to result in a net increase or decrease in the direct or indirect operational GHG emissions of the Campus. The Project would result in one-time GHG emissions from construction and from the loss of sequestered carbon resulting from removal of trees. The URBEMIS2007 program was used to calculate construction emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) from site grading, construction of buildings, roads and parking lots, including importation of soil to the site by truck. Construction of emissions of two other greenhouse gases, methane and nitrous oxide, were estimated separately based on the URBEMIS2007 estimates of CO₂ from diesel construction vehicles and equipment. Although Campus buildings typically have a lifetime of over 50 years, the construction GHG emissions were conservatively amortized over a period of 30 years. The total Project emissions of GHGs from construction activities are estimated at 115.00 MT CO₂e, or 3.83 MT CO₂e per year for 30 years. Amortized over the same 30-year period as construction emissions, the loss of sequestered carbon from tree removal was estimated to equate to 1.04 MT CO₂e emissions per year. When the carbon sequestration of the new trees in landscaping at the site are taken into account, the net annual GHG emissions of the Project would be 23.84 MT CO₂e per year. This level of emissions would be well below the significance threshold of 900 MT CO₂e per year and the impact would be less than significant. Nonetheless, the Campus has committed to offset the GHG emissions associated with the release of carbon sequestered in the trees that would be removed from the Project site (18.83 MT CO₂e per year), through one of the actions listed below, or a combination of actions that would result in a net offset of 18.83 MT CO₂e per year.

Changes to the Project

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure would slightly decrease the Campus’ operational emissions by eliminating electricity and natural gas use in the building. Demolition of the building would slightly increase the construction-related GHG emissions of the Project. No additional tree removal is proposed.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a, b) The URBEMIS2007 program was used to re-calculate construction emissions of GHGs from the Project, taking into account the demolition of the Guzman Suites building. The revised total Project emissions of GHGs from construction activities are estimated at 125.56 MT CO₂e, or 4.2 MT CO₂e per year for 30 years. Taking into account the net emissions associated with the tree removal, the net annual emissions of the Project would be 24.07 MT CO₂e per year, which is slightly greater than the 23.84 MT CO₂e per year emissions analyzed in the Initial Study. This level of emissions would be well below the significance threshold of 900 MT CO₂e per year and the impact would be less than significant.

Conclusions

Because the project consists of re-development of an existing building for uses similar to those for which it was designed, at a lower intensity, as described above, it would not result in a significant greenhouse gas impact for the reasons given above. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
6. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) The IS/MND (pp. 44-45) determined that, because the Project incorporates LRDP EIR Mitigation HAZ-7, which requires that the Campus survey for and remediate potential contamination before any demolition or renovation work is performed, the would not have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through exposure to hazardous materials. Any hazardous materials used during construction would be handled and disposed of in compliance with state and federal laws regulating hazardous waste and would be subject to standard University contract requirements for hazardous materials spill prevention, reporting and response.

Consistent with Campus procedures and LRDP Mitigation HAZ-7, the buildings included in the Project have been surveyed for the presence of potential hazardous materials as part of project design. The survey identified lead-based paint, building materials that contain asbestos, light ballasts that contain PCBs, and lamps containing mercury at various location in the buildings. The Campus has developed procedures and work plans for abatement of these materials during construction, that will be incorporated into the contract documents. The Project site is not within ¼ mile of a public or private elementary, middle, or high school. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within ¼ mile of a school as a result of the project.

e, f) There are no public airports or private airstrips in the vicinity of the UC Santa Cruz campus. No impact would occur with respect to air traffic hazards.

g) Construction of the proposed project could necessitate temporary lane closures on the Merrill College access road and service roads within the college. With implementation of previously adopted LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9A, which specifies construction traffic control and roadway closure notification requirements for contractors, would the project’s potential to interfere with to Emergency Operations would be a less than significant impact.

h) The proposed project would not increase development footprint at Merrill College, nor would it interfere with Campus fire management or otherwise exacerbate the existing hazard in any way. Furthermore, as required by LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10A, UC Santa Cruz Fire Department conducts annual inspections of all residential buildings, including those at Merrill College. Therefore, the project’s potential to result in increased risk of wildfire would be less than significant.

Changes to the Project

The Campus is proposing to demolish the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure rather than renovating it.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-e) The hazardous materials survey for the Project, and identified lead-based paint, building materials that contain asbestos, light ballasts that contain PCBs, and lamps containing mercury in the Guzman Suites building. The Campus requirements for hazardous materials abatement described in the IS/MND, which are incorporated in the Project, would apply to the demolition of the building as well as to other elements of the Project. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not increase the potential of the Project to expose people or the environment to a significant risk associated with hazardous materials.

e, f, h) No changed circumstance or new information are present that would alter the conclusions of the IS/MND with respect to hazards associated with public airports, private airstrips, or wildland fires.

g) With implementation of LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9A, which would apply to the demolition of the Guzman Suites building as well as to the other project elements, the changes to the Project would not increase the potential of the Project to interfere with emergency operations.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project would not introduce any new potential impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address hazards associated with the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
7. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:		
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-f) The IS/MND (pp. 46-49) determined that the Project would not have significant adverse impacts on water quality, for the following reasons. Construction contract documents for the Project would require the project contractor to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to comply with the State Water Resources Control Board general permit for construction activities, and would also require that the contractor implement erosion and sediment control measures for hillside grading during the rainy season, as specified in LRDP Mitigation HYD-2B. Because the project would be subject to these requirements, the potential short-term construction water quality impacts of the project would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not result in an increase in indoor water use at the site and therefore the volume of wastewater discharged from the site would/would not increase. The project would not change the types of activities and uses of the site. Therefore, there is no reason to expect the quality of the wastewater discharged to the sewer system to change. The Project would not add substantial new sources of runoff pollutants.

As described in the IS/MND, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction in impervious surface area of approximately 1,533 sf. Further, in compliance with LRDP Mitigations HYD-3C and HYD-3D, the Project is designed such that post-development storm water runoff peak flow rates will not exceed pre-development rates, design measures to maximize infiltration and dissipation of runoff near its source. LID elements that have been incorporated into the proposed Project include pervious pavement in some areas; service road widths limited to the minimum required for fire protection; impervious surfaces graded to drain by sheetflow to adjacent unpaved areas; and infiltration of runoff in retention areas on site. The storm water management system for the proposed project would be consistent with Campus Standards, as well as with LRDP Mitigations HYD-3C and HYD-3D. The increase in runoff from the proposed project would not result in flows that would increase erosion and sedimentation or result in flooding, and the impact would be less than significant.

g-j) The proposed Project as analyzed in the IS/MND has no potential to result in impacts with respect to 100-year flood hazard areas, dam or levee failure, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area and is outside the inundation hazard area that could

be affected by a failure of levees or dams. The main campus is not in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project would not result in impacts related to any of these hazards.

Changes to the Project

As described in the IS/MND, the Project would renovate the Guzman Suites building. A new ADA-compliant parking space adjacent to the building, was to be created by re-grading and re-stripping the existing roadway and parking area, and replacement of an existing path with a raised ADA-compliant path to the building entrance. The Campus is proposing to demolish the building structure, wooden decks, and asphalt path. With this change in the Project, the roadway and parking area adjacent to the Guzman Suites would not be re-graded or re-stripped. The concrete foundation piers would be cut off at a few feet below the ground surface, with the exact depth to be specified by the Project geotechnical engineer. The retention of the piers would assist in stabilizing the slope on which the building was constructed. In addition, the former building site would be graded according to the recommendations of the Project geotechnical engineer, and planted with native ground cover and shrub species. Temporary irrigation would be provided to allow the plants to become established.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-j) The changes to the Project would eliminate approximately 2,000 sf of existing impervious surface and therefore would result in a reduction in runoff from that site. The building is situated on a slope, along the side of a ridge above a steep-sided canyon (Gully H). Demolition activities would be included in the SWPPP prepared for Phase 2 of the Project. In order to ensure that the building and path demolition does not result in erosion of loose soils, the Project includes the grading and planting described in the previous paragraph. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not result in new or more severe water quality impacts than previously analyzed in the IS/MND. The changes to the Project would not alter the potential of the Project to result in hazards related to 100-year flood hazard areas, dam or levee failure, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant impacts related to hydrology or water quality, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address hydrology and water quality impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
8. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:		
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		
d) Create other land use impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) The IS/MND (p. 50) determined that the Project would not result in adverse environmental impacts related to land use. The applicable land use plan for the campus is UCSC’s 2005 Long Range Development Plan (2005 LRDP). The project site is located in the central UC Santa Cruz campus. Land use designation for the project site is Colleges and Student Housing. The existing use of the site is consistent with this land use designation. The Project would not change the use of the site. The project site is not within the purview of any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, nor would the proposed activity or development affect any area so designated, directly or indirectly.

Changes to the Project

No new use is proposed for the site of the Guzman Suites building. The planting at the site would restore it to a natural condition.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-d) The changes to the Project would not introduce a use that is incompatible with the 2005 LRDP and would not alter the potential of the Project to physically divide an established community. No new habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plan has been proposed or adopted for the Project area since adoption of the MND.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant land use impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the land use impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
8. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) The IS/MND (p. 51) determined that the Project would not result in adverse environmental impacts related to mineral resources because the project site is not within an area designated as a mineral resource on city or county planning maps, and because the campus is within a Zone 3 Mineral Resource Zone, according to California Geologic Survey (CGS) maps. The CGS does not consider development in a Zone 3 area as a significant impact to mineral resources under CEQA.

Changes to the Project

Demolition of the Guzman Suites and associated infrastructure and subsequent grading and planting would alter the area of disturbance for the Project but grading and demolition activities would be limited to areas previously disturbed for construction of the building.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-b) The changes to the Project would not result in impacts related to mineral resources.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant mineral resources impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the land use impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
9. NOISE -- Would the project result in:		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (including construction)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-d) **Operational Noise.** The proposed project does not include any new stationary noise sources and would not result in a noticeable increase in traffic noise. No impact would occur.

Construction Noise.

Based on the results of technical analysis of construction noise impacts, the IS/MND determined that, with implementation of previously adopted LRDP Mitigation NOIS-1, which requires a construction noise mitigation plan for all construction projects on the campus, construction noise could exceed the 80 dBA threshold of significance at the nearest sensitive receptors when construction equipment is operated within 100 feet of sensitive receptors. This is considered a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Merrill Mitigation NOIS-1. This mitigation requires that the contractor provide a temporary sound barrier, which would reduce the noise level at receptors outside the construction site by at least 5 dBA. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the construction noise impact to a less-than-significant level.

Project construction would not include pile driving, blasting or other construction activity that would generate substantial vibration or groundborne noise. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Site ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can achieve the audible range and be felt in buildings very close to the site. Vibration or groundborne noise levels that would be considered a potentially significant impact. Loaded trucks, the equipment which would create the greatest amount of vibration during construction, are capable of producing approximately 80 VdB at 50 feet. Although construction activity would take place within 50 feet of occupied buildings, trucks would not remain at any one location for an extended period of time and would, on average, be used more than 50 feet from the nearest occupied buildings, construction activities would not exceed the FTA groundborne vibration threshold of 83 VdB² for the nearest sensitive land uses. Vibrations from loaded trucks and other equipment would be less than 80 VdB at the nearest commercial land uses located to the west, north, and east of the project site and impacts would be considered less than significant.

e-f) There are not airports or private airstrips in the vicinity of the Campus. No impact would occur.

Changes to the Project

The Project would demolish the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure rather than renovating the building as described in the IS/MND. The re-grading and re-striping of the parking area and roadway adjacent to the building that was included in the Project as describe in the IS/MND would not occur.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-f) The changes to the Project would not introduce or increase any sources of operational noise. The noise associated with demolition of the Guzman Suites building was not taken into account in the noise analysis for the IS/MND. However, the nearest sensitive receptor, the Merrill Provost's residence (Merrill College House), is more than 100 feet from the Guzman Suites building. All other Project construction activity is more than 300 feet from Merrill College House. The equipment used for the demolition and grading would be similar to the equipment for the demolition and grading activities that were included in the noise technical study. Therefore, the noise level at Merrill College House resulting from activities at the Guzman Suites building would not exceed the significance threshold of 80 dBA. For the reasons

² Vibration is measured in vibration decibels (VdB). The human threshold of perception is around 65 VdB; the dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible is around 75 VdB; and vibration levels are acceptable at 85 VdB if there are an infrequent number of events per day.

discussed in the IS (p. 55), vibration produced by the trucks hauling demolition debris would not result in a significant impact to sensitive receptors.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant noise effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects related to noise. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address noise impacts of the Project.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
10. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Contribute substantially to a cumulative demand for housing that could not be accommodated by local jurisdictions		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a,d) The IS/MND (p. 56) determined that the Project would not result in adverse environmental impacts related to population and housing because enrollment growth at the campus is not dependent on the construction of campus housing, the project would not require or trigger any infrastructure expansion that could indirectly induce population growth, and the Project would not displace existing housing or people.

Changes to the Project

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building would eliminate 12 student beds. As a result, the net increase in student beds accommodated by the Project would be approximately 49, rather than the 61 new beds analyzed in the IS/MND.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a) As explained in the IS/MND, the addition or elimination of student beds on campus does not trigger enrollment growth. The changes to the Project would not construct new roads or utilities. For these reasons, the changes to the Project would not alter the conclusion of the IS/MND that the Project would not induce population growth.

b-d) With the demolition of the Guzman Suites building, the Project would eliminate 12 existing student beds on the campus, but would still result in a net increase of approximately 49 new student beds.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant population and housing effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects related to population and housing. The prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the potential population and housing impacts of the Project. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
11. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create other public service impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a-f) The IS/MND determined that the Project would have less-than-significant impacts related to the provision of fire and police protection services because it would not generate significant new demand for City or County fire or police projection because the small increase in Campus population associated with the Project would not result in the need for new on or off-campus police or fire protection facilities whose construction could result in significant environmental impacts. The Project would house single, undergraduate students and would not create new demand for City schools. Merrill College and the campus in general provide recreational facilities and open lands, libraries, and similar public services that serve the campus residents, so the project would not generate substantial increased demand for or use of City parks, libraries or other public services. The impact would be less than significant.

Changes to the Project

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building would reduce the net number of new student beds provided by the Project from 61 to 49.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-f) The demolition of the Guzman Suites building would slightly reduce the Project-related demand for fire and police protection and other public services. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not increase the severity of the Project’s less-than-significant impacts related to police and fire protection and would not result in new significant public services impacts.

Conclusions

The proposed changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant public services effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects related to public services. The prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the potential public services impacts of the Project. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
12. RECREATION --		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a) As analyzed in the IS/MND (p. 58), the Project would not result in additional student enrollment or additional population living off-campus in the City of Santa Cruz, and therefore would not result in substantial increased use or physical deterioration of off-campus recreational facilities. Therefore the project would not be expected to result in substantial increased use or physical deterioration of off-campus recreational facilities.

b) The proposed project does not include construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

Changes to the Project

With the demolition of the Guzman Suites building, the Project would result in a smaller net increase in student beds on campus than analyzed in the IS/MND (49 instead of 61).

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a) The Project still would not result in an increase in students living off campus and Campus recreational facilities would still be adequate to accommodate the increase in the on-campus population. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not increase the potential of the Project to result in substantial increased

use or physical deterioration of off-campus recreational facilities.

b) The proposed project does not include construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant recreation effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects related to recreation. The prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the potential recreation impacts of the Project. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
13. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:		
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycles paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with applicable policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a,b) The Project, as described in the IS/MND (p. 60), would create new beds in two residence halls, which are occupied almost exclusively by first- and second-year undergraduate students. With rare exceptions, first- and second-year students living in campus housing are prohibited from purchasing campus parking permits of any kind and therefore would not be driving to and from the campus. Therefore, the IS/MND (p. 60) determined that the number of new vehicle trips associated with the Project would be negligible and would not result in a significant impact on traffic congestion, or conflict with level of service standards at any intersection, road or highway.

The IS/MND determined that Project construction would not result in significant impacts to the peak-hour level of service of any intersection because construction workers typically arrive at the job site before the AM peak hour and leave before the PM peak hour, off-haul and delivery trips would be spread out over the course of the work day, and demolition and mass grading, which would generate the largest number of truck trips, would take place during the summer, when the number of vehicle trips to and within the campus is much smaller than during the academic year. The IS/MND evaluated the cumulative construction traffic impacts of the Project in conjunction with construction of a storm water detention system in a parking lot approximately 400 feet south of the Merrill Project site as part of the IIP 2 Project which would also involve a substantial amount of soil offhaul. The IS/MND determined that construction of the two projects concurrently will result in a less-than-significant cumulative adverse impact on traffic congestion because the mass grading that would generate most of the surplus soil from the Merrill Project, as well as construction of the detention system, would take place during the summer months and the truck trips would be spread throughout the day.

c) The IS/MND (p. 60) determined that the proposed project has no potential to affect air traffic patterns because the campus is not within an air safety zone that would require restrictions on development and there are no airports in the campus vicinity.

d,e) As described in the IS/MND (pp. 60-61), Project construction could temporarily increase traffic hazards related to conflicts between construction traffic and other motor vehicle/ bicycle/ pedestrian circulation, and some of Merrill College's internal roadways and paths would be blocked intermittently or temporarily. The IS/MND determined that these impacts would be less than significant because, consistent with the previously adopted LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9A and Campus Standards, the construction contractor would comply with Campus requirements for advance notification of road closures, designation and signage of detours and alternate routes, fencing, appropriate hazard warning signs, and flag persons as needed.

f) As analyzed in the IS/MND (pp. 61-62), the Project would be consistent with UCSC's adopted policies in support of alternative transportation because it includes new bicycle parking that would accommodate the potential demand from up to 61 additional residents, the site is well served by pedestrian pathways and transit stops, and the Project would improve pedestrian connections throughout the site, particularly with respect to ADA-accessible circulation routes.

The IS/MND determined that the small increase in transit demand and pedestrian traffic associated with the Project would not result in a significant impact with respect to transit delay, transit capacity or other alternative transportation service because the increase in the number of residents would be relatively small, the increase in transit demand would be spread out over the day and the week, and the Campus implements LRDP Mitigations TRA-4A through TRA-4C on an ongoing basis. Under these mitigations, regularly assesses the need for improvements in campus circulation to accommodate changes in campus-related circulation demands, makes improvements to the operational efficiency and capacity of the campus transit system and to reduce delays at pedestrian crossings to maintain transit cycle time, and works with SCMTD and other agencies to maintain and improve efficiency and capacity of the public transit system serving University facilities.

Changes to the Project

The changes to the Project would slightly reduce the increase in the number of residents at Merrill College associated with the Project. The changes to the Project do not include construction or demolition of any vehicle, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a,b) The Project would eliminate 12 student beds in the Guzman Suites building, which are generally occupied by upper-division students. Unlike the first- and second-year students who live in the residence halls, these students are allowed to keep cars on campus. As there was an average of about 400 vacant beds in UC Santa Cruz student housing in 2012-13, these students could be accommodated in other existing student housing, which would not affect the total number of student vehicle trips to campus. Therefore, the changes to the Project would not increase the number of new vehicle trips associated with the Project and the impact would still be less than significant.

The demolition of the Guzman Suites building and associated infrastructure would generate approximately 570 cy of waste, which would require approximately 28 truck trips for off-haul, over the course of two to four weeks. The construction traffic analysis in the IS/MND focused on the worst-case period of construction in summer 2013, which includes the demolition of the taqueria building, grading for the foundation of the new Plaza Building, and excavation for new elevators at residence halls A and B. While additional pavement demolition and grading are planned for summer 2014, even with the demolition of the Guzman Suites, the amount of demolition waste and off-haul would still be less than the worst case analyzed in the IS/MND. Excavation for the Gully detention vault as part of the Infrastructure Improvements Phase 2 is now scheduled for summer 2014. However, the IS/MND assumed that this excavation would coincide with the demolition of the Merrill Project work that is being carried out in summer 2013. Therefore, the demolition of the Guzman Suites building would not increase the severity of the construction traffic impact analyzed in the IS/MND. The impact would still be less than significant.

c) The University is not aware of any changed conditions or new information that would change the determination of the IS/MND that the Project has no potential to affect air traffic patterns.

d,e) Demolition of the Guzman Suites building may require temporary road closure. However, these would not be more extensive than those that would have been required for re-grading and re-striping the adjacent road and parking area. The changes to the Project would not increase the potential of the Project to cause traffic hazards or impede emergency access.

f) The changes to the Project would not result in greater pedestrian or bicycle traffic or demand for transit services at Merrill College than analyzed in the IS/MND.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project does not have the potential to result in new significant traffic or transportation effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects related to traffic or transportation. The prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address the potential impacts of the Project. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
14. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:		
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Create other utility and service system impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Previous Analysis

a, c) These issues are addressed above, under *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

b,d,e) The IS/MND (p. 64) determined that no impact would occur because the Project would result in a net reduction in water use and wastewater generation at the Project site.

f,g) The IS/MND (p. 64) The IS/MND determined that the Project would result in a small increase in solid waste generation through the increase in the residential population of the college but that the impact would be less than significant because the Santa Cruz municipal landfill has adequate capacity to handle projected waste disposal volumes generated from campus growth under the 2005 LRDP, including the proposed Project.

h,i) The buildings affected by the Project are not served by chilled water, heating hot water, or steam distribution systems and that the natural gas and electricity demand at Merrill College would be about the same with the Project as under existing conditions. The Project would not require any new electrical lines or other upgrades to the Campus electrical or natural gas distribution system or to the PG&E service to the campus. The construction-related impacts of installing natural gas service to this building are analyzed in the IS/MND in sections 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.9 (*Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality*). As discussed in those sections, construction impacts in these areas would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. The Project would not require any new

telecommunications distribution lines; all improvements to telecommunications systems would be interior. No other impacts would occur with respect to electrical, natural gas and telecommunications systems.

Changes to the Project

The demolition of the Guzman Apartment buildings would reduce the demand for all utilities associated with the Project. Minor ground disturbance in previously disturbed areas may be required to cap the natural gas, electric, and telecommunications lines that serve the building.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-h) The changes to the Project would decrease the utility demand associated with the Project. Any ground disturbance associated with capping the utility service to the Guzman building would be in previously disturbed areas.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant impacts related to utilities, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions contained therein. No Project revisions or additional mitigation measures are required and the prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address utility impacts of the Project.

15. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Issues	Additional Project-level Impact Analysis Required	Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Earlier Environmental Document
which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		

Previous Analysis

- a) The IS/MND (p. 66) determined that all Project impacts on wildlife, plant communities, and cultural resources would be less than significant with previously adopted LRDP EIR mitigation measures.
- b,c) The IS/MND (pp. 66-67) determined that the adverse environmental effects of the Project would be limited to the construction phase, and that the cumulative construction-related impacts of projects that may be under construction at the same time as the proposed Project would be less than significant.
- d) The IS/MND (p. 67) determined that the potentially significant construction noise impacts of the Project upon residents of Merrill College and the people working in the academic buildings would be less than significant because the Project incorporates LRDP Mitigation NOIS-1 and with the adoption of Merrill Mitigation NOIS-1.

Effect of Changes to the Project on the Previous Environmental Analysis

a-d) The changes to the Project would decrease the utility demand associated with the Project. Any ground disturbance associated with capping the utility service to the Guzman building would be in previously disturbed areas.

Conclusions

The changes to the Project do not have the potential to result in new significant impacts, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions of the IS/MND with regard to the Mandatory Findings of Significance. The prior environmental analysis is sufficient and comprehensive with respect to the Mandatory Findings of Significance.