2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PURPOSE

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an assessment of the significant environmental effects from implementation of the proposed UC Santa Cruz Student Housing West project ("SHW project" or "proposed project").

This Executive Summary is intended to provide the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public with a clear, simple, and concise description of the proposed project and the potential significant environmental impacts that could result from its implementation.

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15123) require that a summary be included in an EIR that identifies all major conclusions, each significant effect, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts of the proposed project. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved. These issues can include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. All of these required elements of an EIR summary were included in the Revised Draft EIR. This summary focuses on the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed SHW project and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding. This summary also reports the findings of the Supplement to the 2005 LRDP EIR.

The University of California (the University) is the CEQA lead agency for the proposed project. The Board of Regents of the University of California ("The Regents") has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed SHW project. In March 2018, the University published the Student Housing West Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), which assessed and disclosed the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed SHW project. The Draft EIR was circulated for agency and public comment for 92 days. After releasing the Draft EIR, the University revised the design of the project and received numerous comments requesting additional analysis and clarification. In light of the revisions to the project and the comments received, the University published a Revised Draft EIR (RDEIR), which replaced in full the previously published Draft EIR. The Final EIR (FEIR) consists of the RDEIR, comments received on the RDEIR, a list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the RDEIR, the responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process, and other information added by the lead agency.

2.2 STUDENT HOUSING WEST PROJECT

2.2.1 Project Location

The proposed project would be constructed on two sites on the UC Santa Cruz campus: the first, approximately 13-acre site is in the western portion of the campus, west of Heller Drive ("Heller site") and the second, approximately 17-acre site, is in the southeastern portion of the campus on Glenn Coolidge and Hagar Drives ("Hagar site"). The UC Santa Cruz campus is located in Santa Cruz County. Most existing campus development is within the City of Santa Cruz; the remainder of the campus is within unincorporated Santa Cruz County. The proposed project would be constructed entirely within the City of Santa Cruz.

2.2.2 Project Description

The SHW project is an approximately 3,072-student bed project, which is planned for completion by UC Santa Cruz by 2023, via a public-private partnership (P3) delivery method. The FEIR evaluated the environmental impacts from the construction of approximately 2,932 student beds on the Heller site, and 140 beds to house student families and a childcare center on the Hagar site.

Heller Site

The Heller site is currently developed with the Family Student Housing (FSH) complex, which includes a childcare center. The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing FSH complex and the construction of new housing, parking, and other support spaces. The proposed project would construct five buildings with apartments and co-housing style units that would provide approximately 2,712 undergraduate student beds. Buildings 1 and 3 in the northern and western portion of the site would be seven stories tall. Buildings 2, 4, and 5, which would be in the central and eastern portion of the site, would vary in height from five to six stories, with the lower portions of those buildings closer to Heller Drive. Graduate student housing would be provided in one building (Building 6) located in the southern portion of the Heller site. The building would be five stories high and would provide approximately 163 units, including some studio units for couples as well as co-housing units for single students, for a total of approximately 220 beds for graduate students.

The project would also include support spaces, such as laundry facilities, mail facilities, custodial space, storage, etc. In addition, student hubs would be included in Buildings 4 and 5, which would be located centrally within the site and would include retail amenities, a fitness center, administrative and student services, music practice rooms, multi-purpose rooms, study areas, convenience store, and social spaces for residents and neighboring student communities to the east and north. The project would also provide

necessary parking and landscaping, and would include sustainable design features, including but not limited to an on-site membrane bioreactor wastewater treatment facility (MBR plant) to generate recycled water for toilet flushing and irrigation, and rooftop solar panels for electricity generation. The proposed project would provide approximately 174 surface parking spaces for residents and 35-45 spaces for service vehicles and visitors. The project includes two entrances: the first entrance would be at the northern end of the Heller site and would be a three-way intersection, allowing only a right-in, right-out movement into the site, and the second entrance would be at the southern end of the site at Heller Drive and Oakes Road, and would be a four-way intersection.

Hagar Site

The proposed project includes the construction of a new family student housing complex on the Hagar site to provide approximately 140 student beds. The complex would consist of 35 two-story townhouses, with each building comprised of four two-bedroom apartment units with two units located on the first floor and two units on the second floor. Each apartment would include approximately 950 square feet of interior space. Other elements of the housing complex would include: community open spaces; playgrounds located centrally on the site; an approximately 3,500-square-foot community building located in the western portion of the complex near the childcare center; a community garden located in the eastern portion of the site; a 1,375-square-foot service and maintenance building located at the eastern end of the complex; and a MBR plant located in a 150-square-foot concrete masonry unit building. A new childcare facility would be constructed on the southwestern portion of the site, adjacent to Hagar Drive. The new, approximately 13,500-square-foot facility would serve up to 140 children of both employees and students and would employ 30 staff. One parking space would be provided for each apartment for a total of 140 parking spaces and about 18 spaces would be provided for visitors. Between 40 and 50 spaces would be provided in a parking lot near the childcare center to serve the center as well as visitors to the residential complex. The project includes two entrances, one on Hagar Drive and a second one on Glenn Coolidge Drive. Both would be right-in, right-out intersections. The development of student housing on the Hagar site would require an amendment of the 2005 LRDP to change the land use designation of the site from Campus Resource Land to Colleges and Student Housing.

The project would be constructed in three phases, with the first phase (Hagar site housing and childcare facility) available for occupancy by Spring 2020 and the Heller site housing planned to be completed in two additional phases with the first phase completed by Fall 2022 and the second phase completed by Fall 2023.

2.2.3 Project Objectives

The University has developed the following primary objectives to satisfy the requirements of *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15124 (b).

- Comply with the University's commitment under the 2008 Comprehensive Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") to initiate housing development in the area west of Porter College before development of new beds in the North Campus Area;
- Support the development of sufficient and affordable, on-campus student housing under the UC President's Housing Initiative;
- Develop additional housing in a timely manner in order to meet the provisions of the Settlement Agreement;
- Develop new housing while minimizing displacement impacts on students with families;
- Locate undergraduate, graduate, and family student housing on campus in order to facilitate convenient access to classrooms and other learning environments; student services; campus amenities such as retail, restaurants and fitness facilities; and reduce the growth in vehicle trips to the campus by relocating commuting students on campus;
- Incorporate adequate support space needed for students and residential life staff (i.e., social space, recreational space, laundry facilities);
- Provide a childcare facility to serve both students and employees in a location that maximizes its accessibility to families living on and off campus;
- Incorporate design, massing, density, siting, and building footprint strategies to minimize removal of sensitive habitats and environmental impact;
- Develop housing at the highest level of sustainability that is consistent with other project objectives with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver certification at a minimum; and
- Provide a reasonable amount of on-site parking to meet basic parking needs of the project while minimizing traffic impacts on campus.

2.2.4 Porter and Rachel Carson Dining Facilities Expansion Project

The Campus intends to replace and expand the existing dining facilities at Porter and Rachel Carson Colleges, close to the Heller site, by 2023. The dining expansion project is a separate project with its own separate source of funding and timeline for completion, and is not proposed as part of the SHW project. However, the dining facilities expansion project has been sized to serve the students who would live in the new housing on the Heller site and the opening of the expanded dining facilities is expected to be coordinated with the completion of the SHW project on the Heller site. The dining facility expansion

project is, therefore, considered a related project, and is evaluated in this FEIR for its environmental impacts based on the information available at this time. The environmental impacts of the project are presented in this FEIR for purposes of disclosure as they are considered a foreseeable indirect consequence of the SHW project. Once the dining facilities expansion project is more completely defined, the Campus will conduct additional environmental review of that project to the extent required to form the basis of its approval or denial by the decision makers.

2.2.5 Alternatives

Consistent with CEQA requirements, the FEIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts and which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in detail in this FEIR are presented below.

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require the analysis of a No Project Alternative (Section 15126.6(e)). The analysis must discuss existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not to be approved, based on current plans, site zoning, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If a project is a development project on an identifiable site, *CEQA Guideline* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) provides that the discussion of the No Project alternative should compare the environmental effects of the site remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved.

However, in light of the Settlement Agreement, the No Project Alternative for this FEIR consists of reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by the University in the absence of the project to provide as many as possible of the number of beds that are required for the campus student population projected under the 2005 LRDP. As discussed in **Chapter 3.0, Project Description** of the RDEIR, the Campus has already implemented a number of projects to increase the density of occupancy of existing housing and has added beds where feasible by reconfiguring existing space as part of major maintenance/capital renewal projects (as at Crown College, where an additional 22 beds are being added). More beds cannot be added to the existing colleges on the campus without new construction, as planned for Kresge College, and therefore are not considered reasonably foreseeable. With regard to adding student beds at other locations on the campus, the Campus did complete an environmental review of constructing 600 student beds on an infill site in the eastern portion of the campus (East Campus Infill or ECI site). Although the project was approved, the Campus determined that provision of the planned housing at the ECI site was infeasible (note that the ECI site is included in some of the

alternatives analyzed in detail below). Similarly, a project to redevelop the Heller site with 400 student beds and a new childcare center was evaluated in 2006 as part of the 2005 LRDP EIR and the EIR was certified. However, that redevelopment project was not approved and is not anticipated to be implemented. Therefore, the No Project Alternative in this FEIR is a no development alternative, under which no development would occur on either project site and no housing would be added to the campus inventory.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Heller site would remain in its current condition, would continue to provide 196 beds and continue to be occupied by student families, and the childcare center would remain in place and would not be expanded. The Hagar site would remain undeveloped at least in the near term because it is designated Campus Resource Land in the 2005 LRDP, a land use designation given to land that is not planned for development under the 2005 LRDP but may be developed in the future. Until a new LRDP is adopted that re-designates the site for development or another development project is put forth under the existing LRDP that includes an LRDP amendment, the Hagar site would remain undeveloped.

Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, only the 13-acre Heller site would be used to provide student housing, expanded childcare, parking and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide approximately 2,110 student beds, including 1,750 undergraduate beds, 220 graduate beds, and 140 units for students with families; an expanded childcare facility; and student support, dining, and amenity space. Compared to the proposed project, the number of undergraduate student beds would be reduced by about 902 beds. The Hagar site would not be developed as part of this alternative.

Undergraduate student beds would be provided in four buildings (Buildings 1 through 4) in the northern and central portions of the site, in buildings that would be five to seven stories high. Housing for graduate students would be provided in Building 5 located to the south of the undergraduate student housing. Building 5 would be five to seven stories high and would include 220 graduate student beds and HUB space. Housing for students with families would be provided in Building 6 in the southern portion of the site. Building 6 would be five to seven stories high and would include 140 units. The expanded childcare facility would be located on the ground floor of Building 6. This alternative would provide up to approximately 364 parking spaces, comprised of approximately 98 on-site surface parking spaces and approximately 266 parking spaces in a decked capacity (either on-site by adding a one to two story parking deck on the proposed parking lot in the southwestern portion of the site or a one to two story deck off-site on the Rachel Carson parking lot).

As with the proposed project, the MBR wastewater treatment plant would be located in the southwestern corner of the site. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would require the expansion of the Rachel Carson and Porter College dining facilities.

Because the Heller site is highly constrained in terms of development area, it would not be possible to construct the housing under this alternative without first relocating the student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. Although phased demolition (and thereby phased relocation) of the student families was considered, it was determined that the phased demolition would be too disruptive for students with families, create safety issues related to the presence of children in close proximity to the project site, and further elongate the construction schedule and increase costs due to inefficient phasing. Therefore, the entire complex would be vacated and temporary housing for all the families would need to be provided elsewhere. The Campus conducted a review of potential sites on the campus where student families could be housed temporarily in trailers and considered the Ranch View Terrace Phase 2 site as a potential temporary site. However, the Campus has begun planning for the development of new employee housing, potentially utilizing the Ranch View Terrace Phase 2 site, and that site is not available. No other suitable sites have been identified on the campus. The student families would need to be moved off campus into University-leased housing. Therefore, under this alternative, student families would need to be relocated off campus into University-leased housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community with the childcare center being temporarily relocated to the Granary. The Campus's 2300 Delaware Avenue site, suggested for this use by commenters on the Draft EIR, would accommodate only about 25 units, at 15 units per acre, on the northern parking lot, which is not currently used for parking. The Coastal Long Range Development Plan (CLRDP), which is the applicable land use plan for the UC Santa Cruz Coastal Science Campus, does not allow any residential development, with the exception of existing caretaker housing on that campus.

As this alternative would provide about 2,110 beds compared to about 3,072 beds under the proposed project, the amount of building space constructed under this alternative would be approximately 30 percent less than the space constructed under the proposed project. However, the alternative would involve the construction of decked parking, which is not needed under the proposed project.

Due to the reduced size of this alternative, the construction period would be slightly shorter than for the proposed project. However, commencement of construction would be delayed due to the need for redesign and the need to find housing for and relocate the student families.

Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only Alternative

Under this alternative, only the Heller site would be utilized to provide the student housing, childcare, parking, and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide approximately 3,072 student beds, including 2,712 undergraduate student beds, 220 graduate student beds, the 140 units for student families, an expanded childcare facility, along with student support, dining, and amenity space. The Hagar site would not be developed as part of the alternative

The undergraduate student beds would be located in four buildings (Buildings 1 through 4) in the northern and central portions of the site, the graduate student beds would be located in Building 5, and family student housing and the childcare facility would be located in Building 6 in the southern portion of the site. However, because this alternative would provide 2,712 undergraduate student beds, Buildings 1 through 4 would range in height from seven to 10 stories, Building 5 would be a five to seven story building, and Building 6 would be five to seven stories with the childcare center located on the ground floor. This alternative would provide up to approximately 412 parking spaces, comprised of approximately 98 on-site surface parking spaces on site, and approximately 314 parking spaces in a decked capacity (either by adding a two- to three-story parking deck on the proposed parking lot in the southwestern portion of the site or a one- to two-story deck off-site on the Rachel Carson parking lot.

This alternative would include an MBR plant at the Heller site to locally treat wastewater and generate recycled water for toilet flushing and irrigation. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would require the expansion of the Rachel Carson and Porter College dining facilities.

As noted above under Alternative 2, because the Heller site is highly constrained in terms of development area, it would not be possible to phase the demolition or construct improvements at the Heller site without first relocating student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. Furthermore, no suitable sites have been identified on the campus to temporarily relocate student families. Therefore, as with Alternative 2, student families would be relocated to off campus housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community with the childcare center being temporarily relocated to the Granary.

As this alternative would provide all the undergraduate beds in four instead of five buildings, the buildings would be taller and the total amount of building space constructed under this alternative would be greater than the total building space constructed under the proposed project at both the Heller and Hagar sites. Furthermore, the alternative would involve more expensive construction methodologies due to the increased building height and the need to build decked parking. Additionally, working within

such a constricted site could affect the efficiency of the project's delivery and re-design would be necessary. The construction duration would be three to four years.

Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Development Alternative

Under this alternative, two sites would be utilized to provide the needed housing, expanded childcare, parking, and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide approximately 1,572 beds, including 1,212 undergraduate student beds, 220 beds for graduate students, 140 units for students with families, an expanded childcare facility, along with student support, dining, and amenity space. Approximately 1,500 undergraduate beds would be provided in buildings constructed on the North Remote site, such that, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would provide a total of 3,072 beds. The Hagar site would not be developed as part of this alternative.

This alternative includes three buildings on the Heller site to house undergraduate students (Buildings 1 through 3). All three buildings would be five to seven stories in height. The graduate student beds would be located in Building 4 on the Heller site, and family student housing and the childcare center would be located in Building 5 in the southern portion of the Heller site. Buildings 4 and 5 would be five to seven stories in height. This alternative would provide up to approximately 336 parking spaces at the Heller site, comprised of approximately 170 onsite surface parking spaces and approximately 166 parking spaces in a decked capacity (either on site by adding a parking deck to the southwestern parking lot or off site at the Rachel Carson lot). This alternative would include an MBR plant at the Heller site to locally treat wastewater and generate recycled water for toilet flushing and irrigation.

Under this alternative, a portion of 9.6-acre North Remote site would be used to construct housing to provide about 1,500 undergraduate beds. The undergraduate student beds would be provided in three buildings that would be six to eight stories in height. Due to its isolated location with respect to centralized student support services, development on the North Remote site would include support and amenity spaces, including a café/market, fitness room, administrative and student services, study areas, social spaces for residents, laundry facilities and mail facilities. This alternative would also include an on-site MBR plant to serve the proposed housing, and approximately 100 parking spaces in a decked capacity along with significant extensions of utility infrastructure and potential roadway development.

This alternative would also require the expansion of the dining facilities at Rachel Carson and Porter Colleges to serve the approximately 1,572 students who would live on the Heller site. Due to the distance of the North Remote site from the existing colleges, students living in the housing at that site would not have convenient access to existing dining facilities at any of the colleges, and dining facilities would need to be developed as part of the project on the North Remote site.

As noted under Alternative 2, because the Heller site is highly constrained in terms of development area, it would not be possible to phase the demolition or construct improvements at the Heller site without first relocating student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. The Campus also examined the feasibility of sequencing construction and constructing the North Remote housing first so that it could be used to temporarily house the student families. The Campus determined that because of the need for additional site evaluation and design work as well as potential delay due to the need for timberland conversion permits for both the Heller and North Remote sites, it is not possible to develop housing on the North Remote site in a timely manner so that housing can be used by student families temporarily and to enable demolition and construction on the Heller site to commence. As a result, this alternative would also require that students with families be relocated into off campus housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community, with the childcare center being temporarily relocated to the Granary.

Although this alternative would be comparable to the proposed project in terms of the number of beds, more building space would be constructed under this alternative because the development at the North Remote site would include duplication of student support and amenity spaces. In addition, significant extension of infrastructure and potential roadway development would be required due to that site's isolated location. Therefore, total project duration would be three to five years if both sites were constructed concurrently. Due to the need for substantial site evaluation and additional design work needed for the North Remote site, the project would experience a delayed start of construction. The project would be completed by 2024-25.

Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative

Under this alternative, two sites would be utilized to provide the needed housing, childcare, parking, and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide approximately 2,478 student beds, including 2,118 undergraduate student beds, 220 beds for graduate students, 140 units for students with families, an expanded childcare facility, along with student support, dining, and amenity space. Approximately 594 undergraduate beds along with student support and amenity space would be provided in buildings constructed on the East Campus Infill (ECI) site, a 3-acre site in the eastern portion of the campus off Chinquapin Road between Merrill College to the south and Crown/Merrill Apartments to the north. The Hagar site would not be developed under this alternative.

The undergraduate student beds would be provided in Buildings 1 through 4, which would be five to seven stories in height; graduate student beds would be provided in Building 5, which would be five to seven stories in height and would include student support and amenity space; and students with families would be housed in Building 6, which would be five to seven stories with the childcare center located on

the ground floor. This alternative would provide approximately 382 parking spaces, comprised of approximately 98 on-site surface parking spaces and approximately 284 spaces in a decked capacity either on-site by adding a two-story parking deck to the southwestern parking lot or off-site by adding a one-story deck to the Rachel Carson parking lot.

At the ECI site, approximately 594 undergraduate beds would be provided in two buildings that would be seven to eight stories high. The ECI site would provide for 100 parking spaces utilizing a decked facility approach.

Two MBR plants would be constructed, one each at the Heller and ECI sites under this alternative, and wastewater would be treated onsite and recycled water used for toilet flushing and irrigation. This alternative would also require the expansion of the dining facilities at Rachel Carson and Porter Colleges to serve the approximately 2,478 students who would live on the Heller site.

As noted under Alternative 2, because the Heller site is highly constrained in terms of development area, it would not be possible to phase the demolition or construct improvement at the Heller site without first relocating student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. Furthermore, no suitable sites to temporarily relocate student families have been identified on the campus. Due to the need for additional site evaluation and design work as well as potential delay associated with obtaining timberland conversion permits, it is not possible to develop the housing on the ECI site in a timely manner, so that housing can be used by student families temporarily and demolition and construction on the Heller site can be commenced. Therefore, the project schedule would be extended substantially if relocation of student families depends on the completion of ECI housing. As a result, to ensure the project would not be substantially delayed, this alternative would require that student families be relocated into off campus leased housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community with the childcare center being temporarily re-located to the Granary.

Total construction duration of this alternative would be 3 to 4 years if both sites were constructed concurrently. Due to the additional design work and approvals needed for the ECI site, along with the need to temporarily relocate students families and the childcare center, the project could experience a delayed start of construction and the project completion could take up to 5 years. It is anticipated the overall project would be completed by 2024.

Alternative 6: Heller, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative

Under this alternative, three sites would be utilized to provide the needed housing, childcare, parking, and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide about 2,258 student beds,

including 2,118 undergraduate student beds, 140 units for students with families, an expanded childcare facility, along with student support, dining, and amenity space. Approximately 594 undergraduate beds along with student support and amenity space would be provided in buildings constructed on the ECI site. The 220 graduate student beds, along with appropriate support and amenity space, would be provided on a portion of the University-owned 2300 Delaware Avenue property (Delaware site) located in the western portion of Santa Cruz. The Hagar site would not developed under this alternative.

Undergraduate student housing on the Heller site would be located in Buildings 1 through 4, which would be five to seven stories in height. Students with families would be housed in Building 5, which would be five to seven stories with the childcare center located on the ground floor. Elimination of one of the buildings included in the proposed project, would allow for better spacing for these two distinct student communities. This alternative would provide approximately 338 surface parking spaces at the Heller site, comprised of approximately 170 on-site surface parking spaces and approximately 168 parking spaces in a decked capacity (either on-site by adding a one-story parking deck to the southwestern parking lot or off-site at the Rachel Carson parking lot).

As with Alternative 5, about 594 undergraduate beds would be located within two seven to eight-story buildings along with additional student support and amenity space on the ECI site. The ECI site would provide for 100 parking spaces utilizing a decked facility approach. At the Delaware site, the proposed four story buildings for graduate students would be located on the parking lot and tennis courts at the northern end of the site. There is ample space at the Delaware site to add replacement surface parking to serve the proposed housing.

MBR plants to locally treat wastewater and generate recycled water for toilet flushing and irrigation would be constructed at the Heller and ECI sites under this alternative. This alternative would also require the expansion of the dining facilities at Rachel Carson and Porter Colleges to serve the approximately 2,258 students who would live on the Heller site.

As noted under the alternatives above, it would not be possible to phase the demolition or construct the improvements at the Heller site without first relocating student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. Furthermore, no suitable sites to temporarily relocate student families have been identified on the campus, and it would not be possible to construct housing on the ECI site in a timely manner to be used by student families temporarily. The Campus also considered sequencing construction so that graduate housing at the Delaware site would be completed first and could be used temporarily by student families while their permanent homes were completed on the Heller site. Based on the additional site evaluation, design work, and coastal development permit requirements for the Delaware site, it is also not possible to develop temporary

housing on the Delaware site in a timely manner to be used by student families thereby enabling demolition and construction on the Heller site to commence. As a result, to ensure that completion of the project would not be substantially delayed, this alternative would also require student families to be relocated into off-campus leased housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community with the childcare center being temporarily re-located to the Granary.

Total construction duration of this alternative would be 3 to 5 years if all three sites were constructed concurrently. Due to the additional design work and jurisdictional approvals needed for the ECI and Delaware sites, those sites would experience a delayed start of construction and the project completion could occur by 2024-25.

Alternative 7: Heller, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative

Under this alternative, three sites would be utilized to provide the needed housing, childcare, parking, and related support facilities. The Heller site would be redeveloped to provide approximately 1,572 student beds, including 1,212 undergraduate student beds, 220 graduate student beds, and 140 units for students with families, an expanded childcare facility, along with student support, dining, and amenity space. About 594 undergraduate beds along with additional student support and amenity space would be provided in apartment buildings constructed on the ECI site. Approximately 906 undergraduate beds along with additional student support, dining, and amenity space would be provided on the North Remote site. The Hagar site would not be developed as part of this alternative.

Undergraduate student housing on the Heller site would be provided in Buildings 1 through 3, which would be five to seven stories in height. Graduate student housing would be located south of the undergraduate housing buildings in Building 4, a five to seven story building, and housing for students with families would be located in Building 5, which would be five to seven stories with the childcare facility located on the ground floor. This alternative would provide approximately 359 parking spaces, comprised of approximately 170 on site surface parking spaces and approximately 189 parking spaces in a decked capacity (either on-site by adding a one-story parking deck to the southwestern parking lot or off-site at the Rachel Carson parking lot).

As under Alternatives 5 and 6 above, the proposed 594 undergraduate beds and additional student support and amenity space would be located in two seven to eight-story buildings on the ECI site. The ECI site would provide for 100 parking spaces utilizing a decked facility approach. At the North Remote site, two five to seven-story buildings containing 906 undergraduate student beds and student support, dining, and amenity space would be constructed. The site development would also include

approximately 70 surface parking spaces along with significant extensions of utility infrastructure and potential roadway development.

This alternative would include an MBR plant at each of the three sites to locally treat wastewater and generate recycled water for toilet flushing and irrigation. This alternative would also require the expansion of the dining facilities at Rachel Carson and Porter Colleges to serve the approximately 1,572 students who would live on the Heller site.

As noted under the alternatives above, because the Heller site is highly constrained in terms of development area, it would not be possible to phase the demolition or construct improvements at the Heller site without first relocating student families living in the existing FSH complex and the existing childcare center to another location. Furthermore, no suitable sites have been identified on the campus to temporarily relocate student families. Due to the need for additional site evaluation and design work as well as potential delay due to the need for timberland conversion permits and other issues related to feasibility, it is not possible to develop housing on the North Remote site or the ECI site in a timely manner so that housing can be used by student families temporarily and demolition and construction on the Heller site can commence. As a result, to ensure that the completion of the project would not be substantially delayed, this alternative would also require that students with families be relocated into off-campus housing if such housing could be found in the surrounding community, with the childcare center being temporarily re-located to the Granary.

Total project duration of this alternative would be about 3 to 5 years if all three sites were constructed concurrently. Due to the additional design work and approvals needed for the North Remote and ECI sites, those sites would experience a delayed start of construction and the project completion would occur by 2024-25.

2.3 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED/AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The University issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR on August 31, 2017 and circulated it for 30 days.[1] The University also conducted a scoping meeting on September 28, 2017 at the Louden Nelson Community Center at 301 Center Street, Santa Cruz to solicit comments on the scope of the EIR from

[1] An NOP was issued by the Campus in April 2017 for the preparation of an EIR for an LRDP Amendment to facilitate the development of housing on the west campus. Comments received in response to that NOP were reviewed and all applicable comments were considered in the preparation of this EIR. Nevertheless, it should be noted that, since issuing the NOP, the Campus has determined that an LRDP amendment is not needed for the implementation of the proposed project on the selected site on the west campus (the Heller site), although an LRDP amendment remains necessary for implementation of the proposed project on the Hagar site.

interested agencies, individuals, and organizations. Following the selection of the P3 developer who put forth a project that would develop the proposed housing on two sites, on November 1, 2017, the University issued a revised NOP for the project EIR, and initiated another 30-day review period to obtain public and agency comments. The Campus also held another scoping meeting for the EIR on November 29, 2017 at the Oakes College Academic and Administration Building on the UC Santa Cruz campus. Both NOPs, comments on the NOPs, and the scoping meeting transcripts are included in Appendix 1.0 in Volume 1 of the FEIR.

In March 2018, the University published the SHW Draft EIR, and circulated it for agency and public comments for a total of 92 days. The University also conducted four public hearings during the Draft EIR review periods. In September 2018, the University published the SHW RDEIR for a 46-day public comment period and in October 2018 held two public meetings to receive oral comments.

Based on the scoping comments received on the NOP and the comments received on the Draft EIR and the RDEIR, the University notes that the issues to be resolved and areas of controversy relate to the following:

- Concerns about the visual impacts from the development of housing on the East Meadow;
- Concerns about the potential for the project to be precedent setting such that more of the East Meadow would be developed;
- Concerns about potential impacts on special-status species from the proposed development at both project sites;
- Concerns about downgradient water quality and volume impacts from discharge of Hagar site storm water into the underlying karst formation;
- Concerns about downstream erosion from discharge of Heller site runoff into the west fork of Moore Creek;
- Concern that the proposed housing will not address the effects of campus growth on the housing supply in the City;
- Concerns about traffic impacts on both on- and –off campus intersections, as well as impacts on transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities near the project sites; and
- Concerns about the alternatives analyzed in the EIR and recommendations that additional on-campus housing sites be evaluated, and the development of the Hagar site be avoided.

2.4 STUDENT HOUSING WEST PROJECT IMPACT SUMMARY

A detailed discussion regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project are provided in the RDEIR **Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.** A summary of the impacts of the proposed SHW project is provided in this section of the FEIR, in **Table 2.0-1, Summary of SHW Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**. The table also lists mitigation measures, which are proposed to avoid or reduce significant or potentially significant project impacts and indicates whether implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Table 2.0-2, Summary of Dining Facilities Expansion Project Impacts, provides a similar summary of the likely environmental impacts of the related Porter and Rachel Carson Dining Facilities Expansion project.

Table 2.0-3, Summary Comparison of SHW Project Alternatives, presents the potentially significant and significant environmental impacts of the proposed SHW project and compares each alternative to the proposed project to demonstrate whether the alternative would increase or decrease the proposed project's significant impacts. If an alternative would result in a new significant impact that would not occur under the proposed project, that impact is also identified in the table. The table is intended to allow the decision makers, agencies, and the public to compare and contrast these alternatives with the proposed project and weigh their relative merits and demerits.

2.5 SUPPLEMENT TO THE 2005 LRDP EIR

In September 2006, The Regents certified UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP EIR (SCH #2005012113) and approved the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP. The 2005 LRDP provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the UC Santa Cruz campus (which includes the 2,030-acre main campus and the 18-acre University-owned property at 2300 Delaware Avenue) to accommodate an on-campus three-quarter-average enrollment of 19,500 full time equivalent (FTE) students by 2020-21, or an increase of approximately 5,100 students from the 2003-04 baseline. The 2005 LRDP includes a building program to accommodate UC Santa Cruz's academic, research, and public service mission as enrollment grows, and a land use plan that assigns elements of the building program to designated land-use areas and describes general objectives that will guide development within those areas. The 2005 LRDP identified targets for on-campus housing for 50 percent of undergraduate students and 25 percent of graduate students. Thus, the 2005 LRDP EIR evaluated the environmental effects that could result from the implementation of the 2005 LRDP, including the effects of adding 2,300 student beds to the inventory of 6,891 beds existing in Fall 2004, for a total of 9,190 beds.

The certification of the 2005 LRDP Final EIR was challenged in 2007 by several entities, including the City of Santa Cruz. A ruling by the Santa Cruz County Superior Court in *City of Santa Cruz et. al. v. Regents of the University of California et. al.* (CV155571, consolidated with Case No. CV155583) concluded that additional analyses relating to water supply and, housing were required. In August 2008, a Comprehensive Settlement Agreement (2008 Settlement Agreement) was executed by all parties to resolve the lawsuits. The 2008 Settlement Agreement was entered as a final judgment of the Court.

When the University commenced the preparation of the SHW project EIR, it decided that to address the deficiencies pointed out by the Court, it would prepare a new water supply impact analysis and a new population and housing impact analysis of campus growth under the 2005 LRDP and circulate it with the SHW project EIR. Since the prior analyses were conducted for the 2005 LRDP EIR, several years have elapsed and many changes have occurred, which include the changes in the housing inventory in the project area, changes in the campus's growth projections, and changes in the amount of student housing that would be provided by the University under the 2005 LRDP. Because of this, rather than simply update the 2005 analysis, the University prepared a new water supply impact assessment for the 2005 LRDP (including the water demand associated with the SHW project), which replaces in full the prior water supply impact analysis reported in the 2005 LRDP Final EIR. Similarly, the University prepared a new population and housing impact assessment for the 2005 LRDP, which replaces in full the prior population and housing analysis. The new analyses are presented in full in **Chapter 7.0** of the RDEIR, and their findings are presented below in **Table 2.0-4, Summary of the LRDP Water Supply and Population and Housing Impacts and Mitigation Measures**.

2.5.1 LRDP Water Supply Assessment

Similar to the conclusions of the 2005 LRDP Final EIR with regard to water supply impacts, the new water supply impact analysis finds that the City's water supplies are adequate to serve the incremental demand for water as a result of campus growth under the 2005 LRDP (including the SHW project) in normal water years. While the supplies would be insufficient in single dry water years, conservation and curtailment are expected to substantially but not fully address the shortfall. The water supplies would be substantially inadequate under multiple dry water year conditions. Although the Campus' incremental demand would constitute a small portion of the City's demand for water through 2023, given the severity of the supply shortfall, the University conservatively concluded that the Campus' contribution under the 2005 LRDP is considerable and that campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would contribute to the need for the City to secure a new water source to address drought conditions. The analysis of probable environmental impacts of the City's potential new water sources (including but not limited to a recycled facilities project and a desalination project) shows that these projects could result in significant or significant and unavoidable impacts. Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would contribute to those

impacts. Mitigation measures are set forth to minimize the 2005 LRDP's impact on water supply. However, the University has concluded that the impact would not be reduced to a less than significant level and would be significant and unavoidable.

2.5.2 LRDP Population and Housing Impact Assessment

Similar to the conclusions of the 2005 LRDP Final EIR with regard to population and housing impacts, the new population and housing analysis also finds that campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would result in a substantial increase in the region's population and, despite the provision of more housing on campus, would place a substantial demand on available housing in the City of Santa Cruz, resulting in the need for the construction of additional off-campus housing. The additional housing that would be constructed off-campus would not result in significant impacts on most resources that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, the additional housing would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to traffic and water supply. Therefore, the analysis concludes that the 2005 LRDP would result in significant impacts related to population and housing. As no mitigation is feasible, the impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Table 2.0-1
Summary of SHW Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
SHW Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	*Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
SHW Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources.	*Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
SWH Impact AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the Hagar site.	*Potentially Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
SHW Impact AES-4: Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse effect related to light and glare.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation AES-4:** Implement **SHW Mitigation BIO-12**	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact C-AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative visual impacts.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Air Quality			
SHW Impact AIR-1: Construction of the proposed project could result in construction emissions that violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	*Significant*	**SHW Mitigation AIR-1A:** The P3 developer shall submit an equipment and phasing plan to the Campus for review and approval that will demonstrate the following to reduce exhaust emissions during construction: • All diesel-powered off-road equipment larger than 25 horsepower and operating on the project construction sites for more than two days in a row shall meet, at a minimum, U.S. EPA standards for Tier 3 engines or equivalent. • All diesel-powered off-road equipment larger than 25 horsepower and operating on the project construction sites for more than two days in a row shall be equipped with diesel particulate matter filters that meet CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters or alternatively-fueled equipment (i.e., non-diesel) would meet this requirement. • Signal boards shall be electrically powered.	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		• Provide electrical line power so that diesel-fueled generator use shall be limited to 100 hours total at the Hagar site. • Minimize the use of diesel-fueled generators at the Heller site. • Ensure intensive construction activities (grading and building erection) at the Hagar and Heller sites do not overlap (note that current schedule indicates these would occur at separate times). **SHW Mitigation AIR-1B:** The project shall use low volatile organic compound or VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings, that are below current MBARD requirements (i.e., Rule 426: Architectural Coatings), for at least 50 percent of all residential interior paints. This includes all architectural coatings applied during construction. At least 50 percent of coatings applied to interior portions of the project must meet a "super-compliant"" VOC standard of less than 10 grams of VOC per liter of paint.	
SHW Impact AIR-2: Operation of the proposed project would not result in operational emissions that would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact AIR-3: Implementation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	*Significant*	**SHW Mitigation AIR-3:** Implement **SHW Mitigation AIR-1A.**	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact AIR-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact AIR-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
SHW Impact C-AIR-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Biological Resources			
SHW Impact BIO-1: Development of the proposed project would result in a substantial adverse impact on four sensitive natural communities.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-1A: California oat grass grassland** The restoration to compensate for the loss of the California oat grass grassland shall be performed using native species from local seed sources. Methods of the restoration shall involve collection/application of seeds, collection/planting of propagules/plugs, and/or salvaging of top soils under the supervision of a qualified restoration ecologist. The management and monitoring plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Campus and a third-party qualified restoration ecologist that is not implementing the project. The management and monitoring plan will include (a) performance standards to ensure the efficacy of the mitigation; (b) timing requirements; (c) requirements for review and approval of final plans by the Campus as appropriate; (d) specific benchmarks and other criteria that must be met; (e) specific implementing actions; (f) monitoring and maintenance procedures and requirements; (g) qualification requirements for biologists; and (h) other requirements needed to ensure the identified impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. Success criteria shall also include monitoring of noxious weeds. **SHW Mitigation BIO-1B: Purple needlegrass grassland** For any unavoidable permanent losses of purple needlegrass, the Campus shall mitigate by (1) permanently protecting existing purple needlegrass grassland within the campus at a 3:1 ratio to the acreage removed, or (2) by restoring purple needlegrass grassland at a ratio of at least 1:1. • In the event that restoration is the chosen mitigation, the Campus will identify one or more potential sites for restoration on the campus, and will direct the preparation of a management and monitoring plan,	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		including quantitative success criteria, for the restoration site(s). The plan will specify that restoration shall be performed with purple needlegrass from local seed sources. Methods of the restoration shall involve collection/application of seeds, collection/planting of propagules/plugs, and/or salvaging of top soils under the supervision of a qualified restoration ecologist. Success criteria for the restoration shall include providing equivalent or greater overall (rather than species specific) cover of purple needlegrass as is found in the purple needlegrass grassland that will be lost to development. Success criteria shall also include monitoring of noxious weeds. The monitoring period for the restoration of purple needlegrass grassland shall be a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are met. This management and monitoring plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Campus and a qualified restoration ecologist who is not the consultant implementing the project. The management and monitoring plan will include (a) performance standards to ensure the efficacy of the mitigation; (b) timing requirements; (c) requirements for review and approval of final plans by the Campus as appropriate; (d) specific benchmarks and other criteria that must be met; (e) specific implementing actions; (f) monitoring and maintenance procedures and requirements; (g) qualification requirements for biologists; and (h) other requirements needed to ensure the identified impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. Management of the site shall continue for at least 5 years to protect the restored areas from reverting to annual grassland. If purple needlegrass restoration does not meet the success criteria after 5 years, restoration shall be remedied (e.g., replanting) or restoration will be attempted on a new, more suitable site. This same plan will also apply to restored purple needlegrass grassland within the temporarily impacted areas. **SHW Mitigation BIO-1C: Creeping Rye Grass Turfs** • Where creeping rye grass turfs are temporarily	

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		impacted, the temporarily affected areas will be restored by seeding and/or planting plugs of creeping rye grass. The restoration shall be performed using native species from local seed sources. • For any unavoidable permanent losses for up to 0.2 acre of creeping rye grass turfs, the Campus shall mitigate by (1) permanently protecting an equivalent acreage of existing creeping rye grass turfs within the campus at a 3:1 ratio to the acreage removed or (2) by restoring creeping rye grass turfs at a ratio of at least 1:1. • In the event that restoration is the chosen mitigation for the permanently impacted creeping rye grass turfs, the Campus will identify one or more potential sites for restoration on the campus, and will direct the preparation of a management and monitoring plan, including quantitative success criteria, for the restoration site(s). The plan will specify that restoration shall be performed with creeping rye grass from local seed sources. Methods of the restoration shall involve collection/application of seeds, collection/planting of propagules/plugs, and/or salvaging of top soils under the supervision of a qualified restoration ecologist. Success criteria for the restoration shall include providing equivalent or greater overall (rather than species specific) cover of creeping rye grass as is found in the creeping rye grass turfs that will be impacted. Success criteria shall also include monitoring of noxious weeds. This management and monitoring plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Campus and a qualified restoration ecologist who is not the consultant implementing the project. The monitoring period for the restoration of creeping rye grass turfs shall be a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are met. Management of the site shall continue for at least 5 years to protect the restored areas from reverting to annual grassland. If creeping rye grass restoration does not meet the success criteria after 5 years,	

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		restoration shall be remedied (e.g., replanting) or restoration will be attempted on a new, more suitable site. This same plan will also apply to restored creeping rye grass turfs within the temporarily impacted areas. **SHW Mitigation BIO-1D: California Bay Forest** ***Mitigation for Loss of Understory*** • Where California bay forest understory vegetation is temporarily impacted, the temporarily affected areas will be restored by seeding and/or planting native California bay forest understory plants, such as California blackberry, coyote brush, and yerba buena. • For any unavoidable permanent losses, the Campus shall mitigate (1) by permanently protecting an equivalent acreage of existing California bay forest within the campus at a 3:1 ratio to the acreage impacted, or (2) by restoring California bay forest understory vegetation at a ratio of at least 1:1. • In the event that restoration is the chosen mitigation, the Campus will identify one or more potential sites for restoration on the campus, and will direct the preparation of a management and monitoring plan, including quantitative success criteria, for the restoration site(s). The plan will specify that restoration shall be performed with California bay forest understory vegetation from local plant sources. Methods of the restoration shall involve collection/application of seeds and/or collection/planting of propagules/plugs under the supervision of a qualified restoration ecologist. Success criteria for the restoration shall include providing plant survivorship (or established) and providing equivalent or greater overall (rather than species specific) cover of California bay forest understory vegetation as is found in the understory vegetation that will be impacted due to the storm drain improvements. Success criteria shall also include monitoring of noxious weeds. This	

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		management and monitoring plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Campus and a qualified restoration ecologist who is not the consultant implementing the project. The monitoring period for the restoration of California bay forest understory vegetation shall be a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are met. Management of the site shall continue for at least 5 years. If restoration does not meet the success criteria after 5 years, restoration shall be remedied (e.g., replanting) or restoration will be attempted on a new, more suitable site. This same plan will also apply to restored understory vegetation within the temporarily impacted areas. ***Mitigation for Impact to Tree Root Systems*** Tree Protection Zone fencing shall be installed under the supervision of a qualified arborist and maintained to prevent direct damage to trees. The fence shall be placed at a distance that is at or outside of the drip lines of trees or 8 feet from their trunk, whichever is greater. Heavy machinery shall not be allowed to operate or be stored within the dripline of avoided trees unless approved by a qualified arborist. Excavation work within the dripline of trees shall be conducted with light equipment or by hand whenever possible to avoid tearing of large diameter roots. Root pruning shall be performed with a sharp blade taking care not to tear root tissue. Construction materials or debris shall not be placed adjacent to or against the trunks of the trees. Disposal or depositing of oil, gasoline, chemicals or other harmful materials within the forest shall be prohibited. The certified arborist shall be present to monitor activities that may pose a potential threat to the trees.	
SHW Impact BIO-2: The proposed project would not result in an adverse impact, directly and indirectly, on special-status plant species.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-3: The proposed project would not introduce or cause the spread of noxious weeds, which could reduce the abundance of native plants and sensitive communities.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-4: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse impact (i.e., loss or	*Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-4**: The Campus shall implement the following measures.	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
degradation of habitat) on cave invertebrates, including the Santa Cruz telemid spider, Dolloff Cave spider, Empire Cave pseudoscorpion, or Mackenzie's Cave amphipod.		• Require mandatory stewardship training for residents of the proposed Heller site and Hagar site housing (either online or in person) designed to bring awareness to sensitive environments and ways to reduce impacts to the cave and other sensitive biological resources in proximity of the project sites. The training could be provided by the CNR. • Install additional interpretive signage about the cave species, other sensitive plant and wildlife species, and their habitats, Best Stewardship/Leave no Trace principles for lessening the impact on the environment, and the CNR lands and mission. • The CNR Manager will work with Campus Police to evaluate additional enforcement actions that may be implemented to address the unauthorized activities by campus and non-campus population at the cave.	
SHW Impact BIO-5: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse effect on important movement habitat and direct impacts to California red-legged frog.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-5A:** In addition to LRDP Mitigation BIO-9, the project shall implement the following avoidance measures at both project sites. • Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall be present a training session for all project personnel to provide an overview on the CRLF, applicable regulatory policies and provisions regarding their protection, and the avoidance and minimization measures to be followed to protect the species. All crew members shall be briefed on the reporting process in the event that an inadvertent injury should occur to a special-status species during construction. This training shall be incorporated into the daily job orientation and safety training provided to new craft coming onsite. • The biologist may train one or more members of the contractor staff to serve as biological monitor with responsibility for daily inspection of the construction fencing as described below. • The contractor, in coordination with the biologist, shall install exclusionary fencing around the entire project work site. The fencing shall be heavy-duty silt-fence or similar material (not open-meshed). It shall be buried a minimum of 6 inches so that CRLF cannot crawl under the fence and shall be inspected and maintained throughout the construction period,	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		as specified below. • Installation of the fencing shall be monitored by the biologist. Cover boards shall be placed at approximately 100-foot intervals outside the fence to provide cover for wildlife that encounters the fence. Cover boards shall be monitored weekly by the biological monitor to ensure that they remain in place and are functional. • A qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor all construction activities within CRLF upland or dispersal habitat daily during initial ground-disturbing activities, including grading, excavation, and vegetation removal. • The biologist shall perform spot checks of the site once a week. • If a CRLF is observed at any time during project activities, all work that may result in disturbance, injury, or mortality to the individual shall cease. The contractor shall notify the biologist, who shall in turn contact the Campus and USFWS. • Prior to the start of daily construction activities, the biologist or a biological monitor trained by the biologist shall inspect the perimeter fence to ensure that it is not ripped or has holes and that the base is still buried. The fence shall also be inspected to ensure that no CRLF are trapped in the fence. Any CRLF found along and outside the fence shall be closely monitored until the CRLF moves away from the construction area. **SHW Mitigation BIO-5B:** Temporary exclusion fencing shall be placed around the perimeter of the trenched utility corridor and storm water improvements. If possible, all trenched areas shall be completed and backfilled by the end of the work day. Any open trenches that cannot be backfilled shall be covered by the end of the work day. If installation of the utility lines cannot be completed within one day, the utility lines and storm drains shall be trenched in sections no longer than 300 feet in length to allow CRLF movement around the exclusion fences. Trenching shall not occur in amounts greater than what can be completed during the following work day.	

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
SHW Impact BIO-6: The proposed project could result in direct impacts to California giant salamanders and American badgers.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-6A:** Implement **SHW Mitigations BIO-5A** and **5B**. **SHW Mitigation BIO-6B:** Pre-construction surveys for American badger and potential badger burrows shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to construction activities. The survey shall be conducted within 14 days prior to the start of construction activities within 300 feet of the project site. If occupied burrows are found, the qualified biologist shall consult with CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer. If the occupied burrow is determined to be a natal badger den, then the burrow would have to remain protected until the juveniles are old enough to move from their den.	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact BIO-7: The proposed project would not result in the loss or abandonment of active nests for special-status raptors and other special-status and protected birds.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-8: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on western burrowing owl.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-9: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the disturbance of roosting sites for special-status bats.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-10: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the loss of potential San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat nests.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-11: The proposed project could interfere with the movement of wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-11A:** Implement **SHW Mitigation BIO-5A** and **-5B.** **SHW Mitigation BIO-11B:** The Campus shall review the final designs of the buildings at the Heller and Hagar sites to ensure that appropriate bird safety designs, including the most current Bird-safe Design Standards, have been effectively incorporated to reduce potential impacts to birds.	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact BIO-12: Outdoor lighting associated with the proposed project could impact wildlife behavior adjacent to the project sites.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation BIO-12:** Outdoor lighting shall incorporate the following design guidelines: • New outer outdoor lighting shall be directed away from the habitat surrounding the sites and away from	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		the proposed enhanced wildlife movement corridors. • Dimmer lights, the use of motion sensors, and late night off-periods shall be used to minimize lighting impacts to the adjacent sensitive habitat. • Generally following the International Dark-Sky Association guidelines for minimizing light pollution, outdoor lighting shall be provided in a manner that provides for nighttime safety, utility, security, and enjoyment while preventing light trespass into natural areas surrounding the sites. • The design objective shall be to preclude any net increase in ambient lighting into adjacent sensitive habitats. • All external lighting shall include full-cutoff angles, which focus on target areas and do not extend to adjacent sensitive habitat. • Any pedestrian/bicycle pathway safety lighting shall be limited to low-bollard style lights that limit illumination to the trail surface.	
SHW Impact BIO-13: The proposed project would not conflict with a local policy for protecting biological resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-14: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-15: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on wetlands or other jurisdictional features.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact BIO-16: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse indirect impacts related to use of rodenticides, or the introduction pet dogs and cats to the project area.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-BIO-1: The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts on biological resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
SHW Impact CULT-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known historical resource.	*Less than Significant*	**SHW Mitigation CULT-1**: Prior to ground disturbing activities in the study area, a qualified archaeologist shall re-record and photo document the isolated feature P-UCSC-012H before removing it from its current location.	*N/A*
SHW Impact CULT-2: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a previously unknown historical or archaeological resource, or to human remains.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation CULT-2A:** If any grading is proposed within 200 feet of the known margin of CA-SCR-142, the Campus will retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor the grading and to determine whether intact deposits are present. If archaeological materials are exposed by grading, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation CULT-1G and LRDP Mitigation CULT-4B. If human remains are exposed and the County Sheriff-Coroner determines them to be of Native American origin, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation CULT-4C. **SHW Mitigation CULT-2B:** A Native American monitor of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band will be provided an opportunity to monitor during ground disturbance within 200 feet of a known prehistoric deposit. In addition, if a previously unknown prehistoric deposit is uncovered during construction, a native American monitor of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band will be provided the opportunity to monitor grading within 200 feet of the find. **SHW Mitigation CULT-2C**: Once the vegetation on the Hagar site is removed and before any grading for project construction is undertaken, another intensive pedestrian survey of the site will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist.	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact CULT-3: The proposed project would not adversely affect paleontological resources or unique geologic resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-CULT-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative cultural resource impacts.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Geology and Soils			
SHW Impact GEO-1: The proposed project would not expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects related to fault	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
rupture, seismic ground shaking, and/or seismic-related ground failure.			
SHW Impact GEO-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact GEO-3: The proposed project would result in construction of facilities in an area underlain by karst features, which could lead to settlement or collapse beneath the structures.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation GEO-3A:** At the time of the building foundation excavation in areas underlain by dolines, the excavation shall be examined by the project geologist and geotechnical engineer, prior to backfilling of the excavation. A geologic map portraying the distribution of rock and soil shall be prepared by the project geologist, particularly showing the geometry of the exposed marble bedrock. If previously unidentified dolines in excess of the design void span are mapped in the excavation, the project shall be redesigned to span those voids, or further subsurface work shall be performed to adequately characterize the hazard and attendant risks related to karst processes. **SHW Mitigation GEO-3B:** Implement **SHW Mitigation HYD-3B**.	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact GEO-4: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soils or a geologic unit that could become unstable as a result of the project.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact GEO-5: The proposed project would not be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed SHW project would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to geology and soils.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
SHW Impact GHG-1: Project construction and operation would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would not have a significant impact on the environment.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact GHG-2: The proposed project would not conflict with state law, UC Policy on	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Sustainable Practices, or the UC Santa Cruz Climate Action Plan.			
SHW Impact C-GHG-1: The proposed project would not result in a significant cumulative GHG impact.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Hydrology and Water Quality			
SHW Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed SHW project would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact HYD-2: Heller site development and operations would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, 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, or result in downstream erosion and flooding.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact HYD-3: Hagar site development and operations would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality; 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 or cause substantial changes in spring flows; but could result in erosion and sedimentation in Jordan Gulch.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation HYD-3A**: Treated storm water runoff will be sampled on site, and laboratory analyzed for total suspended solids, pH, oil & grease, and nitrates and compared with applicable storm water benchmarks threshold limits in general accordance with protocols outlined in the Industrial General Permit.[2] In the event a limit is exceeded for any of the constituents, an assessment of existing best management practices will be conducted, and appropriate changes will be made to best management practices. **SHW Mitigation HYD-3B:** A minimum 60-foot buffer shall be established between infiltration areas and critical structures, existing or planned, such as buildings, roadways, and life/safety infrastructure. **SHW Mitigation HYD-3C:** In the event that a sinkhole is formed or activated in Jordan Gulch by the discharge of storm water and recycled water from the Hagar site, a graded filter or another filtration system will be designed	*Less than Significant*

2 While the Industrial General Permit is not applicable to the UC Santa Cruz campus, it establishes standard of care protocols for storm water analysis, qualifying storm events for sample collection, and provides benchmark threshold limits for evaluating water quality.

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		and constructed.	
SHW Impact HYD-4: Implementation of the proposed SHW project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-HYD-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Land Use and Planning			
SHW Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not conflict with the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP once amended.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact LU-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing or planned adjacent land uses.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact LU-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-LU-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Noise			
SHW Impact NOIS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose project residents to noise levels in excess of applicable standards.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact NOIS-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in noise levels existing without the project.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact NOIS-3: Construction associated with the proposed project would not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
levels existing without the project.			
SHW Impact NOIS-4: Construction associated with the proposed project would not generate and expose nearby receptors and buildings to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne vibrations.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-NOIS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative noise impacts.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Public Services			
SHW Impact PS-1: Implementation of the proposed SHW project would not result in significant environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or altered fire protection facilities to maintain applicable service levels.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-PS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative public service impacts.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Transportation and Traffic			
SHW Impact TRA-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not increase traffic volumes and degrade off-campus intersection levels of service under 2020 or 2023 conditions.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact TRA -2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase traffic volumes and degrade levels of service at existing and new intersections on the campus under 2020 conditions.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact TRA-3: Construction period traffic could temporarily impact traffic conditions along roadways serving the project sites, including potential effect on emergency vehicle access.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation TRA-3:** The University shall require the Project Developer to prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan that will include, but will not necessarily be limited to, the following elements: • Identify proposed truck routes to be used. • Specify construction hours, including limits on the number of truck trips during the AM and PM peak traffic periods (7:00 – 9:00 AM and 4:00 – 6:00 PM), if	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		conditions demonstrate the need. • Include a parking management plan for ensuring that construction worker parking results in minimal disruption to surrounding uses. • Include a public information and signage plan to inform student, faculty and staff of the planned construction activities, roadway changes/closures, and parking changes. • Store construction materials only in designated areas that minimize impacts to nearby roadways. • Limit the number of lane closures during peak hours to the extent possible. At no time will more than one lane on any roadway be closed. Inform the Campus at least two weeks before any partial road closure. • Use California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) certified flag persons for any temporary lane closures to minimize impacts to traffic flow, and to ensure safe access into and out of the project sites. • Install traffic control devices as specified in the California Department of Transportation Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. • When a pedestrian/bicycle path is to be closed, detour signs will be installed to clearly designate an alternative route. Temporary fencing or other indicators of pedestrian and bicycle hazards will be provided. • To minimize disruption of emergency vehicle access, affected jurisdictions (Campus Police, City Police, County Sheriff, and City Fire Department) will be consulted to identify detours for emergency vehicles, which will then be posted by the construction contractor. • Ensure that access to fire hydrants remains available at all times. • Coordinate with local transit agencies for temporary relocation of routes or bus stops in works zones, as necessary. • Coordinate with other projects under construction in the immediate vicinity including the Kresge College	

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		project, so an integrated approach to construction-related traffic is developed and implemented.	
SHW Impact TRA-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in hazards due to design features or land use incompatibilities.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact TRA-5: The proposed project would not impair emergency access in the long-term.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact TRA-6: The proposed project would conflict with UC Santa Cruz policies related to alternative transportation.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation TRA-6:** Consistent with LRDP Mitigations TRA-4A and TRA-4C, the Campus shall monitor pedestrian traffic and transit times at the Heller Drive crossing adjacent to the project site and, if warranted, extend the existing crossing guard program to this crossing.	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact C-TRA-1: Implementation of the proposed SHW project would not result in significant cumulative traffic impacts.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*Less than Significant*
Tribal Cultural Resources			
SHW Impact TCR-1: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Section 21074.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation TCR-1:** Implement **SHW Mitigations CULT-2A** through **2C.**	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact C-TCR-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant cumulative impact on Tribal Cultural Resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Utilities and Service Systems			
SHW Impact UTIL-1: The proposed project would not cause an exceedance of applicable wastewater treatment requirements but would entail the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental effects.	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Impact UTIL-1:** Implement **SHW Mitigations BIO-1A through 1D, BIO-5B**, and **CULT-2A through 2C.**	*Less than Significant*
SHW Impact UTIL-2: The proposed project would not require the construction of off-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact UTIL-3: The proposed project would require the construction of new storm	*Potentially Significant*	**SHW Mitigation UTIL-3:** Implement **SHW Mitigations**	*Less than Significant*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.		**BIO-1A through 1D, BIO-5B**, and **CULT-2A through 2C.**	
SHW Impact UTIL-4: The proposed project would increase the amount of water used on the project site, and would be adequately served by existing entitlements and water resources under normal water years but not under multiple dry year conditions.	*Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
SHW Impact UTIL-5: The proposed project would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the project site, but would be adequately served by the regional landfill and would also comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact C-UTIL-1: The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities.	*Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
Energy			
SHW Impact EN-1: Construction and operation of the proposed project would increase the use of energy resources on the project site but would not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
SHW Impact EN-2: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded electrical or natural gas facilities, which would cause significant environmental effects.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Other Resources			
Impact AG-1: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland or timberland. In addition, the proposed SHW project and the related dining	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
facilities expansion project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.			
Impact HAZ-1: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-2: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-3: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-4: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-5: The proposed SHW project and dining facilities expansion project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-6: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project	*No Impact*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.			
Impact HAZ-7: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact HAZ-8: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact MR-1: The proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Impact P&H-1: Implementation of the proposed SHW and dining facilities expansion projects would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly, nor would they displace a substantial amount of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Table 2.0-2
Summary of Dining Facilities Expansion Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
DF Impact AES-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities project would not result in a significant impact on scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and quality, or light and glare.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Air Quality			
DF Impact AIR-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities project would not result in a significant impact on air quality during construction and operations.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Biological Resources			
DF Impact BIO-1: The proposed dining facilities expansion project would not result in potential significant impacts to nesting birds.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
DF Impact BIO-2: The proposed dining facilities expansion project would result in potential significant impacts to California red-legged frog.	*Potentially Significant*	**DF Mitigation BIO-2:** Implement **SHW Mitigation BIO-5A.**	*Less than Significant*
DF Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not interfere with wildlife movement.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
DF Impact BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not result in any significant conflicts with local plans and policies.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Cultural Resources			
DF Impact CULT-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of prehistoric or historic period archaeological resources, human remains, or paleontological resources.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils			
DF Impact GEO-1: The proposed dining facilities expansion project would not expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, landslides and cut slopes, or existing geologic conditions. Project implementation would also not result in substantial soil erosion or involve soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
DF Impact GHG-1: The proposed dining facilities project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment, nor would the proposed trail conflict with any applicable plans or policies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Hydrology			
DF Impact HYD-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not have a significant impact related to water quality; siltation, erosion or flooding due to the alternation of drainage patterns; and groundwater recharge.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Land Use and Planning			
DF Impact LU-1: The proposed dining facilities expansion project would not conflict with the 2005 LRDP or with plans, policies, and regulations. In addition, implementation of the proposed dining expansion facilities project would not result in incompatible land uses nor would it conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Noise			
DF Impact NOI-1: Construction activities associated with the dining facilities expansion project would substantially increase noise levels at residential uses in the vicinity but would not	*Significant*	No further mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration. The proposed project would not increase traffic-related noise levels.			
Public Services			
DF Impact PS-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 fire protection, police, schools, and parks. In addition, implementation of the proposed dining expansion facilities project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Transportation and Traffic			
DF Impact TRA-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would not conflict with any applicable plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the traffic circulation system; increase traffic hazards; or result in inadequate emergency access.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Tribal Cultural Resources			
DF Impact TCR-1: Implementation of the proposed project would be unlikely to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*
Utilities and Service Systems			
DF Impact UTIL-1: The implementation of the proposed dining facilities project would not cause substantial adverse impacts requiring new or expanded water supply or expansion of a water delivery system; result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
conveyance systems; or require construction or expansion of new storm water drainage facilities. The proposed dining facilities project would comply with all regulations related to solid waste and there would be sufficient landfill capacity to serve the proposed project.			
Energy			
DF Impact EN-1: Construction and operation of the proposed dining facilities expansion project would minimally increase the consumption of energy but would not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy or exceed the capacity of distribution systems.	*Less than Significant*	No mitigation is required.	*N/A*

*Note: For impacts of the Dining Facilities Expansion project on other resources, See **Table 2.0-1** above.*

Table 2.0-3
Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives[a]

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Aesthetics								
SHW Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	*S/SU*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *S/SU*	Greater; *S/SU*	Reduced; *S/SU*	Reduced; *S/SU*	Reduced; *S/SU*	Reduced; *S/SU*
SHW Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources.	*S/SU*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*
SWH Impact AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would substantially degrade the visual character or quality	*PS/SU*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; S/*SU*	Similar; S/*SU*	Similar; S/*SU*
SHW Impact AES-4: Implementation of the proposed project would result in a substantial adverse effect related to light and glare.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*
Air Quality								
SHW Impact AIR-1: Construction of the proposed project could result in construction emissions that violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	*S/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; LTS	Similar; *S/LTS*	Greater; *S/LTS*	Greater; *S/LTS*	Greater; *S/LTS*	Greater; *S/LTS*
SHW Impact AIR-3: Implementation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	*S/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Biological Resources								
SHW Impact BIO-1: Development of the proposed project would result in a substantial adverse impact on four sensitive natural communities.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact BIO-4: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse impact (i.e., loss or degradation of habitat) on cave invertebrates.	*S/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *S/LTS*	Similar; *S/LTS*	Similar; *S/LTS*	Reduced; *S/LTS*	Reduced; *S/LTS*	Reduced; *S/LTS*
SHW Impact BIO-5: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse effect on important movement habitat and direct impacts to California red-legged frog.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact BIO-6: The proposed project could result in direct impacts to California giant salamanders and American badgers.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact BIO-11: The proposed project could interfere with the movement of wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact BIO-12: Outdoor lighting associated with the proposed project could impact wildlife behavior adjacent to the project sites.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Cultural Resources								
SHW Impact CULT-2: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a previously unknown historical or archaeological resource, or to human remains.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
Geology and Soils								
SHW Impact GEO-3: The proposed project would result in construction of facilities in an area underlain by karst features, which could lead to settlement or collapse beneath the structures.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
Noise								
SHW Impact NOI-3: Construction associated with the proposed project would not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	*LTS*	Similar; *LTS*	Similar; *LTS*	Similar; *LTS*	Similar; *LTS*	Greater; S/*SU*	Greater; S/*SU*	Greater; S/*SU*

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Hydrology and Water Quality								
SHW Impact HYD-3: Hagar site development and operations would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality; 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 or cause substantial changes in spring flows; but could result in erosion and sedimentation in Jordan Gulch.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*	Avoided; *NI*
Transportation and Traffic								
SHW Impact TRA-3: Construction period traffic could temporarily impact traffic conditions along roadways serving the project sites, including potential effect on emergency vehicle access.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*	Greater; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact TRA-6: The proposed project would conflict with UC Santa Cruz policies related to alternative transportation.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Reduced *PS/LTS*	Reduced *PS/LTS*	Reduced *PS/LTS*	Reduced *PS/LTS*
Tribal Cultural Resources								
SHW Impact TCR-1: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Section 21074.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Utilities and Service Systems								
SHW Impact UTIL-1: The proposed project would not cause an exceedance of applicable wastewater treatment requirements but would entail the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could result in cause significant environmental effects.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Reduced; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact UTIL-3: The proposed project would require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	*PS/LTS*	Avoided; *NI*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*	Similar; *PS/LTS*
SHW Impact UTIL-4: The proposed project would increase the amount of water used on the project site, and would be adequately served by existing entitlements and water resources under normal water years but not under multiple dry year conditions.	*S/SU*	Greater; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Greater; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*
SHW Impact C-UTIL-1: The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities.	*S/SU*	Greater; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*	Greater; *S/SU*	Similar; *S/SU*

Project Impact	Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Heller Site Development Only	Alternative 4: Heller Site and North Remote Site Development Alternative	Alternative 5: Heller Site and East Campus Infill Development Alternative	Alternative 6: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and Delaware Site Development Alternative	Alternative 7: Heller Site, East Campus Infill, and North Remote Site Development Alternative
Other Resources								
SHW Impact AG-1: The proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland or timberland. In addition, the proposed SHW project and the related dining facilities expansion project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.	*LTS*	Avoided*; NI*	Similar*; LTS*	Similar*; LTS*	Greater; *LTS*	Greater; *LTS*	Greater; *LTS*	Greater; *LTS*

a. This table lists only the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. A less than significant impact of the project is listed only if an alternative would worsen that impact of the project.

KEY
SU Significant and unavoidable
S Significant impact
PS Potentially significant impact
LTS Less than significant impact
NI No Impact
Avoided Proposed project's impact avoided
Similar Impact similar to proposed project
Reduced Impact less than proposed project
Greater Impact greater than proposed project

Table 2.0-4

Summary of LRDP Water Supply and Population and Housing Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
LRDP Water Supply Impact Assessment			
Revised LRDP Impact UTIL-9: Development under the 2005 LRDP would generate an additional demand for water which would not require that the City secure new or expanded water supply entitlements or resources in normal water years. However, the project's demand, in combination with the demand from other growth in the service area, would require the development of new water supplies for the supply shortfall under single and multiple dry water year conditions.	*Significant*	**LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9A**: Continue to implement applicable prior LRDP Mitigations i.e., UTIL-9A, -9B, -9C, -9H, and -9I which the Campus is voluntarily implementing and has incorporated into campus operations and requirements for new development. **LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9B**: Expand the use of recycled water on the main campus. The Campus will evaluate the feasibility of using excess recycled water generated on the SHW project site for toilet flushing at the nearby Porter and Kresge Colleges, and for irrigation at the Arboretum. The SHW project will have a surplus of about 15 MGY of recycled water. Based on current and projected student beds at Porter and Kresge Colleges, it is estimated that about 3.9 MGY of recycled water could be used in the two colleges, and the balance could potentially be used at the Arboretum.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
LRDP Population and Housing Assessment			
Revised LRDP Impact POP-1: Campus development under the Post-Settlement LRDP would result in substantial population growth in the study area by accommodating increased enrollment and additional employment.	*Significant*	No mitigation is feasible.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
Revised LRDP Impact POP-3: The Post-Settlement LRDP would contribute substantially to the need for more off-campus housing, which would have the potential to trigger the construction of more housing off-campus.	*Significant*	**LRDP Mitigation POP-3**: The Campus will continue to implement prior LRDP Mitigations POP-3A through 3C which the Campus is voluntarily implementing**.**	*Significant and Unavoidable*