

**\*\*\*Revised\*\*\***

**Additions shown by underscoring; deletions shown by strikethrough**

**GB5**

**Office of the President**

**TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS**

**ACTION ITEM**

*For Meeting of January 22, 2014*

**APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET, APPROVAL OF EXTERNAL FINANCING, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN FOLLOWING ACTION PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, SAN JOAQUIN APARTMENTS, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The proposed San Joaquin Apartments (San Joaquin) project is for construction of new apartment-style housing to accommodate 1,003 undergraduate students, live-in residential staff, and faculty in residence. The residential portion of the project and approximately 28 service and accessibility parking spaces would be within the site boundary of the existing 1,325-bed Santa Catalina Residence Hall (Santa Catalina) complex. The project would also provide community amenities such as study and recreation rooms, laundry facilities, outdoor activity space, and bicycle paths. Surface parking at the West Campus Apartments adjacent to the San Joaquin site would be expanded by approximately 181 parking spaces to support San Joaquin and Santa Catalina residents and staff.

The proposed project would provide student housing in support of the campus' Strategic Academic Plan, which identifies an enrollment growth increment of 5,000 students by 2025 for a total of 25,000 students; is consistent with the campus' 2010 Long Range Development Plan; and is in compliance with the 2010 University of California, Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement signed by the University, Santa Barbara County, and the City of Goleta that requires the campus develop new housing in support of enrollment growth in excess of 20,000 students.

The Regents are being asked to: (1) approve the project budget of \$175 million, to be funded from external financing (\$167.24 million) and from Housing Auxiliary Reserves (\$7.76 million); (2) approve the project scope; (3) approve external financing of \$167.24 million; and (4) certify the Environmental Impact Report and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program and Findings, which have been completed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and approve the project design.

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. The President recommends that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings recommend to the Regents that:
  - A. The 2013-14 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Santa Barbara: San Joaquin Apartments – Preliminary Plans - \$7.76 million, to be funded from Housing Auxiliary Reserves.

To: Santa Barbara: San Joaquin Apartments – Preliminary Plans, Working Drawings, Construction and Furnishings and Equipment- \$175 million to be funded from Housing Auxiliary Reserves (\$7.76 million) and external financing (\$167.24 million).
  - B. The scope of the San Joaquin Apartments project shall include construction of apartment-style student housing with approximately 1,003 student beds, and associated general site improvements, landscaping, hardscaping, recreation courts, and fields, and approximately 181 off-site surface parking spaces.
  - C. The President be authorized to obtain external financing not to exceed \$167.24 million to finance the San Joaquin Apartments project. The President shall require that:
    - (1) Interest only, based on the amount drawn down, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
    - (2) As long as the debt is outstanding, general revenues from the Santa Barbara campus shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
    - (3) The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
2. The President recommends that, following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed San Joaquin Apartments project, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings:
  - A. Certify the Environmental Impact Report.
  - B. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program and Findings in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.
  - C. Approve the design of the San Joaquin Apartments project, Santa Barbara campus.

- D. Authorize the President or her designee to modify the design approval, if required, in response to comments received from the California Coastal Commission, provided that any substantial changes in principles or policies of the design approval would be brought to the Regents for consideration.
3. The President recommends that she be authorized to execute all documents necessary in connection with the above.

### **BACKGROUND**

At their March 2013 meeting, the Regents approved Preliminary Plans funding for the San Joaquin Apartments project. The approval allowed the campus to proceed with design, which enabled the campus to determine the detailed scope of the program within the estimated project budget.

Throughout the design phase, the program was adjusted in order to stay within the estimated total budget. During the design phase, the campus experienced a number of bid overages on other projects, evidencing a changing bid climate in the Santa Barbara market. In response, the campus implemented program reductions and design modifications to ensure project affordability. For example, apartment square footages were reduced and community amenities were scaled back in area and their design simplified. Also, the proposed replacement dining commons to serve both Santa Catalina and San Joaquin was removed from the project and the residential units originally planned above the dining commons were incorporated into the design of the two six-story tower buildings. The dining commons component of the project was intended to expand and modernize the dining facilities serving primarily Santa Catalina residents and the greater San Joaquin community. Given the budget constraints, the campus chose to defer that component to a future date and will continue to operate the existing dining facility to meet the needs of the community. The site designated for the replacement dining commons for now will remain in its existing condition of green space and bicycle parking, thus preserving the site for future development.

Completion of the San Joaquin project in 2016-17 would ensure campus compliance with the 2010 Long Range Development Plan ((LRDP) Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) with the City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara, enabling modest enrollment growth through the remaining years of the decade. The Agreement contains several key commitments, most notably that the campus must provide new student beds on existing campus property for 100 percent of students in excess of the baseline enrollment of 20,000. Newly acquired residential buildings, or land acquired for residential development would not count towards the campus housing obligation. The proposed San Joaquin Apartments project would meet approximately 20 percent of the housing necessary to meet the campus’ enrollment growth objective of 5,000 students by 2025 and thus address the housing development parameters of the Agreement.

The Agreement also includes a provision that the campus may temporarily accommodate students in existing or newly constructed housing facilities by converting up to 1,000 double-occupancy rooms to triple-occupancy. This provision allows the University time to plan and construct new student housing in coordination with enrollment growth. In the event that the campus enrollment exceeds student housing capacity beyond the threshold of 1,000 triple-

occupancy rooms, the campus has agreed to freeze enrollment growth at the previous year's level until sufficient new housing is developed to meet the need.

*Project Drivers*

The UCSB Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) provides the framework for achieving the campus' vision for academic excellence through a strategy of managed growth in the campus population, including student enrollment. Expansion of the existing campus population is an integral element in the campus' effort to achieve the academic and intellectual goals of the SAP, as well as to maintain and advance the campus' standing as a top-tier research institution. Academic growth, including faculty recruitment and student enrollment, will ensure that the campus can maintain its core excellence and better leverage commitments to new interdisciplinary endeavors. Enrollment growth will also play an important role in accommodating UC systemwide enrollment growth, as well as meeting the University's civic responsibility of providing an educated workforce.

The primary project drivers are:

- provide housing to address the campus' enrollment growth objective of 5,000 students by 2025<sup>1</sup> as identified in the UCSB SAP;
- provide affordable student housing units to address current unmet demand; and
- provide additional student housing inventory to meet legally binding obligations to the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Goleta that the campus provide new student beds on campus land for students in excess of the baseline enrollment of 20,000.

Campus enrollment is rapidly approaching the threshold of 1,000 triple-occupancy rooms identified in the Agreement that would activate a requirement to freeze enrollment if new housing is not provided. The current 2013-14 enrollment projection is 20,815 which equates to 815 students in excess of the baseline threshold. Based on enrollment projections – and if the San Joaquin project is not constructed – the 1,000 triple-occupancy room threshold would be exceeded by 2017-18, as shown in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> Three-quarter average headcount on-campus enrollment is used to count students.

**Table 1 – Current & Future Enrollment and Housing Capacity  
 (Without San Joaquin Apartments)**

Academic Year	ACTUAL	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
LRDP Baseline Enrollment	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	<b>20,000</b>	20,000
Projected Enrollment	20,791	20,815	20,963	21,247	21,396	<b>21,589</b>	21,782
<i>New Beds Required</i>	<i>791</i>	<i>815</i>	<i>963</i>	<i>1,247</i>	<i>1,396</i>	<b><i>1,589</i></b>	<i>1,782</i>
Current Bed Baseline	7,321						
Sierra Madre Apartment students beds			515				
Total Housing Capacity	7,321	7,321	7,836	7,836	7,836	<b>7,836</b>	7,836
New Beds Above Baseline	-	-	515	515	515	<b>515</b>	515
Required Triple Occupancy	791	815	448	732	881	<b>1,074</b>	1,267

In addition to the pressures of enrollment growth, the campus has a shortage of affordable apartment-style housing. The campus currently provides approximately 960 undergraduate bed spaces in apartment-style living, which are priced approximately 44 percent below market. The price disparity between University-owned and market-rate apartments is amplified by lease terms; University-owned apartments are provided with a nine-month lease whereas market-rate apartments often require a twelve-month lease. (See Table 2.) With the relative scarcity of affordable apartments within the surrounding communities, there is considerable unmet demand for affordable University-owned apartments. The availability of campus undergraduate apartment inventory is further impacted by a guarantee of housing for incoming transfer students. To address the high demand by sophomores and juniors in particular, the campus has employed a lottery system for apartments and has converted double-occupancy rooms into triples. Given robust demand for campus apartments, current freshmen are not allowed to apply for campus apartments for their sophomore year.

**Table 2 - Annual Apartment Cost Comparison 2013-14 (per person)**

	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	Utilities	Annual Total
University Owned	\$593	\$5,337 (9 month contract)	included	\$5,337
Off-Campus Privately Owned	\$763	\$9,156	\$439	\$9,595

**Site Alternatives**

A detailed analysis of site alternatives was included as Attachment 3 in an item presented to the Regents at their March 2013 meeting. At that meeting, the Regents approved Preliminary Plans funding for the San Joaquin Apartments project. The campus evaluated four sites and determined that the proposed site is preferred because of location and the ability to share services. The site is within close proximity of the existing West Campus Apartments and the Sierra Madre Apartments under construction; this location allows the campus to share existing services and potential new services to a larger residential population. The collocation of San Joaquin with

Santa Catalina offers the added benefit of ‘economies of scale’ that would leverage existing personnel, programs, operations and management.

***Delivery Model***

Because of specific conditions of the San Joaquin project, the campus considered it unsuitable to be delivered via a public-private partnership (PPP). An analysis of the delivery models was included as Attachment 4 of the item presented to the Regents at their March 2013 meeting. Difficulties associated with PPPs include operational issues related to management, areas of responsibility, student conduct matters, as well as access and security. Furthermore, the campus has concerns with regards to the quality of student life. The campus has a rich history of residential programming and a well-developed range of integrated student support services and programs designed to complement academic and University life experiences. Given that a PPP entity is a for-profit venture, the provision of such programming and services by the PPP entity are balanced against the bottom line and are typically minimized, with a negative impact on student life.

While a typical PPP-developed and managed housing agreement includes provisions for setting rates at or below market, there is a significant gap between University-owned housing and the local market. At present, rental rates of University-owned apartments are approximately 44 percent below market rate. Financial feasibility analysis indicates that future University-owned housing can maintain that margin better than comparable PPP-developed and managed housing, which would be much closer to market rate, thus limiting affordability.

***Project Description***

The proposed San Joaquin Apartments project would provide student housing and associated support amenities. The residential project would be constructed within the site boundary of the existing 1,325-bed Santa Catalina Residence Hall area located at the corner of El Colegio Road and Storke Road. The project would include four general components: North Village; Storke Gateway Towers; site improvements; and parking. To maximize the use of the site, the project would shift surface parking to an expanded lot at the adjacent West Campus Apartments. The project would consist of 21 buildings as listed in Table 3.

**Table 3 - San Joaquin Apartments Building Count**

Site Area	Apartment Buildings	Community Buildings	Total Buildings
North Village	14	4	18
Storke Gateway Towers			
<i>North Tower</i>	1	0	1
<i>South Tower</i>	1	1	2
Total:	16	5	21

The overall development plan would comprise 208,273 assignable square feet (asf) and 283,873 gross square feet (gsf) of building space. The outdoor program totals 119,982 gsf and would include: support and outdoor amenities, 28 on-site parking spaces for service and

accessibility, an expanded surface parking lot for 181 cars at the adjacent West Campus Apartments,<sup>2</sup> bicycle parking for approximately 2,600 bikes,<sup>3</sup> recreation courts, and a large playfield.

The project would include development of 1,003 student beds in apartment-style housing in two distinct areas:

1. The North Village would provide 651 student beds in 14 walk-up buildings of two and three stories, organized into four distinct clusters.
2. Storke Gateway Towers (North and South Towers) would provide 352 student beds in two medium-rise six-story buildings.

In addition to the 1,003 student beds, the project would include eight two-bedroom/two-bathroom units: four units for professional live-in staff, and four units for faculty in residence. (See Table 4.) All units (students, staff, and faculty) would have a full kitchen, a dining area, living room, and storage.

**Table 4 - San Joaquin Apartment and Bed Counts**

Area	Student Units		Student Beds	Staff Units 2bed/2bath	Faculty Units 2bed/2bath	Faculty/ Staff Beds
	3bed/2bath	1bed/1bath (RA)				
North Village	107	9	651	2	3	10
Storke Gateway Towers						
<i>North Tower</i>	24	2	146	0	1	2
<i>South Tower</i>	34	2	206	2	0	4
Total:	165	13	1,003	4	4	16

- Support amenities would include community study lounges, recreation, and laundry facilities; these would be housed within the apartment buildings, in community buildings located in courtyards at the North Village, and in the pavilion in the new plaza of the Storke Gateway Apartments. A convenience store would also be housed on the ground floor of Storke Gateway Towers.
- Outdoor amenities would include recreation areas, such as sport courts, a playfield, bicycle parking, and bicycle paths, and a new transit hub, all of which would support the combined San Joaquin and Santa Catalina community of 2,328 student beds.

<sup>2</sup> The campus has significant surplus parking and fewer students are bringing cars to campus; most students use alternative transportation such as bicycles and public transit to get to campus. Aiming to expand its alternative transportation program, the campus is in negotiations with the local transit district to establish a shuttle system to transport students between the project site and the campus, and to supplemental parking lots.

<sup>3</sup> Total population plus approximately ten percent for visitors and general movement around site.

- Off-site parking to serve the residents, staff and visitors of the San Joaquin and Santa Catalina community would be comprised of 181 surface spaces added to an existing surface lot at the West Campus Apartments. Excess parking demand would be accommodated at an underutilized student housing parking structure at Storke campus. (Refer to Attachment 8, slide 2.)

### *Proposed Site*

The project site is within the boundaries of the existing Santa Catalina Residence Hall site. The project would optimize the development potential of the land surrounding Santa Catalina within areas of allowable development and site constraints. The site is bounded to the north by a private residential community, to the east by open space and distant Santa Ynez Apartments (upper class undergraduates), to the west by Storke Road, and to the south by El Colegio Road. Other site restrictions include building setbacks related to earthquake faults.

The 14.4-acre site currently contains Santa Catalina's two 10-story residential towers and two-story podium structure that provide associated residential support facilities, including a dining commons, student support space, fitness center, and administrative space. The collocation of the San Joaquin and Santa Catalina housing projects offers the added benefit of leveraging existing personnel, programs, community amenities, operations, and management. The site area surrounding Santa Catalina is currently surface parking for approximately 700 automobiles, parking for 1,500 bicycles, and recreation areas such as tennis, sand volleyball, basketball, a pool, and an expansive lawn and playfield. The San Joaquin project would be built on the site of surface parking, and the parking would be "relocated" to an expanded West Campus Apartments parking lot nearby.

The proposed project design would relocate existing site amenities including recreation areas and bicycle parking, remove the tennis courts, retain the swimming pool and construct additional bicycle paths. The existing 1,500 bicycle parking spaces, which are currently dispersed around the Santa Catalina site, will be redistributed and form part of the approximately 2,600 available spaces when the project is complete. In order to optimize development capacity of the site, the design would only accommodate approximately 28 vehicle parking spaces as needed for service and maintenance vehicles, and disabled access. Parking would be expanded at the West Campus Apartments, constructing approximately 181 spaces to support San Joaquin and Santa Catalina.

### *Design*

The project would be designed for upper division undergraduate students, although it could accommodate a variety of tenants. The goals of the design are to create modern, highly efficient and cost-effective apartment-style housing that would support students' basic housing needs. As proposed, the overall project design would create a vibrant residential student community. Designed from the "inside-out," the project would incorporate a high degree of modularity to accommodate typical one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartment units. The design evolved from efficient "bar" shaped building masses of one to six stories organized to form courtyards and a plaza. Functional exterior components, such as stairs and guardrails, safety mesh, shading devices and sunscreens, as well as covered walkways and porticos all work together to contribute to the architectural character of the project. (Refer to Attachment 6, Design Elements.)



The design would site the medium-rise, six-story Storke Gateway Towers closer to the existing ten-story Santa Catalina towers and locate the low-rise walk-up buildings of the North Village at the perimeter of the site. This approach would create the effect of smoothing the height profile of the site. Design variations would protect against architectural monotony, create building identity, and help to distinguish community buildings from apartment buildings. Thus, the height, bulk, and scale of the buildings would vary, reflecting design criteria and site constraints, including required setbacks from earthquake faults, wetlands, and the adjacent off-campus residential neighborhood.

The project design would be focused in two zones of housing development, the North Village and the Storke Gateway Towers. Each complex would be connected by east-west and north-south pedestrian corridors linking residents to community amenities and to the campus. A main thoroughfare would demarcate the North Village from Santa Catalina and the Storke Gateway Towers. This thoroughfare could be accessed from Storke Road and would support pedestrian, bicycle, and service functions. (See Attachment 8, slide 4.)

The North Village comprises four separate but integrated building clusters laid out in a “pinwheel.” Buildings are clustered to create courtyards that serve students’ need for outdoor social and gathering space. The courtyards also channel natural ventilation and provide for day-lighting of the buildings.

Situated near the transit stop, and with easy access to community laundry, study lounges, and recreation, North Village is design to be akin to a modern suburban residential neighborhood. The clusters are connected by “paseos” and meandering pathways that lead pedestrians into neighboring courtyards. The courtyards would vary in design to help give each cluster of buildings a distinctive character.

With an east-west orientation to capture sweeping views and enhance natural ventilation, the Storke Gateway Towers step down in height from the Santa Catalina towers, creating a large public plaza. The plaza would be an active space, providing access to public transit, outdoor patio seating, a convenience store, bicycle parking, laundry, sand volleyball courts, and a lawn. A prominent north-south pedestrian corridor would link the Storke Gateway Towers with the North Village and Santa Catalina, and provide access to the new playfield and plaza amenities.

Anchoring the southwest corner of the site, the south tower would provide a strong urban and architectural terminus for both El Colegio Road and Storke Road. Similarly, the north tower would frame the entry to the site at Storke Road.

### ***Approval Request and Schedule***

The requested budget approval would fund working drawings, construction, furnishings, and equipment would allow the campus to prepare construction documents to bid and construct the project. Construction is estimated to begin in fall 2014 for occupancy in fall 2016.

**ATTACHMENTS: Follow unless otherwise indicated**

Attachment 1: Project Statistics

Attachment 2: Funding Plan

Attachment 3: Summary of Financial Feasibility

Attachment 4: Housing Rate Impacts

Attachment 5: Policy Compliance

Attachment 6: Design Elements

Attachment 7: California Environmental Quality Act

Compliance Attachment 8: Project Graphics attached

Attachment 9: EIR Summary

Attachment 10: Environmental Impact Report link

<http://facilities.ucsb.edu/planning/downloads/default.asp>

Attachment 11: Mitigation Monitoring Program (included in Attachment 10, as Chapter 10.3 in Volume 1 of the EIR)

Attachment 12: LRDP and LRDP EIR link: <http://lr dp.id.ucsb.edu/>

Attachment 13: CEQA Findings

## PROJECT STATISTICS

CCCI 6436

Costs Category	(\$ Total	% of Total
Site Clearance	1,348,000	0.79%
Building	109,858,000	64.62%
Exterior Utilities	7,467,000	4.39%
Site Development	8,741,000	5.14%
A&E Fees <sup>4</sup>	8,973,000	5.28%
Campus Administration <sup>5</sup>	5,427,000	3.19%
Surveys, Tests, Plans	1,578,000	0.93%
Special Items <sup>6</sup>	9,155,000	5.39%
Finance Cost	8,400,000	4.94%
Contingency	9,053,000	5.33%
<b>Total P-W-C</b>	<b>\$170,000,000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
Group 2 & 3 Equipment	5,000,000	
<b>Total Project</b>	<b>\$175,000,000</b>	

## Project Cost Data

## Analytical Data

Beds <sup>7</sup>	1,019
Parking	181
Gross Square Feet (GSF)	283,873
Assignable Square Feet	208,273
Building Cost/GSF	\$387
Project Cost/GSF	\$599
Building Cost/Bed	\$107,810
Project Cost/Bed	\$166,830

## Comparable Projects at CCCI 6436

Name	GSF	Building Cost/GSF	Building Cost/Bed	Project Cost/Bed
SB - Sierra Madre Apartments	220,325	\$316	\$110,000	\$161,000
BK - Anna Head West Student Housing	147,500	\$432	\$153,000	\$218,000
LA – Northwest Campus Student Housing Infill	387,131	\$344	\$114,000	\$166,000

<sup>4</sup> Fees include Executive Architect and other professional design contract costs.

<sup>5</sup> Campus Administration includes project management and inspection.

<sup>6</sup> Special Items include Value Engineering/Constructability, Permits and Agency Reviews, Environmental/EIR Services, Waterproofing Consultant, Utility Connection and Meter, Peer Reviews, LEED Services, Legal Services, and Independent Seismic Review.

<sup>7</sup> Includes undergraduates, staff, and faculty beds.

## FUNDING PLAN

<b>A. Total Project Cost : \$175,000,000</b>		
Funding Source	Housing Reserves: \$7,760,000 External Financing: \$167,240,000	
<b>B. Funding Schedule</b>		
<b>Phase</b>		<b>Funding Sources</b>
Preliminary Plans	\$ 7,760,000	Housing Reserves
Working Drawings	6,000,000	External Financing
Construction	156,240,000	External Financing
Equipment	5,000,000	External Financing
<b>TOTALS:</b>	\$ 175,000,000	
<b>C. External Financing</b>		
Information on the proposed external financing may be found in <i>Attachment 3</i> (Summary of Financial Feasibility).		

## SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Project Name	<b>San Joaquin Apartments</b>
Project ID	<b>986470</b>
Total Estimated Project Costs	<b>\$175,000,000</b>
Anticipated Interest During Construction	<b>\$8,400,000</b>

<b>PROPOSED SOURCES OF FUNDING</b>	
External Financing	<b>\$167,240,000</b>
Other Source of Funding - Housing Reserves	<b>\$7,760,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$175,000,000</b>

*Fund sources for external financing, including standby and interim financing, shall adhere to University policy on repayment for capital projects. For Externally Financed projects please refer to Section I. For Standby and Interim financings, please refer to Section II & III.*

**SECTION I. Externally Financed Projects (if applicable)**

Long-term external financing assumptions are listed below.

<b>FINANCING ASSUMPTIONS</b>	
Anticipated Repayment Source	<b>General Revenues of the Santa Barbara campus</b>
Anticipated Fund Source	<b>Housing Revenues</b>
Financial Feasibility Rate	<b>6.00%</b>
First Year of Payment	<b>2017</b>
Final Maturity (e.g. 20XX)	<b>2047</b>
Term (e.g. 30 years)	<b>30 years</b>
Estimated Average Annual Debt Service	<b>\$12,150,000</b>

Below are results of the financial feasibility analysis for the proposed project using the campus's Debt Affordability Model. External financing approval requires the campus to meet the debt service-to-operations benchmark and one of the two other benchmarks for approval. The financial projections take into consideration market conditions, new sources of revenue and all previously approved projects. The corresponding campus Debt Affordability Model has been submitted to Capital Markets Finance at UCOP.

<b>CAMPUS FINANCING BENCHMARKS</b>		
<b>Measure</b>	<b>10 Year Projections (as of 6/25/13)</b>	<b>Approval Threshold</b>
<b>Debt Service to Operations</b>	<b>6.00% (max) FY 2017</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
<b>Debt Service Coverage</b>	<b>1.90x (min) FY 2015</b>	<b>1.75x</b>
<b>Expendable Resources to Debt</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>1.00x</b>

<b>AUXILIARY FINANCING BENCHMARKS</b>		
<b>Measure</b>	<b>10 Year Projections (as of 6/20/13)</b>	<b>Approval Threshold</b>
<b>Debt Service Coverage</b>	<b>1.25x (min) FY 2017</b>	<b>1.25x</b>

The campus is at its maximum in debt capacity with a 6.0% ratio for Debt Service to Operations for all campus projects, and 1.25 times Debt Service Coverage for its auxiliary-funded projects.

The metrics used to determine financing feasibility are defined below:

<b><i>Measure</i></b>	<b><i>Definition</i></b>
<i>Debt Service to Operations (%)</i>	<u><i>Annual Debt Service</i></u> <i>Total Operating Expenses</i>
<i>Debt Service Coverage (x)</i>	<u><i>Operating Income + Depreciation + Interest</i></u> <i>Annual Debt Service</i>
<i>Expendable Resources to Debt (x)</i>	<u><i>Expendable Financial Resources (unrestricted net assets + temporarily restricted net assets – net investment in plant)</i></u> <i>Total Debt Outstanding</i>

**HOUSING RATE IMPACTS**

Currently, UCSB single-student apartment rental rates are among the lowest within the University of California system and on average 44 percent below the local market on an annualized basis. The impact of Sierra Madre (approved project) and San Joaquin (proposed project) will require rates to increase an incremental 1.33 percent for six years (see table below) in order to cover the additional annual debt service (approximately \$17 million for both projects). Even with the rate increases, the single student apartment rates will still be well below local market rates.

**Rate Increase Associated with New Projects  
(San Joaquin and Sierra Madre)**

Fiscal Year	Operating Increase	Housing Inventory Expansion	Total Rate Increase (%)
2013-14	3.00%	1.00%	4.00%
2014-15	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2015-16	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2016-17	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2017-18	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2018-19	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2019-20	3.00%	1.33%	4.33%
2020-21	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%
2021-22	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%
2022-23	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%

**Market Analysis - Single Student Apartment Rates and Local Off-Campus Rates**

<b>2016-17 Forecasted Rates</b>	Monthly Rent	Annual Rent <sup>8 9</sup>
San Joaquin/Sierra Madre	\$ 673	\$ 6,057
Off-Campus Privately Owned	\$ 834	\$ 10,008

<sup>8</sup> University housing offers 9-month leases, while off-campus privately owned typically offers 12-month leases.

<sup>9</sup> University housing includes utilities, internet, cable, furniture, and student services. Off-campus privately owned apartments typically do not, but the monthly and annual rent amounts have been adjusted for comparability.

## POLICY COMPLIANCE

**2010 Long Range Development Plan.** The proposed student housing use is in general conformance with the student housing land use designation in the 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The University did not own the property at the time of the 1990 LRDP. While the proposed project is in general conformance with the Regents-approved 2010 LRDP, the Coastal Commission has not yet approved the 2010 LRDP. The Environmental Impact Report has been prepared taking into consideration both the 1990 LRDP and the 2010 LRDP. See Attachment 7, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**Capital Financial Plan.** The 2013-23 Capital Financial Plan for the Santa Barbara campus includes the San Joaquin Apartments project with a project budget of \$175 million from external finance (\$167,240,000) and from housing reserves (\$7.76 million).

**Physical Design Framework.** The project is consistent with the goals and intent of the campus Physical Design Framework approved by the Regents in 2010. (Refer to Attachment 6, Design Elements for more detail.)

**Independent Cost and Design Review.** An independent cost estimate was prepared based on a Detailed Project Program, and has been updated and value engineered at numerous stages during design. The cost estimate has been peer reviewed throughout the programming and design phases. The campus Design Review Committee has reviewed the proposed design from concept design through to the end of schematic design. The selected Construction Manager-at-Risk is reviewing the project for constructability. Peer review by an independent structural engineer occurred in the Design Development (DD) phase and will continue through Construction Drawings (CD). UC Santa Barbara Design & Construction Services will manage the project. The Senior Associate Vice Chancellor / Campus Architect will provide University oversight.

**Seismic Safety Policy.** The project will comply with the University of California Seismic Safety Policy and independent seismic peer review.

**Sustainable Practices.** The project will comply with the University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices. Campus practice is to obtain LEED Gold™ for new construction, and the project will adopt the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements, and achieve a minimum USGBC® LEED for Homes™ Gold certified rating. The campus may also consider certification of the project under LEED for Neighborhoods™.

Key sustainability features of the project include: Water retention and bio-treatment landscapes (bio-swales); passive solar shading devices; reduction of building energy consumption through use of open-air circulation, natural ventilation and high efficiency mechanical equipment; reclaimed water used for irrigation and for toilet flushing in Storke Gateway North Tower; reduction of water use through selection of high efficiency fixtures; solar hot water collectors; access to alternative transportation; use of lo-VOC products.



## DESIGN ELEMENTS

The design of the San Joaquin Apartments project is consistent with the campus' Physical Design Framework (PDF). The PDF describes the approach the campus uses for the development of buildings, landscape, and infrastructure within the context of the 2010 Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP). Below are principles and values from the PDF utilized in the San Joaquin Apartments project:

- The aim is to achieve the services and atmosphere of a college town in campus-developed residential neighborhoods. These are generally compact areas that are clearly demarcated and imbued with an individual character. They comprise compact clusters of buildings, courts, plazas, quadrangles, and open spaces and have well-defined boundaries and entry points.
- The housing, proximate to the Main Campus, supports a sustainable campus environment with a lowered dependency on the automobile.
- In San Joaquin each site area will have individual architectural character and unique landscape design features that are distinguished by dwelling units, study, and community spaces. The character of the San Joaquin site will be energized by the vitality of ground level pedestrian and bicycle activity, and student services.
- Buildings will have a clearly defined portal or major building entry. The entrance will convey its presence and be easily read from major pedestrian routes and open spaces.
- The new residential areas are planned utilizing landscaping, siting, and massing of buildings to preserve view corridors. Amenities for residents may include courtyards with recreation areas, communal gardens, social areas, and retail outlets.
- The San Joaquin Apartments site is based on UCSB Contextual design utilized to create variety and richness. Facades will be carefully designed to contribute to the overall richness and texture of the site. Fenestrations will be responsive to orientation and include punched openings to window wall designs. Materials, finishes, and colors, are considered for their appearance under different lighting conditions, including time of day, and both natural and artificial lighting. Materials reflect their natural characteristics.
- Courtyards are important regional design elements open to the sky and defined by walls or buildings. They offer light, air, privacy, security, and tranquility increasing a sense of neighborhood, community, and scale. They are linked to the pedestrian system of walkways and paseos and populated with seating, water, and plantings. Paseos, or pedestrian walkways, are a series of connecting private and public walkways joined to open plazas, courtyards, and major building entries throughout the site. The paseos reinforce a human scale, provide a pleasant experience for the user, and reveal a number of building facades and open spaces.

- Buildings may be finished in plaster, stone, cast stone, concrete, wood, metal, or concrete masonry units. Colors draw from the Mediterranean and California palettes including cool white, blues, teals, browns, warm tans, yellows and greens. Buildings may contrast or blend with greens and annual grays of the surrounding grasslands, scrublands, and natural areas. Painted metal accessories along with wood doors and beams are possible accents.
- The landscape will provide a comfortable and stimulating environment for the residential population. There will be places to meet and gather, as well as quiet, small spaces for study and reflection.

**Building Design:** Although the buildings will have their own character, collectively all the buildings contribute to the campus's visual identity with common characteristics that create harmony. Harmony is developed through the use of common materials and colors as well as building features described in the campus design guidelines such as exterior stairs, window shades, and loggias.

All of the buildings are organized around plazas or courtyards with living areas of the units always facing the plazas and courtyards where student activities are concentrated. The quieter bedrooms face the neighbors. The buildings also share similar unit types with similar equipment, fixtures, and finishes that contribute to minimizing costs and maximizing competitive bidding. Roofs will consist of light-colored material to reduce solar building heat gain. Solar hot water collectors will meet a portion of building energy demands.

Interconnected walkways and paseos of varying widths and materials connect open plazas, courtyards, and program areas across the site and help to reinforce the east / west axis. These shaded circulation paths provide some protection from inclement weather and provide informal meeting places, while increasing access to natural light and ventilation. They also further reinforce a human scale, provide pleasant and varied experiences for the user, and reveal a number of building facades and open spaces. Outdoor spaces at the center of each cluster in the North Village provide focus and community identity within the San Joaquin project and are easily adapted to support social events.

Special architectural elements, including social hubs such as study lounges and recreation rooms, are treated as architectural features and located at key intersection points along circulation paths. The ground level plaza at the Storke Gateway Towers will be energized by a convenience store, study lounge, transit hub, laundry, and adjacent multipurpose field.

The buildings' massing will maintain view corridors to the mountains and reinforce the site's Cartesian grid; heights will reduce towards the site perimeter.

**Materials:** In the North Village building materials will be light-colored, vertically oriented fluted metal panels, wood siding, and cement plaster. A quiet exterior color palette of cooler white walls at the perimeter is complimented with stronger highlighted interior court colors of deep browns, greens, and deep blue/grays.

The Storke Gateway Towers building materials will be architectural board-formed concrete, Santa Barbara sandstone, cement board, cement plaster, and painted aluminum screens. A quiet exterior

color palette at the bedroom side perimeter walls is complimented with a stronger highlighted plaza side of tans and yellows.

**Landscape and Site Design:** Because of the arid nature of the site and the local climate, plant selection would focus on using native and locally-adapted Mediterranean drought-tolerant plant species. A low water-use irrigation system would be integral to the design. To reduce water usage, turf would be used only at specific recreation areas. A system of storm water filtration planters and bio-swales would be strategically placed throughout the site to capture and filter storm water and minimize impacts of runoff. Where appropriate, pedestrian paving would be of permeable soft materials like decomposed granite, gravel, or unit pavers on a sand base to minimize runoff and maximize rainwater infiltration.

The site design would create a tightly integrated pedestrian and bicycle network intended to encourage walking and cycling as preferred means of moving within the complex and to campus. Bicycle paths would provide circulation around the site and connect to existing bicycle paths leading to campus. A planned transit system would provide alternative transportation to and from campus. Parking for approximately 2,600 bicycles would be distributed throughout the site. A main thoroughfare which passes through the center of the site would create a major east-west circulation spine with dedicated zones for pedestrians, bicycles, and service vehicles. Connector paths would diverge from the main thoroughfare to the North Village, the Storke Gateway Towers, recreational areas and Santa Catalina. The new plaza created by the Storke Gateway Towers would include outdoor patio seating areas, a public transit zone, lawn area, and sand volleyball courts. An important goal of the design is to provide recreational opportunities that encourage exercise and socializing outdoors.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT COMPLIANCE**

**Environmental Impact Summary:** Pursuant to state law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, an Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2013051009) was prepared for the proposed San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project, also referred to as the San Joaquin Apartments.

A Notice of Preparation was filed on May 2, 2013, and a scoping meeting was held on May 21, 2013. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared dated August 10, 2013 and the document was circulated to responsible agencies and to the State Clearinghouse for a 45-day review period (August 10 to September 23, 2013). At the request of the public the Draft EIR comment period was extended to October 24, 2013. A public hearing was held on September 9, 2013 and three individuals testified. Five letters were received by public agencies and ten letters were received from groups and individuals during the comment period. The issues and concerns raised most frequently in the comments and testimony received by the campus included comments on noise, traffic, parking, and public transportation, and mountain views. The Final EIR includes a copy of all comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to all comments, and a Mitigation Monitoring Program.

An Initial Study was prepared to evaluate the potential for the San Joaquin Apartments project to result in significant environmental impacts. The Initial Study determined the San Joaquin project would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and geologic hazards, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, recreation, traffic and circulation, and utilities/service systems (water resources). Mitigation measures were identified in the Initial Study to reduce the identified impacts to cultural resources, recreation, and Utilities/service systems (water resources) to a less-than-significant level.

The Initial Study prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments project determined that the project would not result in significant impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, utilities and service systems (wastewater, solid waste and water service). No additional analysis of these environmental issues areas was required.

The Initial Study determined additional review of the projects' environmental effects in the following areas be analyzed in the EIR: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology and geologic hazards, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, and traffic and circulation. In addition, the EIR considered, in separate sections, Plan and Policy Consistency, Growth Inducing Impacts, and Alternatives to the project. The EIR identified potentially significant project impacts that could be reduced to less-than-significant by implementing the proposed mitigation measures in the following categories: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology and geologic hazards, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic and circulation. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the EIR.

Four alternatives were evaluated in the EIR. The alternatives considered in the EIR include (1) No Project/No Development, (2) Alternative Project Site (3) 2010 LRDP Project Design, and (4) Project Redesign. The Final EIR is accompanied by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

### ***Findings***

The attached Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR for this project in conformance with CEQA.

**ATTACHMENT 8**

GRAPHICS – ATTACHED SEPARATELY

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY**  
**University of California, Santa Barbara**  
**San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**  
**(State Clearinghouse No. 2013051009)**

**December, 2013**





**SAN JOAQUIN APARTMENTS AND PRECINCT IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT**  
**Final Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Impact Summary**  
**December 2013**

Pursuant to State law and University procedures for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2013051009), dated January 2014, was prepared for the proposed San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Project.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Santa Barbara Campus proposes to construct apartment style housing to accommodate 1,003 undergraduate students, live-in residential staff and faculty in residence. The Project would be constructed on undeveloped land at the Santa Catalina Residence Hall on the Storke Campus. Development of the 1,003 student beds would be in two distinct areas 1) the North Village consisting of 14 buildings of 2 and 3 stories (35 to 45 feet tall) providing housing for 651 student beds, and 2) Storke Gateway Towers consisting of 2 medium-rise 6-story buildings (approximately 65 to 70 feet tall) housing 352 students. In addition to the 1,003 student beds the project would provide four two-bedroom/two-bathroom units for faculty in residence. All units would have a full kitchen, a dining area, living room, and storage. The Project includes a variety of accessory uses to serve the on-site population such as a convenience store, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities (volleyball and basketball courts and outdoor open space/playing areas), and a variety of other student related services. Parking associated with San Joaquin and Santa Catalina would shift to an expanded surface lot (approximately 180 spaces) at the adjacent West Campus Apartments and to an underutilized parking structure on Storke Campus (Parking Structure 50 at San Clemente Housing). A network of pedestrian and bicycle paths would be provided throughout the Project site. The primary bicycle access route through the site would be a Class I path located along the eastern and northern perimeters of the site. There would be approximately 2,500 bicycle parking spaces distributed throughout the Project site.

The Final EIR evaluated the construction of a new dining commons (the Portola Dining Commons) to replace the existing Santa Catalina dining commons. In order to stay within the Project's estimated budget the proposed replacement dining commons was removed from the Project and the 17 residential units originally planned above the commons were incorporated into the design of the proposed two 6-story tower buildings. The campus chose to defer the dining commons to a future date. The site designated for the dining commons will remain in its existing condition.

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

An Initial Study was prepared to evaluate the potential for the San Joaquin Apartments Project to result in significant environmental impacts in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines, and is provided in EIR Appendix A. The Initial Study determined that the San Joaquin Project would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts and that

additional review of the Projects' environmental effects related to the following issue areas was required: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning (Plan and Policy Consistency), Noise, Transportation and Traffic

The Initial Study also determined that the San Joaquin Apartments Project would have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to cultural resources, public recreation facilities, and utilities/service systems (water resources). Mitigation measures were identified in the Initial Study to reduce the identified impacts to a less than significant level, and those mitigation measures are also listed on EIR Table 2.2-1 (Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures). Therefore, no further analysis of these environmental issues by the EIR was required.

### **Potentially Significant Impacts That Are Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level But Are Within the Jurisdiction of Another Public Entity**

All of the significant environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments Project would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures identified by this EIR. However, mitigation measures proposed by the EIR that would reduce the significant Project-specific and cumulative traffic impacts of the San Joaquin Apartments Project to a less than significant level include requirements to make improvements to off-campus roadways and intersections. Because UCSB does not have jurisdiction to implement the identified improvements additional information regarding the Project's traffic impacts and proposed mitigation is provided below. All other mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and proposed for adoption are within the control of the University, the implementation of which will reduce all other potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would result in a Project-specific traffic impact to the 2-lane segment of Los Carneros Road between Hollister Avenue and Mesa Road. The northern portion of Los Carneros Road within the City of Goleta is currently being widened to four lanes. However, a portion of the roadway just north of Mesa Road will continue to be two lanes. Proposed mitigation measure TRF-1a indicates that the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan (GTIP) identifies improvements for Los Carneros Road between Hollister Avenue to Mesa Road. Proposed mitigation measure TRF-1b indicates that UCSB shall continue to participate in the "fair-share" funding of GTIP improvements through the payment of traffic fees to the City of Goleta and Santa Barbara County as required by the 2010 *Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement* (Agreement). Implementation of the road improvements identified by proposed mitigation measure TRF-1a would reduce the identified Project-specific traffic impact to a less than significant level. However, UCSB does not have jurisdiction to implement improvements to the affected roadway segment, but has and will continue to pay "fair-share" funding for those improvements. If the identified road improvements are not implemented by the City or County prior to Project occupancy, a significant Project-specific traffic impact would result and would continue until such time as City or County roadway improvements are completed.

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would also contribute to cumulative roadway and intersection impacts that were previously identified by the 2010 LRDP EIR. The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts would occur at: Los Carneros Road between Mesa Road and the 2-lane section just north of Mesa Road; the Los Carneros Road and Hollister Avenue intersection; and the Los Carneros Road & Mesa Road intersection. Improvements for these locations are contained in the GTIP and would reduce the Project's cumulative impacts, as well as the impacts identified in the 2010 LRDP, to a less than significant level.

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would also contribute to a cumulative intersection impact at the Storke Road and Sierra Madre Court intersection if only one northbound travel lane is provided through the intersection, which is proposed to be signalized. The widening of Storke Road to four lanes in Santa Barbara County and the City of Goleta was identified as part of the comprehensive package of transportation improvements developed as part of the 2010 LRDP EIR.

Proposed mitigation measures TRF-2a and 3a identify road and intersection improvements that would reduce each of the Project's cumulative impacts, as well as the impacts identified in the 2010 LRDP EIR, to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures TRF-2a and 3a also indicate the UCSB shall continue to participate in the "fair-share" funding of GTIP improvements through the payment of traffic fees as required by the 2010 *Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement*. Proposed mitigation measures TRF-2a and 3a would reduce the traffic impacts of the San Joaquin Apartments Project to a less than significant level under cumulative conditions if the improvements are implemented prior to growth in traffic levels triggering unacceptable operations based on the City and County significance thresholds.

Implementation of the Los Carneros roadway improvements are within the jurisdictions of City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara. Improvements to Los Carneros Road are identified in the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan. The northern portion of the Los Carneros roadway improvements within the City of Goleta has been made. If the remaining improvements to Los Carneros Road identified in the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan are not implemented prior to Project occupancy, a significant Project-specific traffic impact would result and would continue until such time that the identified roadway improvement mitigation measures are constructed.

### **Potentially Significant Impacts That Can be Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level**

The Initial Study and EIR prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments Project identified environmental impacts of the proposed Projects that could be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. The identified impacts and proposed mitigation measures are summarized on Table 2.2-1.

### **Less Than Significant Impacts**

The Initial Study prepared for the San Joaquin Apartments Project determined that the Project would not result in significant impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources, hazards and

hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, utilities and service systems (wastewater, solid waste and water service). No additional analysis of these environmental issues areas was required.

## **Beneficial Impacts**

Implementation of the San Joaquin Apartments Project would result in several beneficial environmental impacts, including:

- The proposed Project would provide on-campus housing for UCSB students, which minimizes the potential for housing supply impacts in off-campus areas; reduces commute trips to and from campus; and reduces air emissions and emissions of greenhouse gases associated with commute trips.
- The proposed Project would result in the elimination of existing parking lot lighting on the northern portion of the Project site, some of which is oriented directly towards adjacent residences in Storke Ranch.
- The proposed Project's drainage system would eliminate discharges of untreated parking lot runoff water directly to the Storke Wetlands, and result in an increase in water discharged to the open space parcel east of and adjacent to the Project site, which could enhance habitat resources on the open space area.
- The proposed stormwater management ponds would provide foraging habitat for wildlife in the Project area.
- Include compliance with LRDP housing goals and commitments to City and County, without which enrollment growth would be limited.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

This EIR has evaluated a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project. The alternatives evaluated by the EIR are summarized below and the environmentally superior alternative is identified.

**No Project Alternative.** This alternative evaluates environmental conditions that would result if the proposed Project were not implemented. The No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, however, it would not attain the primary objectives of the proposed Project to provide on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth, and to provide housing that is compatible with adjacent land uses. The No Project Alternative would impair the University's obligations under the Master Plan for Higher Education by limiting the campus' ability to increase enrollment commensurate with the plan requirements and is therefore infeasible. Further, under the Agreement with the City of Goleta

and the County of Santa Barbara, the University has agreed to freeze enrollment growth at the previous year's level until sufficient new housing is developed to meet this need.

**Alternative Project Site Alternative.** This alternative consists of two components: the Ocean Road Project Site Component and the Faculty and Staff Housing Units Component. The Ocean Road Project Site Component would result in the development of a project similar to the proposed Project at an alternative site. A planned housing site on the west side of Ocean Road on the Main Campus was selected as the alternative site. The Faculty and Staff Housing Units Component would relocate faculty and staff housing units planned by the 2010 LRDP for the Ocean Road site. The Alternative Project Site Alternative would result in increased aesthetic, air quality, long-term greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

**2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative.** This alternative would result in the development of 600 student bed spaces on the San Joaquin site as described by the 2010 LRDP. The 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would result in reduced aesthetic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project and would fulfill the proposed Project's objective of providing housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses. However, the 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would not achieve the proposed Project's objective of providing student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth, which is also a requirement of LRDP EIR mitigation requirements and requirements of Agreements that UCSB has entered into with the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Goleta. Therefore, this alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative that would attain the primary objectives of the proposed Project. The 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would impair the University's obligations under the Master Plan for Higher Education by impairing the campus' ability to increase enrollment commensurate with the plan requirements and is therefore infeasible. Further, under the Agreement with the City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara, the University has agreed to freeze enrollment growth at the previous year's level until sufficient new housing is developed to meet this need.

**Project Redesign Alternative.** This alternative would also result in reduced aesthetic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project. The Project Redesign Alternative would fulfill the proposed Project's basic objectives of providing on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth identified by the 2010 LRDP, and providing housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses. Therefore, the Project Redesign Alternative would be the alternative, other than the No Project Alternative, that is environmentally superior to the proposed Project and fulfills the basic objectives of the proposed Project.

The Project Redesign alternative is not feasible because constructing 19 apartments at the WCFA site would conflict with the plans for that site in the 2010 LRDP. The 2010 LRDP proposes the existing 250 units at the West Campus Family Apartments (WCFA) be removed and 481 apartments be built on the site. The apartments would be primarily for faculty, staff, and students with families with some units for single students. Constructing a portion of the Project units on the site would displace some of the planned 481 units of housing on the WCFA site therefore

would conflict with the 2010 LRDP objective of constructing 1,874 and 5,000 student beds faculty and staff units on campus. If the 481 units of planned housing at the WCFA site were not built at the identified site they would be required to be built at another on-campus location, which would displace other facilities or uses identified in the adopted LRDP, e.g., faculty/staff housing. The Project Redesign alternative would also impair the University's ability to carry out its obligations and agreements with the City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara that require UCSB to provide housing commensurate with enrollment. Failure to implement the University's housing obligations under the agreements with Goleta and the County would require UCSB to cap enrollment thereby impairing UCSB's ability to fulfill its proportional share of enrollment demand under the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Further it is not financially feasible to construct 19 stand alone apartments on a site that is planned for redevelopment and that would not be easily integrated into the overall campus plan.

### **STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### ***Impacts that Remain Significant***

As discussed above, the University has found that traffic impacts of the Project to Los Carneros Road north of Mesa Road remain significant, either in whole or in part, following adoption and implementation of the Mitigation Measures described in the 2010 LRDP EIR and the Final EIR because implementation of the Mitigation Measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Goleta and such changes are included in the City's Transportation Improvement Plan.

#### ***Overriding Considerations***

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the University has, in determining whether or not to approve the Project, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental risks, and has found that the benefits of the Project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the University's review of the 2010 LRDP EIR and the Final SEIR and other information in the administrative record. The University re-affirms the Findings adopted in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP and certification of the 2010 LRDP EIR and also makes the following findings regarding the Project:

A. The Project implements a portion of the 2010 LRDP and is consistent with the analysis in the 2010 LRDP EIR.

Further, the Project will increase on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth as required by 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation requirements and agreements between the University and the City of Goleta and Santa Barbara County

B. Further, the Project is required to meet the demand for student housing in order for the University to fulfill its proportional share of enrollment demand under the Master Plan for Higher Education.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
FINDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH  
THE APPROVAL OF THE  
SAN JOAQUIN APARTMENTS AND PRECINCT IMPROVMENTS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

**I. CERTIFICATION OF FINAL EIR**

Pursuant to Title 14 California Code of Regulations §15090, the Board of Regents of the University of California ("The Regents") hereby certifies that the San Joaquin Apartments and Precinct Improvements Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") (SCH#2013051009) for the University of California, Santa Barbara campus ("UCSB" or "the campus"), (the "Project"), has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §21000 et seq. ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq. The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR and the 2010 LRDP EIR and Findings (September 2004) were presented to The Regents and that The Regents has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project, as set forth below in Section III. As part of this certification, The Regents hereby find that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the University of California (the "University"). The Final EIR includes the August 2013 Draft EIR, and the December 2013 Final EIR which includes all public comments and the University's responses, and supplemental information prepared by the University following publication of the Final EIR, if any. .

The Final EIR contains the environmental analysis and information necessary to support design approval for the Proposed Project as set forth in Section II. A. below.

**II. FINDINGS**

Having received, reviewed and considered the information in the record before it, including the Draft and Final EIR (August 2013 and December 2013, respectively) and the Final 2010 LRDP EIR and Findings (September 2004 SCH#2007051128), which are herein incorporated by reference, the following Findings are hereby adopted by The Regents, pursuant to Public Resources Code §§21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§15091 through 15093, in conjunction with the approval of the Project, which is set forth in Section III below.

The Regents certifies that these findings are based on the full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of the findings, concerning environmental issues identified and discussed in the Final EIR. The Regents adopts these findings for the approvals set forth in Section III.

The campus has tiered off the 2010 Long Range Redevelopment Plan EIR. The Long Range

Development Plan EIR and relevant, accurate information has been incorporated by reference into the Final EIR.

**A. Background.**

As fully described in Section 4.0 of the Final EIR, the Project consists of new apartment style housing to accommodate 1,003 undergraduate students, live-in residential staff and faculty in residence. The Project would be constructed on undeveloped land at the Santa Catalina Residence Hall on the Storke Campus. Development of the 1,003 student beds would be in two distinct areas 1) the North Village consisting of 14 buildings of 2 and 3 stories (35 to 45 feet tall) providing housing for 651 student beds, and 2) Storke Gateway Towers consisting of 2 medium-rise 6-story buildings (approximately 65 to 70 feet tall) housing 352 students. In addition to the 1,003 student beds the Project would provide four two-bedroom/two-bathroom units for faculty in residence. All units would have a full kitchen, a dining area, living room, and storage. The Project includes a variety of accessory uses to serve the on-site population such as a convenience store, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities (volleyball and basketball courts and outdoor open space/playing areas), and a variety of other student related services. Parking associated with San Joaquin and Santa Catalina would shift to an expanded surface lot (approximately 180 spaces) at the adjacent West Campus Apartments and to an underutilized parking structure on Storke Campus (Parking Structure 50 at San Clemente Housing). A network of pedestrian and bicycle paths would be provided throughout the Project site. The primary bicycle access route through the site would be a Class I path located along the eastern and northern perimeters of the site. There would be approximately 2,500 bicycle parking spaces distributed throughout the Project site.

The Final EIR evaluated the construction of a new dining commons (the Portola Dining Commons) to replace the existing Santa Catalina dining commons). In order to stay within the Project's estimated budget the replacement dining commons is not being proposed for design approval at this time and the 17 residential units originally planned above the commons were incorporated into the design of the two 6-story tower buildings. The height and overall gross and assignable square feet of residential units will remain the same as described in the Draft EIR. The campus chose to defer the dining commons portion of the Project to a future date. The site designated for the dining commons will remain in its existing condition.

**B. Environmental Review Process**

In accordance with CEQA and the University of California Procedures for the Implementation of CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the Project to help focus the EIR on environmental effects that could be potentially significant, identify effects that would not be significant, and explain why certain potentially significant effects were determined not to be significant. The Initial Study is included as Appendix A to the Final EIR, Volume 1.



The Initial Study for the Project concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less than significant after incorporation of mitigation measures: cultural resources, recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems (water resources). The Initial Study determined the Project would not result in significant impacts in the following issue areas: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Population/Housing, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems (wastewater, solid waste, and water service). The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed Project may, either by itself or cumulatively with existing and proposed development in the area, have potentially significant environmental effects in the following areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic. The Draft EIR for the Project therefore analyzed impacts in those areas.

In compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.4, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the Initial Study were distributed to state and local agencies and other interested parties on May 2, 2013 to May 31, 2013 for a 30-day review period.

The Notice of Completion and Draft EIR for the Project were published on August 10, 2013 (SCH# 2013051009). The official public notice of availability announcing: (1) the availability of the Draft EIR for the review and comment by the public and agencies; (2) the date and location of a public hearing on the EIR; and (3) how to obtain copies of the EIR, appeared in the Santa Barbara NewsPress, the local paper of public record, on August 10, 2013. The 45-day public and agency review period extended from August 10, 2013 through September 23, 2013. The public comment and review period was extended to October 24, 2013 at the request of the public. Fourteen comments (6 agency, 4 local organizations, and 4 public) were received during the public review period and were considered by UCSB. Letters were received from the following agencies and organizations:

- Santa Barbara County, Fire Department, Planning and Development Department, and Public Works Department (combined letter)
- Santa Barbara County Air Pollution and Control District
- California Coastal Commission
- City of Goleta
- Metropolitan Transit District
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Isla Vista Association
- Audubon
- Urban Creeks Council
- Sustainability NOW

Written comments addressed traffic and parking, road improvements, aesthetics (loss of views), noise (construction and operation), potential impacts to adjacent wetland and open space area, transit service, cumulative traffic and parking impacts, and cumulative development Projects.

Members of the public were invited to submit comments on the Draft EIR in testimony at a public hearing held for that purpose on September 9, 2013. Three members of the public provided comments regarding the Draft EIR at the public hearing. Verbal comments addressed noise and social and economic impacts.

The Final EIR contains all of the comments received during the public comment period, including a transcript of the public hearing; together with written responses to those comments which were prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Regents finds and determines that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to all comments raising significant environmental issues.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after notice is given, but before certification. The term "information" includes: (i) changes to the Project; (ii) changes in the environmental setting; or (iii) additional data or other information. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 further provides that "[n]ew information added to an EIR is not 'significant' unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible Project alternative) that the Project's proponents have declined to implement."

Since the notice of the Draft EIR, the University decided to defer dining commons for design approval at this time and the 17 residential units originally planned above the commons were incorporated into the design of the two 6-story tower buildings as described in Section 1.7 of the Final EIR. The design changes are not substantial and would not result in additional significant environmental impacts or result in an increase in the severity of impacts identified by the Draft EIR (see Section 1.7 of the Final EIR). Therefore there is no additional data or other information that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon the Project. Therefore, having reviewed the information contained in the Draft and Final EIR and in the administrative record, as well as the requirements under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, The Regents hereby finds that there is no new significant information and no need to recirculate the EIR.

The Final EIR, which includes the Draft EIR and responses to comments received during the public review period for the Draft EIR, was published December 2013. The information

provided in the Final EIR did not include any new information regarding impacts or mitigation measures. The analysis and conclusions contained in the Final EIR reflect the independent judgment of the University and are based upon substantial evidence obtained in the administrative record.

The Final EIR for the Project analyzes environmental impacts in the following areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic. In addition, the EIR considered, in separate sections, Plan and Policy Consistency, Growth Inducing Impacts and Alternatives to the Project. The Final EIR analyzes both the impacts of the Project and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures. All of the significant environmental impacts of the Project were identified in the text of the Draft EIR. Implementation of the Project may result in significant impacts in a number of areas. Certain impacts in the following areas would be significant without mitigation but will be reduced to less than significant levels by incorporating the proposed mitigation measures in the Final EIR: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, and transportation/traffic.

The Final EIR identifies mitigation measures for the potentially significant impacts of the Project and for certain less-than-significant impacts. Though CEQA does not mandate the adoption of mitigation measures where impacts are identified as less than significant, all mitigation measures included in the Final EIR are recommended to The Regents as elements of the Project, and thus become binding upon The Regents' certification of the Final EIR.

**C. Significant Impacts Identified in the EIR That Are Reduced to a Level of "Less Than Significant" by Mitigation Measures Incorporated Into the Project to be Implemented by Another Jurisdiction**

**1. Transportation and Traffic**

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would result in a Project-specific impact to the 2-lane segment of Los Carneros Road between Hollister Avenue and Mesa Road, which exceeds the City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara's LOS C threshold for a 2-lane arterial. The Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan identifies improvements to this 2-lane segment of the road and a portion of these improvements have been made. Construction of the remaining improvements is subject to the exercise of future discretion by the Goleta City Council and the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors. Mitigation Measures TRF-1a and b requiring UCSB to continue participating in the "fair share" funding of the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan which identifies improvement Projects for Los Carneros Road are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential impacts to transportation and traffic would be reduced

to a less than significant level (See Section 5.8 of the Final EIR).

Implementation of the Los Carneros roadway improvements are within the jurisdictions of City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara. Improvements to Los Carneros Road are identified in the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan. The northern portion of the Los Carneros roadway improvements within the City of Goleta has been made. If the remaining improvements to Los Carneros Road identified in the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan are not implemented prior to Project occupancy, a significant Project-specific traffic impact would result and would continue until such time that the identified roadway improvement mitigation measures are constructed.

**D. Potentially Significant Impacts Identified in the EIR That Are Reduced to a Level of "Less Than Significant" by Mitigation Measures Incorporated Into the Project.**

The Initial Study and Final EIR identify the following significant impacts associated with the Project that are reduced to less than significant levels by Mitigation Measures identified in the EIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines (a)(1), The Regents finds that the significant environmental impacts which these Mitigation Measures address will be mitigated to a less than significant level or avoided by incorporation of the Mitigation Measures into the Project.

The mitigation measures identified below are presented in summary form. For a detailed description of these mitigation measures, please see appropriate references in the Draft EIR, as amended by the Final EIR.

**1. Aesthetics-Potential Impact to Scenic Trees**

Construction of the parking lot on the west side of Storke Road has the potential to affect the long-term health of a row of six redwood trees located along the southern border of the proposed parking lot. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-1a and 2010 LRDP Mitigation Measure BIO-3D requiring a tree protection plan be prepared and implemented to avoid loss of the trees during construction is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and would reduce the potential significant impact to an important visual resource to a less than significant level (See Page 5.1-40 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in impacts to scenic trees.

**2. Aesthetics-Shadows From Landscaping**

Proposed landscaping adjacent to non-UCSB residences to the Project has the potential to result in shadow-related impacts. Project Mitigation Measure AES-2a requiring UCSB to maintain landscaping adjacent to non-UCSB residences so that it provides beneficial screening effects but

does not result in shadow impacts and is maintained so that it does not exceed the height of the property line wall is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project and would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See Pages 5.1-53 through of the Final EIR). 2010 LRDP Mitigation Measures AES-4A and 4B requiring the Design Review Committee to review the Project designs to protect mountain views and ensure Project designs are compatible with surrounding development would further reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in new landscaping that would create shadows on the adjacent Storke Ranch residents. Additional apartments on the Towers would not result in significantly more shadows and are not adjacent to Storke Ranch residents.

### **3. Aesthetics-Lighting**

Lighting for the Project along walkways and service drives and the bicycle path on the eastern and northern perimeter of the site has the potential to effect nearby users, lighting from upper sun decks on the buildings has the potential to impact adjacent residences, and lighting from the proposed parking lot would potentially impact traffic on Storke Road. Project Mitigation Measures AES-3a, 3b, and 3c requiring directional lighting and shielding, Design Review Committee review of lighting plans to ensure illumination limits effects on nighttime views, and providing minimum lighting for adequate safety and security and Project Mitigation Measures AES-4 and AES-5 requiring limiting hours of nighttime lighting, limiting the height of lights to approximately 1-foot candle size, and landscaping heights to shield lighting are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project and would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See Page 5.1-65 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in new lighting beyond what was considered in the Final EIR.

### **5. Air Quality-Dust Emissions**

Dust emissions from the Project construction have the potential to result in a significant air quality impact and contribute to existing non-attainment conditions for PM<sub>10</sub>. Project Mitigation Measures AQ-1 a through b requiring a variety of dust control measures are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and would minimize the effects of short-term construction-related dust emissions and related air quality impacts from the Project to a less than significant level (See Section 5.2 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional construction dust.

**6. Biological Resources-Tree Removal**

Construction of the Project would result in the removal of 39 mature trees considered to have biological importance. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-1a and 2010 LRDP Mitigation Measure BIO-3D requiring the trees to be replaced at a 3:1 ratio and with native trees is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project and will reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See Pages 5.3-25 through 5.3-26 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in the removal of more trees than identified in the Final EIR.

**7. Biological Resources-Tree Preservation**

Construction of the parking lot on the west side of Storke Road has the potential to adversely affect the long-term health of a row of six mature redwood trees. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, 1 through 6 requiring a variety of tree protection measures are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project and will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant level (See Page 5.3-26 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in the removal or construction impacts to more trees than identified in the Final EIR.

**8. Biological Resources-Nesting Birds**

Construction activities for the Project have the potential to result in significant impacts to nesting birds. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-3 a, b, and c requiring tree removal outside the typical nesting season, pre-construction nesting surveys if tree removals or construction is to occur during the bird nesting season, and restrictions on tree removals and noise-producing construction activities if nesting birds are present, are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that impacts to nesting birds are reduced to a less than significant level (See Pages 5.3-27 through 5.3-28 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in the removal or impact to more trees than identified in the EIR.

**9. Biological Resources-Water Quality Impacts**

Construction of the optional stormwater ponds and bicycle and pedestrian paths through the open space east of the San Joaquin Project site has the potential to result in short- and long-term erosion, sedimentation, and water quality impacts to wetland resources. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-5a and b requiring a variety of construction site best management practices and preparation of a site specific restoration plan is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See Section 5.3-

32 through 5.3-33 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional erosion and sedimentation impacts than identified in the Final EIR.

#### **10. Biological Resources-Impacts to Wetland**

Increased human presence in the open space area east of the Project site could impact wetland areas if the optional pedestrian path is constructed. Project Mitigation Measure BIO-6a requiring installation of interpretive signs along the path to educate people about the sensitive habitat areas and signs encouraging people to stay on the path is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See Pages 5.3-30 through 5.3-31 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional potential impacts to the open space area east of the Project site.

#### **11. Cultural Resources**

There is no evidence that archaeological or paleontological resources are located on the Project site. There is still the possibility that such resources could be encountered during the Project construction phase. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project construction, Project Mitigation Measures CUL-1a through e requiring suspension of earth disturbing work in the vicinity of the find, evaluation by a non-University archaeologist, appropriate mitigation and monitoring by a Chumash representative are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level (See Appendix A, Initial Study Section 6.5 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional area of ground disturbance and therefore no additional impacts to cultural resources.

#### **12. Geology-Seismic Impacts**

The Portola Dining Commons would be developed on a portion of the Project site with the potential to experience ground deformation and uplift caused by tectonic movement at depth, rather than ground rupture caused by fault movement. In addition, Project-serving underground utility lines crossing active faults on the Project site have the potential for damage in the event of seismic activity. The Project Mitigation Measure GEO-1a requiring the Portola Dining Commons building plans to incorporate foundation and structural recommendations by qualified engineering geologists and GEO-2a requiring utilities crossing active faults to have shut off valves are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential

impacts from seismic activity would be reduced to a less than significant level (See Page 5.4-12 through 5.4-13 through 5.4-15 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in new construction less than 50 feet from the identified fault on the Project site. Mitigation measures for utility lines will still apply.

### **13. Hydrology and Water Quality**

The proposed optional drainage system for the San Joaquin site including installation of three stormwater ponds has the potential to result in local scour and sedimentation impacts and thereby impacting adjacent wetland and open space areas. Project Mitigation Measure HYD-1a requiring ungrouted rock rip rap energy dissipaters or similar devices to be installed at all discharge points and requiring 1:1 wetland buffer restoration for area disturbed by the installation of the devices are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential impacts to water quality and wetland buffer would be reduced to a less than significant level (See Final EIR Pages 5.5-12 through 5.5-13). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in changes to the optional stormwater ponds.

### **14. Noise-Construction**

Construction of the apartments and parking lot have the potential to result in significant short-term noise and vibration impacts to adjacent residences, including on-site residents of the Santa Catalina Residence Hall and adjacent residents of Storke Ranch and the West Campus Apartments. Project Mitigation Measure N-1a requiring a variety of measures to reduce impacts from construction noise including and not limited to: limitations on the use of noise generating construction equipment during specific hours (8:00 am and 5:00 pm), locating stationary noise generating construction equipment and laydown and construction vehicle staging areas at least 200 feet away from noise sensitive receptors and land uses, shielding equipment from noise sensitive receptors by using temporary walls, sound curtains or other similar devices if required, and informing adjacent residents one week before construction are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and are adequate to reduce the effects of short-term construction noise impacts to nearby residences to a less than significant level (See Pages 5.7-28 through 5.7-29 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional construction noise. Since the Dining Commons would be built at a later date there would be less construction noise during Project construction.



## **15. Recreation**

Residents of the San Joaquin Apartments Project would increase the demand for on-and off-campus recreation facilities, including beach and coastal access ways. 2010 LRDP EIR REC-2B and 2C and Project Mitigation Measure REC-1a requiring continued maintenance of adjacent beaches and coastal access trails and REC-1b requiring the Project to include recreation facilities on the Project site are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential impacts to recreation opportunities would be reduced to a less than significant level (See Appendix A, Initial Study Section 6.15 of the Final EIR). The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in a change in campus-wide or Project recreation activities.

### **E. Cumulative Impacts**

Under CEQA, cumulative impacts are significant when the incremental effects of the Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects. The Final EIR analyzes cumulative impacts with respect to the following environmental issue areas: air quality, geology and soils, noise, utilities, and transportation and traffic. The “cumulative context” includes the existing, previously approved, and reasonably foreseeable future projects at UCSB that would contribute to the particular cumulative impact.

The Final EIR identifies significant cumulative impacts related to transportation and traffic and Utilities and Service Systems. Cumulative traffic impacts that can be reduced to a less than significant level are described in Section C above (See Section 5.8. 4 of the Final EIR)

Potable water use by the San Joaquin Apartments Project would incrementally contribute cumulative water demand impacts that would result from the build-out of the 2010 LRDP and other development in the Goleta Water District service area. Mitigation Measure W-1a through W-1e identified in the 2010 LRDP EIR (MM W-3A, 3C through 3F) requiring the use of recycled water to the maximum extent feasible, installation of water saving devices, launching a public awareness campaign and developing a UC Santa Barbara Water Conservation Program, and identifying and acquiring additional water supplies are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and will ensure that potential cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems would be reduced to a less than significant level (See Appendix A, Initial Study, Section 6.17, Page 6.17-9 of the Final EIR).

The changes in the Project to defer the Portola Dining Commons and move 17 apartments to the North and Storke Towers do not alter the conclusion of the Final EIR because the Project change does not result in additional traffic or water use.

**F. Mitigation Measures Recommended to Further Reduce Less Than Significant Impacts**

The Final EIR contains a variety of recommended mitigation measures that would further reduce impacts identified as less than significant for the San Joaquin Apartments Project for air quality, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic and are proposed for adoption. Implementation of these measures is not required to reduce significant impacts.

**1. Air Quality-Emissions Control**

Construction emissions resulting from the development of the San Joaquin Apartments Project would contribute to emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and diesel particulate matter. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure AQ-2a 1 through 9 requires a variety of emission control measures that if implemented would further reduce air quality impacts to less than significant levels.

**2. Hydrology and Water Quality-Soil Permeability**

The low permeability of soil on the Project site may not be conducive to the use of extensive areas of permeable pavement. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure HYD-2a recommends site specific soil infiltration tests to determine infiltration potential. If implemented onsite bioretention features would be sufficiently sized and impacts to hydrology and water quality would be further reduced to less than significant levels.

**3. Hydrology and Water Quality-Stormwater Discharge**

The proposed stormwater discharge system is not currently designed to discharge into the southernmost of the three optional stormwater ponds. In order to ensure the southerly pond is used most effectively HYD-3a recommends the proposed Project site drain system be modified. Implementation of this measure would further reduce potential impacts to hydrology to less than significant levels.

**4. Noise-Operational Impacts**

Project-related activities that occur on the Project site, primarily in the North Village area, have the potential to result in transient sounds that may be considered disturbing by nearby residents. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure N-2a recommends posting signs indicating where complaints can be reported if necessary. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure N-3a recommends waste and recycling collection stations be located on the interior sides of new structures. Implementation of this measure would further reduce potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

**5. Traffic-Bus and Shuttle**

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would increase demand for bus service between the Project

site, off-site parking areas, and the Main Campus. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure TRF-4a recommends UCSB continue working with the Metropolitan Transit District to identify the operating characteristics of the proposed San Joaquin Apartments Project and monitor ridership levels over a two year period to determine necessary changes in the bus or shuttle systems. Implementation of this measure would further reduce potential traffic impacts to less than significant levels.

## **6. Traffic-Bicycle Network**

The San Joaquin Apartments Project would increase the number of bicycle trips within the study area, particularly between the Project site and the Main Campus. Recommended Project Mitigation Measure TRF-5a recommends UCSB continue to monitor bicycle network needs and explore capacity increases to the campus bicycle network. Implementation of this measure would further reduce potential bicycle traffic impacts to less than significant levels.

## **G. Mitigation Monitoring Program**

Public Resources Code §21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines §15091(d) require the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Program for the changes to the Project which it has adopted or made a condition of Project approval in order to ensure compliance during Project implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by The Regents requires the campus to monitor Mitigation Measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those Mitigation Measures designed to reduce environmental impacts that are less than significant. The Mitigation Monitoring Program includes all of the Mitigation Measures and Project design features identified in the Final EIR, and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. The MMP is included in Section 10.3 of the Final EIR.

## **H. Alternatives**

Section 8.0 of the Final EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis also included an analysis of a No Project/No Build Alternative and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The EIR examined each alternative's feasibility and ability to meet the Project objectives. Those found to be clearly infeasible were rejected without further environmental review in Section 8.0, Page 8-3, of the Draft EIR. The rejected alternatives included the development of alternative uses on the Project site such as academic or commercial uses and providing student housing at an off campus location.

Alternatives that might have been feasible and that would attain most of the Project objectives were carried forward and analyzed with regard to whether they would reduce or avoid significant

impacts of the Project. These alternatives include: (1) No Project; (2) Alternate Project Site - Ocean Road Project Site and Alternative Project Site-Faculty and Staff Residential Units; (3) Project Redesign Alternative; and (4) 2010 LRDP Project Design.

In connection with certification of the Final EIR for the Project, the University certifies that it independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings. The University finds that no new alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the Final EIR for the Project have been identified and that the feasibility of the analyzed alternatives has not changed since the Draft EIR. Brief summaries of the evaluated alternatives are provided below.

The University certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the administrative record, and finds that all the alternatives are infeasible for the reasons set forth below.

### **1. Project Objectives**

As described in Section 4.7 of the Final EIR, the objectives of the San Joaquin Apartments Project are to:

1. Implement provisions of the 2010 LRDP to provide on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth and as required by 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation requirements and agreements between UCSB and the City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara.
2. Provide housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses and minimizes environmental impacts to resources on and adjacent to the Project site.
3. Provide on-site services required for student residents and provide amenities that enhance learning and social interaction.
4. Provide a project design that implements the University's sustainability goals.
5. Provide parking adequate to accommodate the proposed Project's demand.

### **2. Alternative 1: No Project**

Under the No Project Alternative, student housing, a new dining commons, and other proposed student-serving facilities would not be developed at the San Joaquin apartments site, and a new parking lot on the west side of Storke Road would not be constructed. Existing parking lots, turf

areas and other portions of the Project site that would be used for the development of the proposed Project would remain in their current condition.

This alternative would avoid potentially significant but mitigable impacts to aesthetics air quality, biological resources, geologic (seismic), hydrology and water quality, construction noise, Project specific and cumulative traffic, and cumulative utilities and service system (potable water) impacts.

The Project site was identified in the 2010 LRDP as one of the on-campus student housing sites to accommodate the 5,000 student enrollment increase over the 15-year LRDP planning period. The University entered into The *2010 University of California, Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Mitigation Implementation and Settlement Agreement* (Agreement) with the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Goleta. The Agreement requires the University to build student, faculty, and staff housing on-campus and that housing be built in a phased manner commensurate with enrollment growth envisioned by the 2010 LRDP.

Therefore, it is reasonably assumed that additional student housing would be developed on the San Joaquin Project site and/or at another on-campus location sometime during the 2010 LRDP planning period since such development was contemplated in the 2010 LRDP and the 2010 LRDP EIR.

The No Project alternative is infeasible because it would not meet the proposed Projects' objectives and it would result in a negative impact on the University's ability to fulfill the objectives of the 2010 LRDP and the Agreement with local jurisdictions to build on-campus student housing. The No Project Alternative would impair the University's obligations under the Master Plan for Higher Education by impairing the campus' ability to increase enrollment commensurate with the plan requirements and is therefore infeasible. Further, under the Agreement with the City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara, the University has agreed to freeze enrollment growth at the previous year's level until sufficient new housing is developed to meet this need.

### **3. Alternative 2: Alternative Project Site**

This alternative consists of two components: the Ocean Road Project Site Component and the Faculty and Staff Housing Units Component. The Ocean Road Project Site Component would result in the development of a project similar to proposed Project at an alternative site on a housing site on the Main Campus identified for faculty and staff housing in the 2010 LRDP. The Faculty and Staff Housing Units Component would relocate faculty and staff housing units planned at the Ocean Road site to the Project site.

The Alternative Project Site Alternative would result in increased aesthetic, air quality, long-term greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

**4. Alternative 3: Project Redesign Alternative**

This alternative shifts approximately 19 student residential units from the Project site to the proposed 1.5-acre parking lot site on the west side of Storke Road at West Campus Family Apartments (WCFA); shifts the parking spaces from the proposed 1.5-acre parking lot to the San Joaquin site; and relocates the bicycle/pedestrian path that would be located along the northern perimeter of the San Joaquin site. All other amenities would be developed on the Project site.

This alternative was found to be environmentally superior to the Project because it would result in reduced aesthetic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project and would fulfill the proposed Project's basic objectives of providing on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth identified by the 2010 LRDP, and providing housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

**5. Alternative 4: 2010 LRDP Project Design**

This alternative would result in the development of 600 student bed spaces on the San Joaquin site as described by the 2010 LRDP. The 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would result in reduced aesthetic impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project and would fulfill the proposed Project's objective of providing housing that is compatible with surrounding land uses. However, the 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would not achieve the proposed Project's objective of providing student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth, which is also a requirement of LRDP EIR mitigation requirements and requirements of agreements that UCSB has entered into with the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Goleta. Therefore, this alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative that would attain the primary objectives of the proposed Project.

The 2010 LRDP Project Design Alternative would impair the University's obligations under the Master Plan for Higher Education by impairing the campus' ability to increase enrollment commensurate with the plan requirements and is therefore infeasible. Further, under the Agreement with the City of Goleta and the County of Santa Barbara, the University has agreed to freeze enrollment growth at the previous year's level until sufficient new housing is developed to meet this need.

## **6. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Each of the alternatives to the Project is listed on Table 8.5.1 of the Final EIR. This table summarizes the potential for the alternatives to result in reduced, similar, or greater environmental impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project.

The “No Project” alternative would generally avoid or reduce all environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project. However, this alternative would not implement any of the proposed Projects’ objectives. Section 15126.6(e) (2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states, “If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

The Project Redesign alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative and would meet the basic objectives of the proposed Project and result in reduced aesthetic impacts. However this alternative is not feasible because constructing 19 apartments at the WCFA site would conflict with the plans for that site in the 2010 LRDP. The 2010 LRDP proposes the existing 250 units at the West Campus Family Apartments (WCFA) be removed and 481 apartments be built on the site. The apartments would be primarily for faculty, staff, and students with families with some units for single students. Constructing a portion of the Project units on the site would displace some of the planned 481 units of housing on the WCFA site therefore would conflict with the 2010 LRDP objective of constructing 1,874 and 5,000 student beds faculty and staff units on campus. The University is required to carry out its obligation to provide housing commensurate with enrollment. If the entire 481 units of planned housing at the WCFA site were not built at the identified site they would be required to be built at another location. Therefore, the Project Redesign alternative would impair the University’s ability to carry out its obligations and agreements with the City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara that require UCSB to provide housing commensurate with enrollment. Failure to implement the University’s housing obligations under the agreements with Goleta and the County would require UCSB to cap enrollment thereby impairing UCSB’s ability to fulfill its proportional share of enrollment demand under the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Further it is not financially feasible to construct 19 stand alone apartments on a site that is planned for redevelopment and that would not be easily integrated into the overall campus plan.

### **I. Additional Findings**

#### **1. Irreversible Commitment of Resources**

The Project involves an irreversible commitment of resources for energy and materials used

during construction, and likely constitute a long-term commitment of the Project site to the designated use.

**2. Incorporation by Reference**

The text of the Final EIR, the 2010 LRDP, the 2010 LRDP EIR, and the Findings and Overriding Considerations previously adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the LRDP, are hereby incorporated into these Findings in their entirety. Without limitation, the incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the Project in spite of the associated significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

**3. Record of Proceedings**

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which The Regents bases its Findings and decisions contained herein. Most documents related to the Final EIR are located in the UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design, Campus Design and Facilities, Building 972, at the Santa Barbara campus. Some documents included in the record of proceedings may also be located at other offices at the Santa Barbara campus, at the University's Office of the President, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, California 94607, and/or at the offices of consultants retained by the Campus for this Project. The custodian for the record of the proceedings is the Director, Office of Campus Planning and Design, Santa Barbara campus.

**4. Statement of Overriding Considerations**

The University finds that all mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR will be adopted as part of the Project. The University further finds that the remaining significant and unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based upon the facts set forth above in these Findings, the LRDP EIR and LRDP EIR Findings, the Final EIR, and the record, as follows:

The University has fully considered the discussion and analyses of the Record regarding the environmental impacts, socioeconomic effects, cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources. The University finds that the Project provides region-wide and statewide legal, social, environmental and other benefits, which overrides any unavoidable significant adverse impacts of the Project. The University finds that the alternatives to the Project set forth in the Final EIR and summarized in this document are infeasible because such alternatives would limit the legal, social, economic and other benefits of the proposed development, and are therefore outweighed by them.



**1. Impacts that Remain Significant**

As discussed above, the University has found that traffic impacts of the Project to Los Carneros Road north of Mesa Road remain significant, either in whole or in part, following adoption and implementation of the Mitigation Measures described in the 2010 LRDP EIR and the Final EIR because implementation of the Mitigation Measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Goleta and such changes are included in the City's Transportation Improvement Plan.

**2. Overriding Considerations**

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the University has, in determining whether or not to approve the Project, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental risks, and has found that the benefits of the Project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the University's review of the 2010 LRDP EIR and the Final SEIR and other information in the administrative record. The University re-affirms the Findings adopted in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP and certification of the 2010 LRDP EIR and also makes the following findings regarding the Project:

A. The Project implements a portion of the 2010 LRDP and is consistent with the analysis in the 2010 LRDP EIR.

B. Further, the Project will increase on-campus student housing commensurate with planned student enrollment growth as required by 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation requirements and agreements between the University and the City of Goleta and Santa Barbara County.

C. Further, the Project is required to meet the demand for student housing in order for the University to fulfill its proportional share of enrollment demand under the Master Plan for Higher Education. Failure to implement the University's housing obligations under the agreements with Goleta and the County would require UCSB to cap enrollment thereby impairing UCSB's ability to fulfill its proportional share of enrollment demand under the Master Plan for Higher Education.

**J. Summary**

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the University has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant

environmental effects of the Proposed Action:

1. Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, and based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project identified in the Project EIR:
  - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.
  - b. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency, and the University lacks concurrent jurisdiction with that other public agency.
  - c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible any unadopted mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the Findings.
2. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents hereby determine that:
  - a. All significant effects on the environment due to the Approval of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
  - b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.I.4, above.

### **III. APPROVALS**

The Regents hereby intend to take the following actions:

- A. Certify the Final EIR, as described in Section I, above.
- B. Adopt as conditions of approval all the applicable 2010 LRDP mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Section II of the Findings, above.
- C. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project accompanying the Final EIR and discussed in Section II.G. of the Findings, above.

D. The Regents hereby adopt the Findings in their entirety including the Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section II. I. 4., above.

E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the Project, and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the foregoing Findings, the Regents hereby approve the design of the San Joaquin apartments.