# CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR, FINDINGS, AND APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA CRUZ 2005 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The University of California ("University"), as lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines,[1] has completed the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the 2005 Long Range Development Plan ("2005 LRDP") for the University of California, Santa Cruz ("UC Santa Cruz" or "the campus"). The Final EIR has been assigned State Clearinghouse No. 2005012113. The proposed project analyzed in the Final EIR is a new Long Range Development Plan ("LRDP") for UC Santa Cruz. The LRDP that is the subject of these findings and approvals is the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006).

The Final EIR consists of six volumes. Volumes I, II and III of the Final EIR (September 2006) contain the October 2005 Draft EIR. Volumes I and II analyze the significant environmental effects of implementing the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), which proposed to increase campus enrollment growth to 21,000 students by the 2020-2021 academic year. Volumes I and II also identify measures to eliminate or reduce the significant impacts of the project as proposed, as well as measures to further reduce many of the project's less-than-significant impacts, and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Draft 2005 LRDP. Volume III analyzes the significant environmental effects of three specific development projects proposed by UC Santa Cruz for implementation under the 2005 LRDP. The three projects are the Infrastructure Improvements Project, the Family Student Housing Redevelopment Project, and the 2300 Delaware Project.

Volume IV of the Final EIR describes the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006), which is a refinement of the project analyzed in the Draft EIR. The refined project is the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative analyzed in the Draft EIR and identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Hence, the Final Draft LRDP (September 2006) proposes a total enrollment of 19,500 students within the LRDP horizon, which represents 22 percent less growth in campus enrollment than the 21,000 total enrollment proposed in the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). The proposed 2005 LRDP building program is also reduced in the Final Draft 2005 LRDP in proportion to the reduction in enrollment growth. Volume IV also includes description and analysis of the environmental effects of minor refinements to the three proposed specific development projects.

The Recirculated Draft EIR is a volume containing additional information and analysis regarding the impacts of the proposed project on freeway facilities. The Recirculated Draft EIR is included in the Final EIR as Appendix A (Volume VI).

---

[1] CEQA is found at Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.* The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, title 14, § 15000 *et seq.*

Volumes V and VI of the Final EIR contain copies of comment letters on the 2005 Draft EIR and on the Recirculated Draft EIR that were submitted by public agencies, organizations and members of the public; transcripts of public hearings on the Draft EIR; and written responses regarding environmental issues raised in both the written and oral comments.

The Final EIR is hereby incorporated in these findings by reference. Design, site development and infrastructure approvals for each the three specific development projects will be addressed in separate actions of The Regents and/or University officials delegated such authority pursuant to the Standing Orders and Bylaws of The Regents of the University of California.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the Board of Regents of the University of California ("The Regents") certifies that it has been presented with the Final EIR, that it has further considered all additional written and oral statements received by The Regents prior to or at its public hearing on the Final EIR and Final Draft 2005 LRDP, and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and received at its public hearing prior to making the following certifications and the findings in Section II and the approvals in Section III, below.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, The Regents certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the University.

The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR satisfies the requirements for a long range development plan EIR prepared under Public Resources Code Section 21080.09 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15081.5.

Based upon the foregoing, The Regents finds and determines that as the certified Environmental Impact Report for the 2005 LRDP (September 2006), the Final EIR provides the basis for approval of the 2005 LRDP (September 2006), and the supporting findings set forth in Section II, below. In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.09, such further review as may be required under the provisions of CEQA for implementation of projects implementing the 2005 LRDP, may be based upon the Final EIR or a tiered analysis based upon the Final EIR.

FINDINGS

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the record of proceedings, The Regents hereby adopts the following findings in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA:

Part A: Findings regarding the environmental review process and the contents of the Final EIR.

Part B: Findings regarding the significant effect on the environment of the 2005 LRDP and disposition of related mitigation measures.

Part C: Findings regarding the Mitigation Monitoring Program

Part D: Findings regarding alternatives to the project and the reasons that the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative is adopted as the project and the other alternatives have been rejected.

Part E: Statement of Overriding Considerations determining that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that will result and therefore justify approval of the project despite such impacts.

The Regents adopts these findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the approvals set forth in Section III, below.

## A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

### 1. Development of the Proposed 2005 LRDP

In May 1989, The Regents adopted the 1988 LRDP for UC Santa Cruz as a guide for physical development in support of campus needs and goals and the campus population growth projected through 2004-05. As of academic year 2005-06, the campus was within the projected overall enrollment and employee growth levels established by the 1988 LRDP. However, the University projects that system-wide, full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment will increase by approximately 63,000 from 1998 through 2010. Therefore, in January 2000, the University's Office of the President asked each University of California campus to consider the feasibility of implementing campus-specific enrollment targets. As a result, UC Santa Cruz has prepared a new LRDP to plan for anticipated growth through 2020-21. Environmental Review Process

An Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report were prepared for the 2005 LRDP in accordance with CEQA and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. In January 2005, the University published a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") and Initial Study indicating that an EIR would be prepared for the 2005 LRDP. The period for public and agency review of the NOP and Initial Study extended from January 27, 2005 through February 28, 2005.

The Notice of Completion and Draft EIR for the project were published on October 18, 2005. On December 18, 2005, the campus issued an official public notice, which appeared in the Santa Cruz Sentinel, announcing that, in response to requests from the public, the campus had elected to extend the comment period through January 2006. One hundred twenty-two letters were received during the public review period for the Draft EIR. In addition, members of the public were invited by formal public notice to submit comments on the Draft EIR in testimony at public hearings held for that purpose on November 16, 2005 and November 30, 2005. Fifty-six persons provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearings.

After reviewing the comments received on the Draft EIR, the University expanded the analysis of the traffic impacts of the proposed 2005 LRDP on freeway facilities to include segments of Highway 1 and Highway 17. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, the additional traffic analyses were published in a Recirculated Draft EIR – Additional Traffic Analysis (RDEIR) on October 18, 2005. The official public notice announcing: (1) the availability of the RDEIR for review and comment by the public and agencies; and (2) how to obtain copies of the EIR, appeared in the Santa Cruz Sentinel on March 20. 2006. The public and agency review period for the RDEIR extended from March 20, 2006 through May 3, 2006. Fifteen letters were received during the public review period for the RDEIR.

**2. Absence of Significant New Information**

The Regents recognizes that the Final EIR incorporates information obtained by the University since the Draft EIR and the RDEIR were completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications and other changes as follows:

***Changes to the 2005 LRDP***

The 2005 LRDP has been modified to plan for a smaller projected growth in enrollment than was analyzed in the Draft EIR for the proposed project. The 2005 LRDP that is the subject of the Final EIR was analyzed in the Draft EIR as the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative, and was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. The increase in enrollment under the project analyzed in the Final EIR, which is the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006), is 1,500 students fewer (or 22 percent less enrollment growth) than was proposed under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). The total campus population increase, including employees and visitors, would be about 20 percent less than the population increase analyzed in the Draft EIR. The total on-campus population in the year 2020, under the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006), would be 25,325 persons (including non-UCSC employees and visitors). Summer session student population on the campus would be proportionally reduced under the Final Draft 2005 LRDP.

In the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006), about 2,300 new student beds would be added to the campus housing stock. This is 1,090 fewer beds than were analyzed in the Draft 2005 LRDP EIR (October 2005); however, the percentage of students that would be housed on campus under the Final Draft 2005 LRDP is the same as under the Draft 2005 LRDP. The Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006) also would provide the same number of employee housing units as under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). Therefore, a somewhat higher proportion of the faculty and staff would be housed on campus under the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006) than under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005).

One development area in the central campus, designated as Colleges and University Housing under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), has been reduced in size by about 14 acres in the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006). The 14 acres that would not be developed are designated as Campus Resource Land in the Final Draft 2005

LRDP (September 2006). Additionally, the land use diagram for the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006) includes minor adjustments to boundary lines, to conform to existing landforms. These minor adjustments did not change the amount of land previously identified for each designation.

The Regents finds that these changes would not result in new or more severe environmental impacts. As a result, these changes do not require recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

***Changes to Mitigation Measures.*** As described in the Final EIR, a number of the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and the RDEIR have been modified and several new mitigation measures have been added in response to comments received and as refinements and enhancement of the mitigation identified in the Draft EIR and the RDEIR. The Regents finds that these changes and additions to the mitigation measures augment the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and the RDEIR, strengthen the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, and enhance their clarity, but do not cause any new significant impacts, nor have these new mitigation measures been added to address new significant impacts of the project. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, no recirculation of the EIR is necessary based on the change and additions to the mitigation measures in the Final EIR.

***Other Changes.*** Various minor modifications have been made to the text, tables and figures of the Draft EIR, as set forth in the Final EIR. These changes are generally of an administrative nature such as correcting typographical errors, making minor adjustments to the data, and adding or changing certain phrases for clarification or to improve readability. The Regents finds that these changes are of an insignificant, non-substantive nature and do not require recirculation of the EIR.

Based on the foregoing, and having reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and in the record of proceedings, including the comments on the Draft EIR and the RDEIR and the responses thereto, the above-described information, and all information received by The Regents at the hearing on the 2005 LRDP, The Regents hereby finds that no significant new information has been added to the Final EIR that would require recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The new information added to the EIR and referred to above does not involve any new or substantially more severe significant impacts, or indicate that the Draft EIR was in any way inadequate or conclusory.

### 3. Differences of Opinion Regarding the Impacts of the Project

In making its determination to certify the Final EIR and to approve the project, The Regents recognizes that the analysis of the project involves a number of controversial environmental issues, and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to these issues. The Regents has acquired a better understanding of the breadth of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the Draft EIR and the RDEIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR and the RDEIR, and the responses to those comments. Having reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis

presented in the Final EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR and the RDEIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the responses to those comments, and the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR and at The Regents' hearing on the Final EIR and 2005 LRDP, The Regents has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the proposed project. The Regents accordingly certifies that its findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints expressed in the Final EIR, as well as the information in the record of proceedings for the proposed project.

## B. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following section summarizes the significant effects on the environment, or significant impacts, of the project, and includes the findings of The Regents as to those impacts, as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of The Regents regarding the significant impacts of the project, mitigation measures, alternatives to the project and the mitigation measures proposed by the Final EIR and adopted by The Regents as conditions of approval.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR about project impacts before and after mitigation and do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each significant impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, these findings provide a summary description of each impact, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, state The Regents' intention to adopt the mitigation measures and incorporate them into the project, and state The Regents' findings on the significance of each impact after adoption of the mitigation measures. These findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determinations contained herein regarding mitigation measures and the project's impacts.

As set forth in Part III, below, The Regents adopts and incorporates into the project the mitigation measures set forth in these findings to reduce or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the project, as well as certain mitigation measures to further reduce less-than-significant impacts. In adopting these mitigation measures, The Regents intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these findings, said mitigation measure is hereby adopted, incorporated into the project, and made a part of the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language of the mitigation measures set forth below fail to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Several comments on the Draft EIR suggested various measures as proposed additional mitigation measures or modifications to the EIR's proposed mitigation measures. Several of the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR were modified in the Final EIR, and other mitigation measures were added to the Final EIR in response to

such comments. With respect to the additional mitigation proposals contained in comments that were not accepted in the Final EIR, The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons set forth in the responses to comments contained in the Final EIR as its grounds for rejecting adoption of those mitigation measures.

### 1. Aesthetics

a. *LRDP Impact AES-3 Scenic Resources around Lower Campus Meadows:* Development under the 2005 LRDP could substantially damage scenic resources on campus around the lower campus meadows.

LRDP Mitigation AES-3A: For development projects around the lower campus meadows that have the potential to affect scenic resources, the Campus shall conduct visual simulations and, when necessary, shall modify project design to maintain scenic resources through measures such as changes in scale, massing, building orientation, building finish, screening or other measures to reduce the visual obtrusiveness of the construction.

LRDP Mitigation AES-3B: For Academic Core development in and bordering the Great Meadow, the Campus shall limit the removal of natural vegetation outside building footprints, and cluster development at meadow edges.

LRDP Mitigation AES-3C: The Campus shall design the alignment and grades of the new Meyer Drive extension to be below the line of sight as viewed from Hagar Drive. If necessary, earthen berms shall be incorporated into the roadway design for purposes of screening the new roadway.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations AES-3A, AES-3B and AES-C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

b. *LRDP Impact AES-4 Visual Quality of Historic District.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could substantially damage the aesthetic quality of the Cowell Ranch Historic District as a scenic resource.

LRDP Mitigation AES-4: Until the final Cowell Ranch Historic District Management Plan is completed, for projects in the Cowell Ranch Historic District or within 500 feet of its boundaries, the Campus shall take the following measures into account in project design to preserve the historic visual quality of the historic district:

- To the greatest extent feasible, a buffer of at least 200 feet shall be maintained between the boundaries of the historic district and new building development that would be visible against the backdrop of historic buildings from significant campus viewpoints.
- New buildings or structures within 500 feet of the district boundaries shall be subject to review by the Design Advisory Board to ensure that design is consistent with or

complementary to the historic aspect of the district and its buildings with respect to scale, massing, architectural style and materials, such that the rural historic visual character of the district is maintained.

Once the Final Cowell Ranch Historic District Management Plan is adopted, all projects within adjacent areas identified in the management plan shall be evaluated for consistency with the visual design guidelines included in the Management Plan.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation AES-4, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*c. LRDP Impact AES-5 Visual Character.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could substantially degrade the existing visual character of the campus and adjacent areas.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5A: Prior to design approval of development projects under the 2005 LRDP, the UC Santa Cruz Design Advisory Board shall review project designs for consistency with the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2005 LRDP, and the character of surrounding development so that the visual character and quality of the project area are not substantially degraded.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5B: For projects in redwood forest areas that are visible from areas outside the forest, building heights will be designed to be no higher than the height of the surrounding trees. If a building taller than all the surrounding trees is proposed for construction in a redwood forest area, visual simulations shall be prepared. If the proposed design is determined, in consultation between the visual consultant and the campus, to be degrading to the visual character of the campus, the design will be modified to reduce the visual obtrusiveness of the proposed project.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5C: Campus development shall be designed and construction activities shall be undertaken in a manner that shall minimize removal of healthy and mature trees around new projects, except where the proximity of adjacent mature trees to new development is expected to result in a safety hazard or the ultimate decline of the trees.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5D: The Campus shall continue its Site Stewardship Program to help maintain and restore natural areas on campus.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5E: The Campus shall ensure that the site plan and design of any development in the Campus Support area on Empire Grade Road adjacent to Cave Gulch: (1) includes a visual undeveloped buffer between the new structures and Empire Grade Road; (2) maintains the natural vegetation in this buffer while adequately managing the fire hazard; and (3) provides an arrangement of buildings and vegetation on the site to screen views of on-site activities from Empire Grade Road and Santa Cruz Waldorf School.

LRDP Mitigation AES-5F: Trees identified for removal will be evaluated for their aesthetic value as part of the environmental review process of individual projects. Individual construction projects that result in the removal of large oak trees or other large unique trees considered to be aesthetically valuable components of the landscape shall replace such trees at a 1-to-1 ratio, either on site, or elsewhere on campus via a contribution to the campus's Site Stewardship Program for planting replacement trees.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations AES-5A, AES-5B, AES-5C, AES-5D, AES-5E and AES-5F, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*d. LRDP Impact AES-6 Light and Glare.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could create new sources of substantial light or glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

LRDP Mitigation AES-6A: Where there is a potential for reflective glare, as along meadow margins, project design shall provide for the use of nonreflective exterior surfaces, or other design measures to avoid new sources of reflected light.

LRDP Mitigation AES-6B: Lighting for new development projects shall be designed to include directional lighting methods shielded to minimize light spillage and minimize atmospheric light pollution. This lighting should be compatible with the visual character of the project site and meet the UC Regents' Green Building Policies.

LRDP Mitigation AES-6C: As part of the design review process, the UC Santa Cruz Design Advisory Board shall consider project-related light and glare and the Campus shall require the incorporation of measures into the project design to limit both to the extent allowed by code.

LRDP Mitigation AES-6D: The Campus shall require that field lights used for the illumination of sports and recreation fields be turned off after 11 PM to minimize night lighting sources on campus, except when special events are scheduled.

LRDP Mitigation AES-6E: As part of the design review process, UC Santa Cruz Design Advisory Board shall review outdoor lighting fixtures for roads, pathways, and parking facilities to ensure that the minimum amount of lighting needed to achieve safe routes is used, and to ensure that the proposed illumination limits adverse effect on nighttime views.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations AES-6A, AES-6B, AES-6C, AES-6D and AES-6E, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

**2. Air Quality**

*a. LRDP Impact AIR-1 Construction emissions.* Construction activities under the 2005 LRDP would result in emissions of $PM_{10}$ on a short-term basis.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-1: The Campus shall apply standard MBUAPCD recommended mitigation measures during construction of new facilities under the 2005 LRDP, as appropriate.

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily, or as needed.
- Prohibit all grading activities during periods of high wind (over 15 mph).
- Apply chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days).
- Apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer), as appropriate, to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydro-seed area.
- Require haul trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose materials.
- Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible.
- Cover inactive storage piles.
- Install wheel washers at the entrances to construction sites for all exiting trucks.
- Pave all roads on construction sites.
- Damp-sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.
- Post a publicly visible sign that specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District shall be visible to ensure compliance with Rule 402.
- Each project shall limit the area under construction at any one time.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the short-term emissions of $PM_{10}$ from construction activities under the 2005 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation AIR-1, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

*b. LRDP Impact AIR-2 Operational Emissions.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would result in daily operational emissions above the MBUAPCD thresholds, and therefore the proposed project may contribute substantially to a violation of air quality standards or hinder attainment of the regional air quality plan.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-2A: The Campus shall incorporate in each new project design and construction features that conserve natural gas and/or minimize air pollutant emissions from space and water heating. Specific measures that will be considered for each project include, but are not limited to the following:

- Orientation of buildings to optimize solar heating and natural cooling;
- Use of solar or low-emission water heaters in new buildings; and
- Installation of best available wall and attic insulation in new buildings.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-2B: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation TRA-2B to reduce motor vehicle trips.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-2C: The Campus shall install VOC and $NO_x$ controls on the new gas turbines to reduce emissions by 90 percent (e.g., oxidation catalyst and SCR).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations AIR-2A, AIR-2B and AIR-2C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the emission of nitrogen oxide (NOx), but not to a level below the applicable significance threshold. Although emissions of other pollutants will not exceed the thresholds, the impact related to NOx emissions remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

c. *LRDP Impact AIR-4 Conflict with Air Quality Management Plan.* Growth associated with the 2005 LRDP would conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-4A: The Campus will work with AMBAG to ensure that campus growth associated with the 2005 LRDP is accounted for in the regional population forecasts.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-4B: The Campus will work with MBUAPCD to ensure that the campus growth-related emissions are accounted for in the regional emissions inventory and mitigated in future regional air quality planning efforts.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the 2005 LRDP was not accounted for in AMBAG forecasts; therefore, the 2005 LRDP would not be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan. LRDP Mitigations AIR-4A and AIR-4B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, would ensure that campus growth under the 2005 LRDP is accounted for in the regional population forecasts, and that emissions from campus growth under the 2005 LRDP are accounted for in future air quality plans. Nevertheless, even with the implementation of these mitigation measures, the increase in emissions from campus growth under the 2005 LRDP may hinder the region's attainment of air quality standards. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents**

**finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*d. LRDP Impact AIR-5 Operational Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.* Campus operations under the 2005 LRDP would not result in a substantial human health risk to campus occupants and other populations in the vicinity of the campus from long-term exposures to TACs, but would result in a substantial health risk to campus occupants at certain on-campus locations from short-term exposures to TACs.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-5A: The Campus shall develop and implement an emergency generator maintenance testing schedule consistent with Table 4.3-22, Volume I of the Final EIR.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-5B: If the Campus does not replace the existing cogeneration system with a new system with lower emissions within three years, the Campus shall conduct source tests for acrolein for the Central Plant emergency generator and the Delaval engine, and recalculate the health index using the results of those tests. If the health index is greater than 1.0 with mitigation AIR-5A, the Campus shall reduce emissions from the emergency generator by either: 1) replacing the generator; 2) replacing the engine with a more efficient one; or 3) installing a catalytic oxidizer or other emissions controls.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations AIR-5A and AIR-5B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*e. LRDP Impact AIR-6 Construction emissions of toxic air contaminants.* Construction activities under the 2005 LRDP could potentially result in a substantial health risk to campus occupants at certain on-campus locations from short-term exposures to TACs.

LRDP Mitigation AIR-6: The Campus will minimize construction emissions by implementing measures such as those listed below:

- Require the use of cleaner fuels (e.g., natural gas, ethanol) in construction equipment
- Require that construction contractors use electrical equipment where possible
- Require construction contractors to minimize the simultaneous operation of multiple pieces of equipment at a construction site
- Minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use

- Schedule operations of construction equipment to minimize exposure to emissions from construction equipment.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the estimated acute non-cancer health risks associated with emissions of toxic air contaminants from potential construction projects under the 2005 LRDP exceed the applicable threshold at certain locations on the campus. The results of this analysis are subject to a high level of uncertainty due to the uncertainty with respect to the emissions of acrolein from construction equipment. Therefore, it would be speculative to make a conclusion as to the significance of the impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation AIR-6, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will minimize the emission of toxic air contaminants to the extent feasible. The Regents finds that, to the extent there is any remaining significant impact, such impact is determined to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings. *LRDP Impact AIR-7 Cumulative Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.* Regional growth could result in an increase in toxic air contaminants but the implementation of technological improvements would reduce air toxics and associated human health risks.**

LRDP Mitigation AIR-7: UC Santa Cruz will continue its efforts in the area of TAC emission reduction.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increase in toxic air contaminants that could result from regional growth is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation AIR-7, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

### 3. Biological Resources

*a. LRDP Impact BIO-1 Northern Maritime Chaparral.* Development on the main campus under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse effect, directly and indirectly, on northern maritime chaparral, a sensitive natural community identified by CDFG, and Santa Cruz manzanita, a special-status plant that generally occurs within northern maritime chaparral areas.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-1A: **Avoidance.** The Campus shall avoid removal or fragmentation of any patch of northern maritime chaparral greater than 10 acres in size and any patch of Santa Cruz manzanita greater than 0.25 acres in size, where feasible, and shall establish a habitat buffer between development and adjacent northern maritime chaparral. The habitat buffer will consist of a band of native vegetation, at least 30-feet wide, between the chaparral patch and the adjacent development. This habitat buffer may be included within the 100-foot-wide fire buffer around buildings in cases where this buffer would be managed by fuel reduction strategies compatible with habitat management (see LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10B).

The Campus shall document northern maritime chaparral and Santa Cruz manzanita avoidance and impact minimization efforts in project-level environmental documents. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, the environmental document shall also explain this conclusion.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-1B: **Compensatory Preservation and Management on Campus.** Where avoidance as specified in LRDP Mitigation BIO-1B is determined not to be feasible, and a patch 10 acres or larger of northern maritime chaparral will be removed, the Campus shall designate for permanent preservation and shall manage comparable areas of existing northern maritime chaparral habitat on campus at a ratio of at least 1:1. Similarly, for any patch of Santa Cruz manzanita 0.25 acres or larger in size that will be removed, the Campus shall designate for permanent preservation and shall manage other areas of Santa Cruz manzanita on campus. Mitigation ratios for Santa Cruz manzanita may vary depending on the density of the stands affected and preserved, as indicated in Draft EIR Table 4.4-3, but must provide preservation at a ratio of at least 1:1. Preservation of northern maritime chaparral and Santa Cruz manzanita may occur at the same site as long as both required mitigation ratios are met.

The acreage of northern maritime chaparral to be removed, the acreage and density of Santa Cruz manzanita patches to be removed, and the density of proposed preservation patches shall be assessed based on project-specific analyses using the most detailed and reliable vegetation mapping available.

Protection and management planning for the proposed preservation areas of northern maritime chaparral and Santa Cruz manzanita shall occur prior to the removal of these resources due to development. Management to enhance habitat and species dominance and prevent succession to hardwood or evergreen forest shall continue in perpetuity.

Within one year of protecting a stand, the Campus shall prepare a management and monitoring plan that describes quantitative biological goals, management techniques, safety procedures, monitoring protocols, schedules and success criteria for that stand. The management plan will be developed in consultation with CDFG and in coordination with the Campus Vegetation Management Plan (see LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10B) and will be consistent with safety requirements. Management plan components shall include monitoring and control of non-native invasive species and monitoring and removal of mixed hardwood forest trees.

The goals of management for northern maritime chaparral and Santa Cruz manzanita shall be to reduce the incursion of mixed hardwood forest and non-native invasive species into these stands, encourage regeneration of chaparral species including Santa Cruz manzanita, and to maintain or increase the density of Santa Cruz manzanita in the chaparral, with the overall goal of maintaining and enhancing 1 acre of comparable or better quality chaparral habitat or Santa Cruz manzanita for every 1 acre removed.

The effectiveness of the management plan will be reviewed at five-year intervals. If success criteria, as defined in the Management Plan, are not achieved within five years, the Campus shall review and revise the management plan. If it is determined after 10

years that the management effort was not successful at the selected site, or was successful for only a portion of the site, and is not likely to be successful, the Campus either shall designate another area of chaparral on campus for long term management; or shall implement LRDP Mitigation BIO-IC (Restoration). If management was successful in a portion of the preserved area, sufficient acreage will need to be designated in a new area only to mitigate that portion of the acreage not previously mitigated at the original site.

Each patch successfully managed to prevent succession will be protected and managed in perpetuity either through land use designation such as HAB (Campus Habitat Reserve), through a conservation easement or deed restriction, or through a similar permanent mechanism.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-1C: **Restoration.** If no patch of northern maritime chaparral or Santa Cruz manzanita of adequate size or suitable density can be identified for preservation and management on campus, or if mitigation is not successful or only partially successful after 10 years at a preservation site, the Campus may designate a comparable, preferably contiguous, area of chaparral-forest transition habitat on campus for preservation and restoration. Northern maritime chaparral or Santa Cruz manzanita removed through development, or any portion of the patch not previously mitigated through preservation of a comparable patch, shall be mitigated through designation of chaparral-forest transitional habitat for restoration, at a ratio of 3:1, with the management goal of successfully restoring the acreage to chaparral at a 1:1 ratio for every acre lost to development.

Portions of the chaparral-forest transition area that are contiguous with protected northern maritime chaparral and Santa Cruz manzanita areas will be given the highest priority for restoration in order to minimize edge effects.

Within 1 year of designation, as specified in Mitigation BIO-1B, above, a management and restoration and monitoring plan, including quantitative success criteria, shall be prepared for the restoration area. Success criteria for the restoration shall include providing equivalent or greater overall cover of native chaparral species (such as brittleleaf manzanita, Santa Cruz manzanita, sensitive manzanita, wartleaf ceanothus, blue blossom and chamise) as is found in the northern maritime chaparral that will be lost to development. Among the restoration techniques that could be used in the chaparral-forest transition areas are tree removal, monitoring and control of non-native species, and prescribed burning, where this can be conducted safely. Management of the site shall continue in perpetuity to protect the northern maritime chaparral management areas from succession to mixed evergreen forest.

If northern maritime chaparral restoration does not meet the success criteria after 10 years, restoration areas shall be either replanted, or restoration attempted on another, suitable site on campus. Once the management success criteria have been met, the Campus will designate the parcel for preservation in perpetuity, as described under Mitigation BIO-1B, above.

If restoration efforts on campus are not successful, the Campus may explore options for mitigation off campus, through mechanisms such as contribution to a mitigation bank or other management effort, provided that this will ensure protection and management of chaparral at the ratio of at least 1:1 for every acre lost on campus. Should the Campus elect to participate in an off-site mitigation program, priority will be given to sites that are closest to UC Santa Cruz in order to protect local genetic diversity.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-1A, BIO-1B and BIO-1C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*b. LRDP Impact BIO-2 Coastal Prairie.* Development on the main campus under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse impact to coastal prairie, a sensitive natural community.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-2A: The Campus shall avoid removal of coastal prairie through redesign of proposed development areas and road alignments. The design of all campus facilities shall include a buffer between development and prairie in order to reduce indirect impacts from edge effects such as increases in noxious weed species. The width of each buffer will depend on the site and the nature of adjacent development. The minimum buffer shall be 30 feet from the edge of paved areas or buildings to the edge of coastal prairie. Landscaped areas are acceptable within the habitat buffer, provided that they are planted with species that are not invasive in coastal prairie (i.e., no non-native grasses) and are not fire prone.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-2B: The Campus shall mitigate for unavoidable losses of coastal prairie by restoring coastal prairie at a 3:1 ratio. Before impacts to coastal prairie occur, a management and monitoring plan, including quantitative success criteria, shall be prepared for the restoration site. Success criteria for the restoration shall include providing equivalent or greater overall (rather than species specific) cover of native perennial bunchgrasses (such as purple needlegrass, California oatgrass, and Pacific panic grass) and native forbs (such as white hyacinth and dwarf brodiaea) as is found in the coastal prairies that will be lost to development. Management of the site shall continue for at least 15 years to protect the coastal prairie management areas from reverting to annual grassland. If coastal prairie restoration does not meet the success criteria after 5 years, restoration shall be remedied (e.g., replanting) or restoration attempted on a new, more suitable site.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-2A and BIO-2B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*c. LRDP Impact BIO-3 Jurisdictional Wetlands.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in substantial, adverse direct and indirect impacts to jurisdictional wetlands.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-3A: At the time that a specific development project is proposed, the Campus shall conduct a site reconnaissance to determine whether wetlands are present on the site. If no potential wetlands are found, no further mitigation is necessary.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-3B: If potential wetlands are found, the Campus shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a delineation of waters of the state and waters of the United States during the environmental review phase of the project to determine the location, extent, and function of wetlands within 200 feet of development footprints.

LRDP Mitigation LRDP BIO-3C: Direct impacts to jurisdictional wetlands shall be avoided in the design of the project. If avoidance is not feasible, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation BIO-3D.

LRDP Mitigation LRDP-BIO-3D: If avoidance of wetlands is not feasible, to compensate for temporary or permanent loss of jurisdictional wetlands, the Campus shall restore or create wetland habitat to ensure no net loss of the extent and function of these communities. Prior to any work that could disturb jurisdictional or other wetland habitat within the project area, the Campus shall obtain the following permits as required:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Nationwide or individual permit as required under Clean Water Act Section 404
- Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board – Water quality certification or waiver under Clean Water Act Section 401
- California Department of Fish and Game – Streambed Alteration Agreement

Consultation with these agencies shall govern how the disturbance of wetlands will be mitigated, including the location and extent of wetland restoration or creation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-3A, BIO-3B, BIO-3C and BIO-3D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*d. LRDP Impact BIO-4 Riparian Vegetation.* Construction of bridge crossings and other improvements under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial temporary and permanent adverse impact on riparian vegetation.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-4A: Campus construction projects shall avoid patches of riparian vegetation greater than 0.1 acre in size or longer than 300 linear stream feet. If avoidance is not feasible, LRDP Mitigation BIO-4B shall be implemented.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-4B: The Campus shall compensate for the loss of patches of riparian vegetation greater than 0.1 acre in size or longer than 300 linear stream feet through on-site and/or off-site restoration and/or enhancement of riparian habitat in order to ensure that no significant loss of riparian habitat functions and values occurs. The size of the area(s) to be restored will be determined based on a 1:1 mitigation ratio. UC Santa Cruz shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to develop a conceptual restoration and

monitoring plan that describes how riparian habitat will be enhanced or restored and monitored over a minimum period of time. UC Santa Cruz shall be responsible for ensuring that the restoration and monitoring plan is implemented. The terms of the restoration and monitoring plan shall be determined in consultation with the CDFG and other permitting agencies.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-4C: If more than 0.2 acre or 600 linear stream feet of riparian vegetation is temporarily removed at UC Santa Cruz as a result of proposed storm water drainage improvements or other development under the 2005 LRDP, UC Santa Cruz shall restore riparian vegetation within the project area or in the nearest suitable upstream or downstream reach. Riparian vegetation shall be restored following the construction of each project that has a temporary impact on more than 0.2 acre or 600 linear feet of riparian vegetation. UC Santa Cruz shall compensate for the loss through on-site restoration and/or enhancement of riparian habitat in order to ensure that no significant loss of riparian habitat functions and values occurs. The size of the area(s) to be restored will be determined based on a 1:1 mitigation ratio. UC Santa Cruz shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to develop a conceptual restoration and monitoring plan that describes how riparian habitat will be enhanced or restored and monitored over a minimum period of time. UC Santa Cruz shall be responsible for ensuring that the restoration and monitoring plan is implemented. The terms of the restoration and monitoring plan shall be determined in consultation with the CDFG and other permitting agencies.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-4A, BIO-4B and BIO-4C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*e. LRDP Impact BIO-6 Spread of Noxious Weeds.* Development under the 2005 LRDP has the potential to introduce or cause the spread of noxious weeds, which could reduce the abundance of native plants and sensitive communities.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-6: To avoid or minimize the introduction or spread of noxious weeds, sudden oak death or pitch canker into uninfested areas, UC Santa Cruz shall incorporate the following measures into project plans and specifications for work on the north campus to be conducted under the 2005 LRDP.

- Only certified, weed-free materials shall be used for erosion control.
- UC Santa Cruz shall identify appropriate best management practices to avoid the dispersal of noxious weeds, sudden oak death and pitch canker. The Campus shall then include appropriate practices in Campus Standards for construction to be implemented during construction in all north campus areas. Typical best management practices include the use of weed-free erosion control materials and revegetation of disturbed areas with seed mixes that include native species and exclude invasive non-natives. Best management practices to avoid the spread of sudden oak death and pitch pine canker will be determined in consultation with the California Department of Forestry.

- In uninfested areas, topsoil removed during excavation shall be stockpiled and used to refill the trench on site if it is suitable as backfill.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-6, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*f. LRDP Impact BIO-7 Ohlone Tiger Beetle.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse impact on Ohlone tiger beetle populations on the campus from increased bicycle use on trails and obstruction of potential movement corridors by trees planted in the Arboretum.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-7A: During periods of adult beetle activity or larval development (January to June), bicycles will not be allowed on trails in Marshall Field or West Marshall Field that support Ohlone tiger beetles.

Temporary fencing and signs will be installed and maintained during this period at trail entry points. The information signs will advise all trail users of the need to avoid these areas. UC Santa Cruz Police shall also patrol these areas during this period in order to alert or issue citations to violators and help ensure compliance.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-7B: Any modification of the vegetation composition and/or fencing of Arboretum lands north of the currently enclosed Arboretum will be developed in consultation with the USFWS in order to protect and maintain potential movement corridors for the Ohlone tiger beetle.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-7A and BIO-7B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*LRDP Impact BIO-8 Cave Invertebrates.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would not result in a substantial adverse impact (i.e., loss or degradation of habitat) for cave invertebrates, including the Santa Cruz telemid spider, Dollof Cave spider, Empire Cave pseudoscorpion, or Mackenzie's Cave amphipod.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-8A: The Campus shall discourage activities by members of the public that could jeopardize the physical integrity, condition or scientific value of the caves, through appropriate signage and educational literature, Campus Natural Reserve website information, or other appropriate measures.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-8B: The Campus shall consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game to develop a design for a barrier for the entrance of Empire Cave that will not harm special-status species inhabiting the cave. The barrier shall be installed, if determined to be advisable by USFWS and CDFG, to prevent illegal access to the cave.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that development under the 2005 LRDP would have a less-than-significant impact on cave invertebrates. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-8A and BIO-8B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

g. *LRDP Impact BIO-9 California Red-Legged Frog.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse effect on breeding or important movement habitat for California red-legged frog; direct impacts to California red-legged frog populations; or indirect impacts on the species from downstream hydrological changes in the Moore Creek watershed.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-9: To minimize disturbance of breeding and dispersing California red-legged frogs, all ground-disturbing construction activity within the Moore Creek watershed, such as vegetation clearing, site leveling and grading, that occurs within designated red-legged frog habitat shall be conducted during the dry season, (after May 1 and before October 15). If ground-disturbing activities cannot be completed within the dry season, UC Santa Cruz shall contact the USFWS field office to initiate the following measures and determine whether additional mitigation measures are necessary to minimize potential impacts.

- To prevent California red-legged frogs from moving through the construction site during the rainy season, temporary exclusion fencing shall be placed around the construction work area at least one week prior to the start of construction activities. The fence shall be made of a fine-meshed material that does not allow red-legged frogs to pass through, and the bottom shall be buried to a depth of two inches so that California red-legged frogs cannot crawl under the fence.
- A qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor all construction activities within California red-legged frog upland habitat daily during initial ground-disturbing activities. The biological monitor shall look for red-legged frogs during grading, excavation, and vegetation removal activities. Once all initial ground-disturbing activities are completed, the biologist shall perform spot checks of the site once a week. If a red-legged frog is discovered, construction activities shall cease in the immediate vicinity of the individual until USFWS is contacted and the frog has been removed from the construction area by a qualified biologist with a permit to handle the species or by USFWS personnel, and released near a suitable burrow at least 300 feet away from the construction area.
- Prior to the start of daily construction activities, the biological monitor shall inspect the perimeter fence to ensure that it is not ripped or has holes and that the base is still buried. The fence will also be inspected to ensure that no frogs are trapped in the fence. Any frogs found along and outside the fence will be closely monitored until they move away from the construction area.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-9, which is hereby adopted and**

**incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*h. LRDP Impact BIO-11 Special-Status Raptors.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in the loss or abandonment of active nests for special-status raptors.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-11: Prior to construction or site preparation activities, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct nest surveys at each site that has appropriate nesting habitat. The survey shall be required for only those projects that will be constructed during the nesting/breeding season of sharp-shinned hawk, golden eagle, northern harrier, long-eared owl, or white-tailed kite (typically February 1 through August 31).

The survey area shall include all potential nesting habitat, including the mixed evergreen forest, redwood forest, and isolated trees that are within 200 feet of the proposed project grading boundaries. The survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

If active nests of sharp-shinned hawk, golden eagle, northern harrier, long-eared owl, and white-tailed kite (or other species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code) are present in the construction zone or within 200 feet of the construction zone, a temporary fence shall be erected at a distance of 200 feet around the nest site (or less if determined to be appropriate by the biologist according to the species and site conditions). Clearing and construction within the fenced area shall be postponed until juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt as determined by the biologist.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-11, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*i. LRDP Impact BIO-12 Western Burrowing Owl.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would not potentially result in a substantial adverse impact on western burrowing owl.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-12A: Prior to any ground disturbance of grassland habitats on the lower campus, a qualified biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey to identify western burrowing owls and/or potential habitat features (e.g., burrows) and to evaluate use by burrowing owls in accordance with current CDFG survey guidelines (CDFG 1995).

Surveys will be conducted within the proposed disturbance footprint and a 500-foot radius of the disturbance boundary of each proposed project. For construction activities occurring within the western burrowing owl habitat (whether during breeding or non-breading seasons), surveys will be conducted within 30 days prior to construction. The surveys will document whether burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to

disturbance areas. Survey results will be valid only for the season during which the survey is conducted.

If western burrowing owls are found during the breeding or nonbreeding season, LRDP Mitigation BIO-12B will be implemented.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-12B: If burrowing owls are found, the Campus will avoid all burrowing owl nest sites to the extent feasible. Avoidance will include establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone of at least 250 feet around each nest site during the breeding season. If burrowing owls are found outside the breeding season (September 1–January 31), avoidance will include the establishment of at least a 160-foot non-disturbance buffer zone around each burrow being used. In both cases, highly visible temporary construction fencing will delineate the buffer zone.

If burrowing owl nest sites cannot be avoided, the Campus will conduct passive relocation by installing one-way doors in suitable burrow entrances that are used or may be used by the owls. This measure is described in detail below.

In order to displace burrowing owls without destroying eggs, young, or adults, one-way doors will be installed on owl burrows before February 1 prior to disturbance, and each burrow will be monitored following CDFG's protocol (CDFG 1995). Suitable artificial burrows will be created nearby according to the conservation measures established for this species. The protocol includes monitoring the burrow for a 48-hour period after the one-way doors are installed. The doors will be checked every 24 hours following installation to determine whether they are still intact. If the one-way door is still correctly installed after a continuous 48-hour period (i.e., no animals have dug up the door and rendered it useless), then the one-way door will be removed and the burrows will be excavated using hand tools and plastic tubing to maintain an escape route for any animals still inside the burrow.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that development under the 2005 LRDP would have a less-than-significant impact on western burrowing owl. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-12 A and BIO-12B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

*j.* *LRDP Impact BIO-13 Special-Status Bats.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the disturbance of roosting sites for special-status bats.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-13A: If tree removal or grading activity commences on a project site in the north campus during the breeding season of native bat species (April 1 through August 31), a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether active roosts of special-status bats (pallid bat, Pacific Townsend's big-eared bat, western red bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis, long-legged myotis, yuma myotis, or greater western mastiff bat) are present on the project site or in areas containing suitable roosting habitat within 50 feet of the project site.

Field surveys shall be conducted in late April or early May in the season before construction begins, when bats are establishing maternity roosts but before pregnant females give birth. If no roosting bats are found, no further mitigation would be required.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-13B: If roosting bats are found, disturbance of the maternity roosts shall be avoided by halting construction until either (1) the end of the breeding season or, (2) a qualified biologist removes and relocates the roosting bats in accordance with CDFG requirements.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations BIO-13A and BIO-13B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*k. LRDP Impact BIO-14 San Francisco Dusky-Footed Woodrat.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the loss of potential San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat nests.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-14: A pre-construction/grading survey of all suitable San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat habitat within 100 feet of the proposed grading footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to detect any woodrat nests.

The survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities. If active nests (stick houses) are identified within the construction zone or within 100 feet of the construction zone, a fence shall be erected around the nest site with a 100-foot minimum buffer from construction activities. At the discretion of the biologist, clearing and construction within the fenced area would be postponed or halted until juveniles have left the nest. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests will occur. If any woodrat is observed within the grading footprint outside of the breeding period, individuals shall be trapped and relocated to a suitable location in proximity to the project site by a qualified biologist in accordance with CDFG requirements, and the nest dismantled so it cannot be reoccupied.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-14, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*l. LRDP Impact BIO-15 Wildlife Movement.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-15: New fencing planned for installation around Arboretum plantings between Moore Creek and the Great Meadow shall be constructed to allow for the movement of mammals across or around the barrier.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-15, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*m. LRDP Impact BIO-19 Cumulative Impact on Ohlone Tiger Beetle.* Campus population growth under the 2005 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional population growth, would result in a substantial adverse cumulative impact to Ohlone tiger beetle populations on campus from increased bicycle traffic on trails suitable for this species.

LRDP Mitigation BIO-19: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations BIO-7A and BIO-7B.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation BIO-19, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

**4. Cultural Resources**

*a. LRDP Impact CULT-1 Archaeological Resources.* Implementation of the 2005 LRDP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource as the result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1A: As early as possible in the project planning process, the Campus shall define the project's area of potential effects for archaeological resources. The Campus shall determine the potential for the project to result in cultural resource impacts, based on the extent of ground disturbance and site modifications anticipated for the proposed project. The Campus shall also review confidential resource records to determine whether complete intensive archaeological survey has been performed on the site and whether any previously recorded cultural resources are present.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1B: Where native soils will be disturbed, the Campus shall provide and shall require contractor crews to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving, regarding how to recognize archaeological sites. In addition, campus employees whose work routinely involves disturbing the soil shall be informed how to recognize evidence of potential archaeological sites and artifacts. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential archaeological sites and artifacts and to notify the campus if any are found. In the event of a find, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation CULT-1G, below.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1C: For project sites that have not been subject to prior complete intensive archaeological survey, the Campus shall ensure that a complete intensive surface survey is conducted by a qualified archaeologist during project planning and design and prior to soil disturbing activities. If an archaeological deposit is discovered, the archaeologist will prepare a site record and file it with the California Historical Resource Information System. In the event of a find within the area of

potential effects, the Campus shall consult with a qualified archaeologist to design and conduct an archaeological subsurface investigation and/or a construction monitoring plan of the project site to ascertain the extent of the deposit relative to the project's area of potential effects, to ensure that impacts to potential buried resources are avoided.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1D: If it is determined that the resource extends into the project's area of potential effects, the Campus shall ensure that the resource is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, who will determine whether it qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource under the criteria of CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. This evaluation may require additional research, including subsurface testing, If the resource does not qualify, or if no resource is present within the project area of potential effects, this will be reported in the environmental document and no further mitigation will be required unless there is a discovery during construction.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1E: If a resource within the project's area of potential effects is determined to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the Campus shall consult with the qualified archaeologist to consider means of avoiding or reducing ground disturbance within the site boundaries, including minor modifications of building footprint, landscape modification, the placement of protective fill, or other means that will permit avoidance or substantial preservation in place of the resource.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1F: If avoidance or substantial preservation in place is not possible for an archaeological site that has been determined to meet CEQA significance criteria, the Campus shall retain a qualified archaeologist who, in consultation with the Campus, shall prepare a research design, and plan and conduct archaeological data recovery and monitoring that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, prior to or during development of the site. The Campus shall also ensure that appropriate technical analyses are performed, and a full written report prepared and filed with the California Historical Resources Information System, and also shall provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1G: If an archaeological resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The Campus shall contact a qualified archaeologist to provide and implement a plan for survey, subsurface investigation as needed to define the deposit, and assessment of the remainder of the site within the project area to determine whether the resource is significant and would be affected by the project. LRDP Mitigation CULT-1F shall also be implemented.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-1H: If, in the opinion of the qualified archaeologist and in light of the data available, the significance of the site is such that data recovery cannot capture the values that qualify the site for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources, the Campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the site to be preserved intact, such as project redesign, placement of fill, or

project relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation CULT-3A.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations CULT-1A through CULT-1H, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*b. LRDP Impact CULT-2 Historic Resources.* Implementation of the proposed 2005 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic building or structure as the result of alteration of the building or of the site, or other project development.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2A: For projects within Cowell Ranch Historic District overlay, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations AES-4A and AES-4B.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2B: As early as possible in the project planning process, the Campus shall define the project's area of potential effect for historic structures. The Campus shall determine the potential for the project to result in impacts to or alteration of historic structures, based on the extent of site and building modifications anticipated for the proposed project.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2C: Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older that has not been evaluated previously, the Campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it at professional standards, and assess its significance under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the University system, the campus, and the region. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for historical resource, no further mitigation is required and the impact is less than significant.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2D: For a building or structure that qualifies for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources, the Campus shall consult with the architectural historian to consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it "as is," or other measures that would not alter the building.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2E: If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the Campus shall ensure that documentation and treatment shall be carried out by a qualified architectural historian, as described below:

- If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with

Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings" (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

- If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited in the McHenry Library Special Collections, and with the California Historical Resources Information System. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.
- If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-2F: If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the Campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation CULT-3B.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations CULT-2A through CULT-2F, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*c. LRDP Impact CULT-3 Substantial Change in Significance of Historical or Unique Archaeological Resource.* Implementation of the 2005 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, and the values that contribute to the significance of the resource cannot be preserved through documentation and data recovery.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-3A: If a significant archaeological resource cannot be preserved intact, before the property is damaged or destroyed, the Campus shall ensure that the resource is appropriately documented by implementing a program of research-directed data recovery, consistent with LRDP Mitigation CULT-1F.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-3B: If a significant historic resource or unique archaeological resource cannot be preserved intact, before the property is damaged or destroyed the Campus shall ensure that the important information represented by the resource is

preserved, by implementing a program of documentation as described in LRDP Mitigation CULT-2D.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations CULT-3A and CULT-3B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, in most cases will reduce impacts of the development under the 2005 LRDP on historical and unique archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. For specific projects, however, there may be occasions when a historical resource or unique archaeological resource cannot be substantially preserved in place. In rare cases, data recovery and documentation may not provide sufficient mitigation for an exceptionally significant resource. Although the Campus would prefer to preserve a highly significant resource where possible, there may be cases in which avoidance or preservation of such a resource is not feasible. Therefore, the impact will be significant and unavoidable. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*d. LRDP Impact CULT-4 Disturbance of Human Remains.* Implementation of the proposed 2005 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-4A: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations CULT-1A through CULT-1H to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-4B: The Campus shall provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-4C: In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, the Campus shall ensure that all excavation in the vicinity halts immediately and the area of the find is protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the Campus will notify the Santa Cruz County Coroner of the find and protect the find without further disturbance until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the Campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

LRDP Mitigation CULT-4D: If human remains cannot be left in place, the Campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out. The Campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an

opportunity for local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As required by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the Campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested, provided that the appropriate group can be identified through California NAGPRA procedures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations CULT-4A, CULT-4B, CULT-4C and CULT-4D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*e. LRDP Impact CULT-5 Unique Paleontological Resources.* Development under the 2005 LRDP has the potential to disturb or destroy unique paleontological resources.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-5A: During project planning, the Project Manager shall consult the most recent Campus Soils and Geology map to determine whether the proposed project is underlain by a formation that is known to be sensitive for paleontological resources.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-5B: If the project site is underlain by paleontologically sensitive formations, the Campus shall retain a qualified paleontologist to determine, through assessment of results of geotechnical investigations or site inspection, whether proposed excavation or grading has the potential to encounter the members of sensitive formations that are fossiliferous, and if so, to develop a paleontological monitoring and data recovery plan and implement it during the construction period as appropriate. In addition, the paleontologist shall conduct a construction crew education session regarding paleontological potential and significance, and of stop-work provisions in the event of a discovery,

LRDP Mitigation CULT-5C: In the event of a discovery of a paleontological resource on campus, work within 50 feet of the find shall halt until a qualified paleontologist has examined and assessed the find and, if the resource is determined to be a unique paleontological resource, the resource is recovered. The Campus shall ensure that all finds are adequately documented, analyzed, and curated at an appropriate institution.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-5D: In the event that a proposed project would result in impacts to a unique paleontological resource, the project planning team shall work together to reduce impacts to the find through design and construction modifications, to the extent feasible.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations CULT-5A, CULT-5B, CULT-5C and CULT-5D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*f. LRDP Impact CULT-6 Unique Geological Resources.* Increased population on campus as a result of implementation of the 2005 LRDP could result in damage to the scientific and cultural value of unique geologic resources.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-6: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations BIO-8A and BIO-8B.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation CULT-6, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*g. LRDP Impact CULT-7 Cumulative Impacts on Archaeological and Historic Resources and Human Remains.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could contribute to cumulative damage to and loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources, historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures) and human remains in the Santa Cruz west side.

LRDP Mitigation CULT-7: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations CULT-1 through CULT-4.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation CULT-7, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

**5. Geology and Soils**

*a. LRDP Impact GEO-1 Unstable Geologic Unit.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could occur on a geologic unit or soil that would become unstable as a result of the project and could result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, or liquefaction, creating potential risks to life or property.

LRDP Mitigation GEO-1: Where existing information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical studies shall be performed for areas that will support buildings or foundations. Recommendations of the geotechnical investigations will be incorporated into project design.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation GEO-1, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*b. LRDP Impact GEO-2 Expansive Soil.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in construction of campus facilities on expansive soil, but this would not create potential risks to life and property.

LRDP Mitigation GEO-2: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation GEO-1.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation GEO-2, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

c. *LRDP Impact GEO-4 Construction on Karst.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could result in construction of facilities on sites underlain by karst features, which could lead to settling or collapse beneath the structures.

LRDP Mitigation GEO-4: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation GEO-1.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation GEO-4, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

### 6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. *LRDP Impact HAZ-2 Routine Generation of Hazardous Waste.* Development under the 2005 LRDP could increase routine generation of hazardous, radioactive, or biohazardous wastes on campus by UC Santa Cruz laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment because hazardous waste would continue to be comprehensively managed by UC Santa Cruz pursuant to state and federal law and campus policies and procedures.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-2: The Campus will enhance its hazardous waste minimization program by (1) monitoring chemical purchases and use; and (2) maintaining a hazardous waste website to provide campus waste generators with the latest information on hazardous waste requirements; recycling, treatment, and disposal options; and waste minimization techniques.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for development under the 2005 LRDP to increase routine generation of hazardous waste would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation HAZ-2, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

b. *LRDP Impact HAZ-7 Contaminated Building Materials.* Demolition or renovation of buildings under the proposed 2005 LRDP could potentially expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-7: The Campus shall survey buildings for potential contamination before any demolition or renovation work is performed. If contamination is discovered, appropriate remediation will be completed.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for demolition or renovation of buildings under the 2005 LRDP to expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials construction activities under the 2005 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation HAZ-7, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

*c. LRDP Impact HAZ-9 Emergency Operations Plan.* Campus development under the 2005 LRDP could potentially interfere physically with the campus's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9A: The Campus shall continue to include the following requirements in its Campus Standards and implement them under the 2005 LRDP:

- Construction work shall be conducted so as to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic.
- Contractors shall notify the University's Representative at least two weeks before any road closure.
- When paths, lanes, or roadways are blocked, detour signs must be installed to clearly designate an alternate route. Fire hydrants shall be kept accessible to fire fighting equipment at all times. To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, Physical Plant and Physical Planning and Construction shall continue to require that construction and maintenance project managers notify campus police and fire departments and the campus dispatchers of the closures and alternative travel routes.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9B: The Campus shall test the effectiveness provisions of the EOP annually, and update as necessary.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9C: Before the beginning of the construction of the north campus loop road, the Campus shall expand existing main campus EOP to cover new development areas. In addition, the Campus will develop a site-specific EOP prior to occupancy of Building C at 2300 Delaware Avenue.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-9D: Any new development project on the north campus shall be provided with a secondary emergency egress route prior to occupancy of the development.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations HAZ-9A through HAZ-9D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*d. LRDP Impact HAZ-10 Wildland Fires.* Campus development under the proposed 2005 LRDP would result in increased risk from wildland fires.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10A: UC Santa Cruz Fire Department will continue to conduct annual inspections of all residential and laboratory buildings and biennial inspections of all other buildings.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10B: Prior to beginning north campus construction, UC Santa Cruz will develop a new Vegetation Management Plan aimed at preventing wildland fires in the north campus. This Vegetation Management Plan will include provisions governing vegetation management and will specify pruning guidelines and provide a minimum of 30 feet of clearance between existing vegetation and buildings. The Vegetation Management Plan will include a rigorous inspection schedule of the interior and exterior of buildings with particular focus on ensuring that surrounding vegetation does not endanger buildings. The Plan will ensure that fire hydrants are adequately spaced and accessible and that fire roads are maintained and accessible. The Plan will also address limiting the risk of fires in the undeveloped regions on the campus.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10C: The Campus shall provide wildland fire prevention signage in the north and upper campus areas in conjunction with the new development.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-10D: Building component protection as prescribed in the International Uniform Wildland Interface Code (UWIC) shall be required where appropriate as determined by the Campus Fire Marshal.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations HAZ-10A through HAZ-10D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*e. LRDP Impact HAZ-11 Hazardous Materials Use by Non-UC Santa Cruz Entities.* Implementation of the proposed 2005 LRDP would increase use of hazardous materials by non-UC Santa Cruz entities on campus, which could create hazards to the public or the environment under routine and upset conditions.

LRDP Mitigation HAZ-11: For projects proposed by non-UC Santa Cruz entities on campus that involve laboratory space, non-UC Santa Cruz entities shall be required, through contracts and agreements, to implement programs and controls that provide the same level of protection required of campus laboratories and departments. The following project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented for non-UC Santa Cruz tenants:

- Non-UC Santa Cruz entities shall submit the qualifications of designated laboratory directors to UC Santa Cruz EH&S prior to commencing laboratory operations. Such documentation shall be in the form of educational and professional qualifications/experience.

- Non-UC entities shall submit certification of compliance with NIH biosafety principles to the UC Santa Cruz EH&S prior to commencing on-site research. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of completed medical waste management plans, biosafety management plans, inventories of infectious or select agents, applicable permits and updates.
- If hazardous material quantities are proposed to be increased above applicable threshold quantities as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, non-UC entities shall implement a Risk Management Plan/California Accidental Release Prevention Plan (RMP/CalARP), which discusses the handling and storage of acutely hazardous materials on site. The RMP/CalARP shall be approved by the Certified Unified Program Agency and filed with the UC Santa Cruz EH&S prior to commencing proposed operations.
- Non-UC entities shall submit certification to the UC Santa Cruz EH&S to verify that applicable requirements for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes have been met prior to commencing on-site research. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of management plans for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes, and written verification of contracts with licensed waste disposal firms.
- Non-UC entities shall provide to the UC Santa Cruz EH&S copies of all required environmental reports to local, state, and federal environmental and safety regulators.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation HAZ-11, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

### 7. Hydrology and Water Quality

*a. LRDP Impact HYD-2 Storm Water Runoff During Construction.* Campus development under the 2005 LRDP could result in storm water runoff during construction, which could substantially degrade water quality.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-2A: For all construction projects less than one acre in area, the Campus shall continue to require the use of construction site controls and best management practices in compliance with the campus draft Storm Water Management Program, the campus Erosion Control Standards, and the Site Requirements for Erosion Control and Drainage in the Campus Standards Handbook.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-2B: No grading shall be conducted on hillsides (sites with slopes greater than 10 percent) during the wet season (October 1 through May 31) unless controls that prevent sediment from leaving the site are implemented. Erosion control measures, such as erosion control blankets, seeding or other stabilizing mechanisms shall be incorporated into the project erosion control plan or SWPPP and applied to graded hillside prior to predicted storm events.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations HYD-2A and HYD-2B, which are hereby**

**adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*b. LRDP Impact HYD-3 Increased Runoff.* Campus development under the 2005 LRDP would alter drainage patterns in the project area, and increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, which could result in substantial siltation or erosion on or off site, and increase the amount of urban pollutants in storm water runoff, which could affect water quality.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-3A: The Campus shall install additional signs and expand the public education program to inform and educate the campus population about the importance of staying on paved roads and approved paths to prevent vegetation disturbance and soil erosion.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-3B: The Campus shall implement control measures to reduce erosion along new and existing unpaved fire roads, including but not limited to water bars to redirect flow off the road and flow dispersion of runoff from roads.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-3C: Each new capital project proposed under the 2005 LRDP that creates new impervious surface shall include design measures to ensure that post-development peak flows from 2-, 5- and 10-year storms do not exceed the 2-, 5-, and 10-year pre-development peak flows and that post-development peak flows from a 25-year storm do not exceed the pre-development peak flow from a 10-year storm.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-3D: The Campus shall require each new capital project to include design measures to minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the increase in the volume of storm water runoff discharged from the project site to sinkholes or natural drainages. These design measures shall include features that maximize infiltration and dissipation of runoff, preferably near the area where new runoff is generated, and may include, but will not be limited to: vegetated swales, bioretention areas, infiltration trenches and basins, level spreaders, permeable pavement, minimizing directly connected impervious surfaces, storage and re-use of roof runoff, and green roofs. Within one year following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus shall provide a protocol for design consultants to use in demonstrating that measures to reduce runoff are included in the project design to the maximum extent practicable.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-3E: Design and planning for new pathways and bikeways shall include fencing, signage and/or other design features to control pedestrian/bicycle circulation and minimize the potential for shortcuts. Bridges shall be provided where new pathways cross drainages that become inundated during the rainy season.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that because of existing problems in the four watersheds on campus, new development cannot increase flows in channels without increasing the risk of erosion and sedimentation that may have a significant impact on water quality. The Campus has so far been successful in avoiding increases in peak flows from new development, and there is reasonable certainty that the Campus will be able to maintain peak flows from**

**project sites at pre-development levels. However, it is uncertain whether the campus will be successful in avoiding or minimizing an increase in the volume of site runoff for all future projects to the extent necessary to prevent substantial erosion leading to significant effects on water quality. LRDP Mitigations HYD-3A through HYD-3E, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will minimize the impact to the extent feasible. Nevertheless, even with the implementation of these mitigation measures, the increase in the volume of runoff resulting from campus development under the 2005 LRDP could exacerbate existing erosion conditions. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

c. *LRDP Impact HYD-5 Aquifer Recharge and Groundwater Quality.* Campus development under the 2005 LRDP would not deplete groundwater supplies through pumping of groundwater for beneficial use, interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, or affect groundwater quality.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-5A: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation HYD-3D.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-5B: For projects involving construction on karst, if: (a) groundwater is encountered beneath the building site during the geotechnical investigation, and (b) the proposed foundation type would require pressure grouting, the Campus will follow the procedures outlined below:

- Perform a dye tracing study to determine if there is a potential for pressure grouting to affect water quality in springs and seeps around the UC Santa Cruz campus. If a potential impact is indicated, alternative building foundation plans will be considered.
- As an alternative, the Campus may conduct a preliminary hydrogeological study to evaluate whether the groundwater zone encountered during the geotechnical investigation is hydraulically connected to the karst aquifer. If the hydrogeological study indicates that the groundwater zone is hydraulically independent of the karst aquifer, such that there is no potential for grout injected during construction to affect karst water quality, a dye tracing study need not be performed. If results of the hydrogeological study indicate hydraulic connectivity between the groundwater encountered beneath the site and the karst aquifer, the Campus shall conduct a dye tracing study as described above.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-5C: If the existing or a new groundwater well is used the Campus shall perform monitoring of water levels within that well and any adjacent wells, and monitoring of those springs in the campus vicinity shown to be connected to the well with a dye tracing study or other applicable testing method for the duration of groundwater pumping to ascertain whether there is any long-term decline in water levels or spring discharge.

If monitoring of water levels and springs indicates that campus use of groundwater is contributing to a net deficit in aquifer volume, as indicated by a substantial decrease in average water levels in any monitored wells or a substantial reduction of flows in monitored springs, the Campus will terminate or reduce its use of groundwater from the aquifer. The average water levels and flows in springs will be defined through a statistical analysis of historic data, with consideration of associated seasonal rainfall and seasonal variations in spring discharge flow rates.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for development under the 2005 LRDP to deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations HYD-5A and HYD-5B, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact**

*d. LRDP Impact HYD-6 Flooding and Water Quality in Caves.* Implementation of the 2005 LRDP would alter drainage patterns on the campus, increase the rate and amount of surface runoff, potentially affect the quality of runoff, and therefore could cause flooding and water quality impacts in caves on or off site.

LRDP Mitigation HYD-6: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations HYD-3C and 3D.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation HYD-6, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

**8. Noise**

*a. LRDP Impact NOIS-1 Construction Noise.* Construction of campus facilities pursuant to the 2005 LRDP could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise but not to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.

LRDP Mitigation NOIS-1: Prior to initiation of construction of a specific development project, the Campus shall approve a construction noise mitigation program that shall be implemented for each construction project. This shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Construction equipment used on campus is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.

- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Notices of the dates and hours of anticipated construction shall be posted in academic, administrative, and residential buildings within 100 feet of construction noise sources at least a week before the start of each construction project.
- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.
- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic or residential use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during holidays, Thanksgiving break, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer breaks.
- Loud construction activity within 100 feet of a residential building shall be restricted to the hours between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM, Monday through Saturday.
- Loud construction activity within 100 feet of an academic building shall be scheduled to the extent feasible on weekends.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that construction of new facilities on infill sites on the central campus would occur at distances less than 100 feet from existing and future sensitive receptors on the campus, and would result in noise levels that exceed the criteria at these nearby receptors. Also, as construction occurs on the north campus, there could be receptors occupying the new uses within 100 feet of a construction site. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation NOIS-1, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will control construction noise on campus to the extent practicable and feasible, and will reduce the potential impact at most locations to a less-than-significant level. However, there could potentially be some construction sites on campus where, even with implementation of the adopted mitigation, the noise levels will not be reduced to levels below the thresholds. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*b. LRDP Impact NOIS-2 Off-Campus Traffic-Related Noise.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would result in increased vehicular traffic on the city road network, which would not result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels at modeled locations.

LRDP Mitigation NOIS-2: Campus Standards shall be amended to include a requirement to be imposed on all campus contracts that only City-designated truck routes shall be used for contractor truck trips accessing the campus.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increase in vehicular traffic on the city road network resulting from campus growth under the 2005 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP**

**Mitigation NOIS-2, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

c. *LRDP Impact NOIS-3 On-Campus Traffic-Related Noise.* Future residents on the campus would not be exposed to high noise levels from increased vehicular traffic on the campus road network.

LRDP Mitigation NOIS-3: For future noise-sensitive land uses such as Family Student Housing and other housing complexes that would be constructed under the 2005 LRDP, building and area layouts shall incorporate noise control as a design feature, as feasible. Noise control features would include increased setbacks, landscaped berms or vegetation screens, and building placement to shield noise-sensitive exterior areas from direct roadway exposures. The Campus may also use other noise attenuation measures such as double-pane windows and insulation to minimize interior noise levels.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the noise associated with increased vehicular traffic on campus roads under the 2005 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation NOIS-3, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

**9. Population and Housing**

a. *LRDP Impact POP-1 Direct Population Growth Inducement.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would directly induce substantial population growth in the study area by accommodating increased enrollment and additional employment.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the population that would be added to the study area as a result of campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would be substantial compared to the projected population growth in the city of Santa Cruz and the rest of Santa Cruz County. Although on-campus employment is more than adequately accounted for in AMBAG forecasts, growth in student enrollment and on-campus residential population is not accounted for in AMBAG forecasts for the city of Santa Cruz. A substantial increase in residential population in itself is not a significant environmental effect, but 2005 LRDP-related population growth on the study area transportation system and water supply are significant and unavoidable environmental effects. Accordingly, the effect of increased population from the proposed project is also significant impact. Because the proposed project is a program that includes campus population growth as an essential component, no mitigation is available to avoid or reduce this impact. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. The Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*b. LRDP Impact POP-3 Cumulative Housing Demand.* Growth of the campus under the 2005 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional growth, would create a demand for housing that combined with demand created by other growth in the county, would exceed the supply.

LRDP Mitigation POP-3A: The University will continue to monitor demand for student housing on an annual basis, and will ensure that a sufficient number of students beds is available on campus, through a combination of new housing construction and temporary modification of existing housing space ("overflow housing"), to accommodate at least 50 percent of undergraduate student enrollment and 25 percent of graduate student enrollment at any given time, as demand dictates.

LRDP Mitigation POP-3B: Within one year following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the University will fund and carry out a study to identify ways in which the University can collaborate with other large employers, the City of Santa Cruz, and the County of Santa Cruz to assist in providing wider access to available housing for UC employees and affiliates and other community members, through mechanisms such as a jointly-funded housing trust augmented by grants and other funding sources.

LRDP Mitigation POP-3C: The Campus will consult with the City and County of Santa Cruz on data needs and potential future joint projects and, within one year following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus will fund and carry out a market analysis of the local housing market, including demand for housing by housing type and other demand factors, costs, vacancy, and occupancy rates, to provide data to assist the City in its planning activities related to housing needs, to assist the Campus in planning Campus housing, and to assist in the planning of potential joint projects. The Campus will update this study at no greater than five-year intervals.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that campus growth under the 2005 LRDP, in conjunction with other employment growth in the study area, would result in a demand for housing that would exceed the existing and projected housing supply. This cumulative impact would be significant. Because the demand generated by campus growth would constitute a substantial portion of the total housing demand in the city of Santa Cruz and the rest of Santa Cruz County, the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation POP-3A through POP-3C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the impact by ensuring that student housing is available on campus to meet the expected demand and by assisting local agencies with planning for affordable housing. Because it is uncertain that even with these efforts by the City and the Campus, adequate additional affordable housing would be built, the impact of cumulative population growth with respect to housing supply would be significant and unavoidable. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

### 10. Recreation

a. *LRDP Impact REC-2 Increased Use of Recreational Facilities.* Increased on-campus population under the 2005 LRDP would result in increased use of recreational facilities on campus and in the city of Santa Cruz, which could result in deterioration of the facilities.

LRDP Mitigation REC-2A: The Campus shall ensure that open space, tot lots, and similar facilities for use by families are included in all new family housing developments built on the campus under the 2005 LRDP.

LRDP Mitigation REC-2B: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation HYD-3A and HYD-3B.

LRDP Mitigation REC-2C: To discourage the illegal use of bicycles on trails in Pogonip City Park, the Campus shall: (1) install signage on campus property near entrances to the park indicating that trail users are leaving University property and that bicycles are prohibited on some trails in the park; (2) maintain fencing and signage on University property at the Coolidge Drive lookout as needed to discourage unauthorized access into the park from the University; (3) work with campus and other local outdoor recreation groups to undertake measures to regularly inform and educate students, faculty and staff about caretaking of the regional trail system and regional open spaces; and (4) revise campus bicycle maps to explicitly identify the park boundary and Pogonip City Park rules regarding bicycle use.

LRDP Mitigation REC-2D: The Campus shall coordinate with the City of Santa Cruz's efforts in organizing an annual or semi-annual volunteer trail maintenance day, and shall assist in the recruitment of volunteers for these events from the UC Santa Cruz campus through campus advertising and education efforts.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations REC-2A through REC-2D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

b. *LRDP Impact REC-4 Cumulative Demand for New Recreation Facilities.* Cumulative growth in study area population, including 2005 LRDP-related off-campus population, could result in the development of new off-campus recreation facilities, the construction of which would not result in significant environmental impacts.

LRDP Mitigation REC-4: The Campus will continue to make campus recreational facilities available to the public, and will provide casual recreation amenities, such as walking paths and picnic tables, that will be available for public use.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for cumulative growth in study area population, including 2005 LRDP-related off-campus population, to result in the development of new off-campus**

**recreation facilities is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation REC-4, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

c. *LRDP Impact REC-5 Increased Use of Regional Recreation Facilities.* Cumulative growth in study area population, including 2005 LRDP-related off-campus population, would result in increased use of regional recreational facilities, which would not result in deterioration of most facilities. The contribution of the project to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

LRDP Mitigation REC-5: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations REC-2C, REC-2D and REC-4, above.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for cumulative growth in study area population, including 2005 LRDP-related off-campus population to result in deterioration of regional recreation facilities through increased use is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation LRDP Mitigation REC-5, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

**11. Transportation and Circulation**

a. *LRDP Impact TRA-1 On-Campus Intersections.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would cause an increase in on-campus traffic that could result in unacceptable levels of service at two on-campus intersections if the growth in traffic outpaces the modifications to the on-campus circulation system proposed under the 2005 LRDP.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-1: The Campus shall monitor the level of service at two intersections (Hagar Drive/McLaughlin Drive and Heller Drive/Meyer Drive) every three years beginning in 2007, and implement intersection improvements or signalization as needed to maintain an acceptable level of service.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation TRA-1, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

b. *LRDP Impact TRA-2 Off-Campus Intersections.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would cause unacceptable levels of service at ten off-campus intersections.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-2A: In addition to any project- level traffic analyses required by CEQA, UC Santa Cruz shall, at intervals of no more than three years or increments of no more than 1,000 students in enrollment growth (whichever occurs first), conduct traffic counts at the identified intersections to determine if the additional traffic generated by campus growth or a specific project would trigger the need for the specific intersection

improvements listed in Table 4.14-18, or other improvements to achieve the City's level of service standards. If the analysis indicates that, with the traffic contribution of campus growth or of a specific proposed project, the levels of service would degrade to unacceptable levels, the Campus shall inform the City of this conclusion, and contribute its "fair share" (as defined on page 4.14-46 of Volume II of the Final EIR) of the cost of the needed improvements.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-2B: UC Santa Cruz shall continue to implement and will expand its existing Transportation Demand Management programs with the objectives of increasing sustainable transportation modes (use of modes other than single-occupant vehicles) above 55 percent during the planning horizon of the 2005 LRDP and reducing peak hour traffic volumes. Potential measures that the Campus will consider for achieving this objective are listed in Table 4.14-19.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that in most cases, significant impacts at the off-campus intersections affected by 2005 LRDP development can be mitigated with improvements, most often by installing a traffic signal. In addition, implementation of LRDP Mitigation TRA-2B, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the impact of the 2005 LRDP on off-campus intersections. However at four intersections, even with mitigation, the levels of service would remain unacceptable. In addition, the feasibility and/or implementation of all of the improvements at the ten affected intersections cannot be guaranteed by UC Santa Cruz because the improvements are the responsibility of other jurisdictions, and detailed planning, environmental review, and engineering have not yet been completed. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*c. LRDP Impact TRA-3 On-Campus Parking Supply.* If the development of planned parking does not keep pace with other growth on campus, or if parking supply is reduced as a result of development on existing parking lots, campus growth under the 2005 LRDP could generate demand for parking in excess of on-campus parking capacity.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-3A: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation TRA-2B TDM measures to reduce on-campus parking demand associated with single-occupant vehicle commuters and with long-term storage of infrequently used vehicles.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-3B: The Campus shall monitor on-campus parking utilization rates annually, and will construct additional parking when demand approaches capacity. The Campus will use projected average daytime utilization rate in excess of 90 percent in a given parking zone as a measure of parking capacity

LRDP Mitigation TRA-3C: The Campus shall continue to enhance existing parking management systems to maximize utilization of existing parking capacity. Parking

capacity enhancements may include real-time monitoring of lot utilization, changeable message signs identifying available parking spaces, use-based parking permits, zoned parking permits, or other measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations TRA-3A, TRA-3B and TRA-3C, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*d. LRDP Impact TRA-4 Alternative Modes of Transportation.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would result in increases in circulation volumes (numbers of pedestrians, bicycles, and transit and other motor vehicles) that would conflict with and reduce the effectiveness of alternative modes of transportation, including transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4A: UC Santa Cruz shall monitor campus and Metro transit service and other alternative modes of transportation on an annual basis, to assess the need for improvements in campus circulation to accommodate changes in campus-related circulation demands.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4B: Based on results of LRDP Mitigation TRA-4A, the Campus shall improve the operational efficiency and capacity of the campus transit system as needed to maintain transit cycle time, and shall work with SCMTD and other agencies to maintain and improve efficiency and capacity of the public transit system serving University facilities.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4C: Based on the results of LRDP Mitigation TRA-4A, the Campus shall implement measures, including physical and operational improvements, that will ensure that transit travel times between the two most widely-separated colleges does not exceed the time interval between class periods. These measures may include, but are not limited to; channelization of pedestrian crossings, installation of signal-controlled pedestrian crossings, and grade-separated pedestrian crossings where appropriate.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4D: The Campus shall coordinate implementation of needed campus roadway and circulation improvements identified in the 2005 LRDP with the pace of campus development.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4E: Based on the results of LRDP Mitigation TRA-4A, the Campus shall implement the bicycle circulation elements of the 2005 LRDP as needed to maintain and enhance the effectiveness of bicycles as a transportation mode.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-4F: The Campus shall implement integrated transit, bicycle and pedestrian way-finding systems on the main campus.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations TRA-4A through TRA-4F, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.**

*e. LRDP Impact TRA-5 Special-Event Traffic.* Traffic generated by simultaneous full-capacity special events on campus would cause the off-campus intersections listed in Table 4.14-22, Volume II of the Final EIR to operate at LOS E or F during event-related peak hours. On-campus, the special event traffic could cause congestion related to visitors searching for parking.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-5A: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigations TRA-2A, TRA-2B, TRA-3B, TRA-3C, and TRA-4A through -4E.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-5B: The Campus shall improve parking management for special events, through appropriate expansion of on-campus parking enforcement at nights and on weekends in order to better manage parking resources to accommodate campus needs.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-5C: The Campus shall provide on-line parking permit sales and way-finding information for visitors in order to reduce back-ups of vehicles at the main entrance kiosk.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-5D: The Campus will continue to promote use of the on-line Campus Events Calendar System to improve coordination between Campus units, and to coordinate traffic and parking management for traffic producing events. An automatic link will be added to the Calendar System to notify TAPS of the proposed scheduling of any event of over 50 persons in size so that the potential for parking and traffic congestion can be assessed before an event is finally scheduled. Upon notification, TAPS will consult with event planners to endeavor, through rescheduling or schedule coordination, to minimize the number of simultaneous full-capacity events and, in particular, those that might occur during traffic peak commute hours. In addition, TAPS and the Event Coordination Committee will collaborate to formulate a Traffic Management Plan, which may include special shuttles from on- or off-campus sites, special designated temporary parking, and other parking and traffic management measures to minimize traffic and parking congestion associated with special events.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for traffic generated by special events on campus under the 2005 LRDP to cause congestion is a less-than-significant impact. LRDP Mitigations TRA-5A through TRA-5D, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

*f. LRDP Impact TRA-6 Freeway Operations.* Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would contribute to unacceptable freeway level-of-service operations.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-6A: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation TRA-2B.

LRDP Mitigation TRA-6B: UC Santa Cruz shall contribute its fair share of the local cost of the needed improvements as identified by the state at the five significantly affected freeway facilities based on the cost of the needed improvements less the value of any regional, state and federal funds to be provided for each improvement.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that significant impacts at the affected freeway facilities can be mitigated with implementation of transportation demand management programs pursuant to LRDP Mitigation TRA-6A, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project. In addition, implementation of LRDP Mitigation TRA-6B, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the impact of the 2005 LRDP on freeway operations through fair share contributions to freeway facility improvements. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of all of the improvements at the five significantly affected freeway facilities cannot be guaranteed by UC Santa Cruz because the improvements are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies, and detailed planning, environmental review, and engineering have not yet been completed. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

**12. Utilities**

a. *LRDP Impact UTIL-4 Solid Waste Disposal.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would increase the volume of municipal solid waste that would require disposal, but would not require an expansion of the city landfill.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-4: The Campus will continue to improve its recycling and waste reduction programs and identify additional means of reducing waste.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increased volume of municipal solid waste under the 2005 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation UTIL-4, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

b. *LRDP Impact UTIL-5 Campus Electrical System.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus electrical system, which would not result in significant environmental impacts.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-5: Where feasible, new campus buildings will be added to the Campus Energy Management System. Heating and cooling will be controlled based on time of use of building and outside temperature.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the expansion of the campus electrical system under the 2005 LRDP would not result in significant environmental impacts. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation UTIL-5, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

c. *LRDP Impact UTIL-7 Campus Cooling Water and Heating Water Facilities.* Development under the 2005 LRDP would require the expansion of campus

cooling water and heating water generation and conveyance facilities, which would result in significant environmental impacts.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-7: The Campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation AIR-2A.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that, due to limited ground disturbance needed to install cooling and heating water pipelines to serve development under the 2005 LRDP, air quality, noise, and other construction-phase impacts would generally be less than significant. With implementation of mitigations identified in the Final EIR, most potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation UTIL-7, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce air quality impacts from operational emissions from the new boilers at the Central Heating Plant and space heating in other new non-residential buildings on the campus. However, even with this mitigation, emissions of $NO_x$ will be above the significance threshold (see finding for LRDP Impact AIR-2, above). No other mitigation is available. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

*d. LRDP Impact UTIL-9 Cumulative Water Demand.* Development under the 2005 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional growth in the SCWD service area, would generate increased demand for water during normal and drought years, and the development of new water supplies and infrastructure to serve normal and drought year demand could result in significant environmental impacts. The contribution of the proposed project to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9A: The Campus shall continue to implement and improve all current water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water, including the following:

- Continue the leak detection and repair program.
- Install an individual water meter in each new employee housing unit to encourage residential water conservation.
- Install waterless urinals in all new buildings.
- Require that new contracts for washing machines in student residences be certified by the Consortium on Energy Efficiency 6 to have a water factor of 5.5 or less or meet an equivalent standard. New washing machines purchased for use in athletic facilities shall meet applicable standards for water-efficiency for institutional machines.
- Incorporate water-efficient landscaping practices in all new landscape installations. Water-conservative landscaping practices shall include, but will not be limited to the following: use of water-efficient plants, temporary irrigation systems for plant establishment areas where mature plants will be able to survive without regular

irrigation, grouping of plants according to their water requirements, design of planting areas to maximize irrigation pattern efficiency, and mulch covering in planting areas.

- To facilitate monitoring of water usage in all new development, the Campus shall: (1) install separate meters on water lines for individual buildings and (2) install meters on irrigation lines where one point of connection irrigates 1 acre or more.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9B: As new technologies become available, the Campus shall continue to conduct pilot programs for high-efficiency plumbing fixtures including, but not limited to, dual-flush toilets. If a piloted technology proves to be successful (i.e., the high-efficiency fixtures are effective in water savings and do not require more frequent or expensive maintenance than the existing standard), the Campus shall revise its standards to require use of the fixtures in all new buildings.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9C: Within one year following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus shall implement a water conservation education program for campus residents. This will include but would not be limited to:

- Distribution to residents of employee housing of educational materials covering the following topics: basic home water conservation practices, plumbing retrofits and replacements, and strategies to conserve landscape irrigation.
- Designation of a staff member who will be responsible for developing and implementing a water conservation education and awareness program to reduce water consumption in student residences, dining halls, and student affairs facilities.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9D: Within one year following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus shall consult with the City of Santa Cruz regarding the appropriate scope of and initiate, an engineering audit of campus water use. The audit will assess existing campus water uses, identify options for reducing water consumption, prioritize feasible improvements based on the amount of potential water savings and cost effectiveness, and recommend top priority measures for implementation within the succeeding five years, and lower priority measures for potential subsequent implementation. The audit will include, but will not be limited to the following:

- An inventory of plumbing fixtures in non-housing facilities on campus, which will identify the number and locations of fixtures and identify those that do not meet current campus standards for water efficiency. (Regarding retrofit of plumbing fixtures in student housing, see LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9H.)
- An inventory of irrigation systems on the campus, including identification of systems that are not metered, the methods used to control the irrigation schedule, and potential for improvement.
- An inventory of locations on campus where buildings and irrigation are on the same meter.
- An analysis of potential water conservation measures for the campus cooling water system.

- Identification of landscaped areas on campus that have plants that are high water-use.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9E: The Campus shall begin implementation of the top priority recommendations of the water audit conducted under UTIL-9D within one year of completion of the audit and complete implementation of the top priority recommendations within five years after completing the audit.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9F: The Campus shall, at five-year intervals during the term of the 2005 LRDP, revisit the results of the water audit conducted under UTIL-9D, consult with the City of Santa Cruz Water Department, conduct round table discussions with representatives of relevant campus departments, and conduct additional study of new technologies as needed to identify additional feasible and effective water conservation measures for implementation on the campus during the subsequent five year period. The following are among the measures that shall be considered:

- Adding existing irrigation systems to the campus's central control system.
- Retrofitting existing water meters such that building use and irrigation are separately metered.
- Replacing natural turf on athletic fields with artificial turf.
- Installing timers on showers in student residences.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9G: Within two years following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus shall initiate a study on feasible measures for utilization of reclaimed water (including rainwater, grey water, cooling tower blowdown water and/or recycled water) in new development. Potential uses of reclaimed water include cooling, irrigation, and toilet flushing. The study shall contain a plan to utilize reclaimed water in new development as feasible and effective in water conservation, and shall include an implementation schedule.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9H: Within five years following approval of the 2005 LRDP, the Campus shall complete the retrofit of all plumbing fixtures in student housing not meeting the efficiency standards current in 2005 (1.6 gallons per flush for toilets). The new fixtures installed under the retrofit program shall conform to the campus standard for new buildings current at the time of the retrofit.

LRDP Mitigation UTIL-9I: If and when the City implements drought emergency management measures, the University will implement the following measures for the duration of the drought emergency:

- Reduce use of potable water for irrigation on the campus landscape, the CASFS and the Arboretum in accordance with reductions required by the City for similar users.
- Utilize water from the existing supply well in Jordan Gulch for non-potable uses. The Campus shall implement a program of monitoring flow at downgradient springs during the time when the well is being used.
- Require that residential water use on campus be reduced consistent with the City's target for multifamily residential facilities.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that cumulative development within the City's water service area, including campus growth under the 2005 LRDP, would have a significant cumulative impact due to inadequate water supplies, especially during periods of drought. Although LRDP Mitigations UTIL-9A through UTIL-9I, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, will reduce the Campus's contribution to cumulative water supply impacts, they would not eliminate the need for a new water source. The development of a new city water supply source, such as a desalination facility, could have significant effects on the environment. Because it is unknown at this time whether all environmental impacts associated with water supply development projects could be reduced to a less-than-significant level, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

## C. MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires the lead agency, when making the findings required by Public Resources Code Section 21081(1)(a), to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted, in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. A Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared that requires the University to monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to further reduce environmental impacts that are less than significant. The Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program set forth in Volume IV of the Final EIR, which includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted and incorporated into the project, and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the 2005 LRDP.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation for conditions within the jurisdiction of the University. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures specified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Program will be accomplished through administrative controls over project planning and implementation. Monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through verification in periodic Mitigation Monitoring Reports and periodic inspection by appropriate University personnel. The University reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of Mitigation Measures if, in the exercise of discretion of the University, it is determined that the amended or substituted Mitigation Measure will mitigate the identified significant environmental impact to at least the same degree of significance as the original Mitigation Measure it replaces, or would attain an adopted performance standard for mitigation, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

## D. ALTERNATIVES

The EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the 2005 LRDP. This analysis is found in Section 5, Volume II, of the Draft EIR. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis also evaluated a "no project" alternative, and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The EIR examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives as identified in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Table 5-2 in the Draft EIR compares the environmental impacts of the proposed project and each of the alternatives.

Project Objectives

The Regents finds that the objectives for the project are as described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. The purposes of the UC Santa Cruz 2005 LRDP (September 2006) are to guide the physical planning and development of the UC Santa Cruz campus in order to allow the Campus to achieve its mission, which is to support the teaching, research, and public service programs of the University of California. The objectives of the 2005 LRDP are to:

- Provide for instruction, research, support, residential facilities and infrastructure needed to:
- Accommodate anticipated enrollment growth and program development
- Support the breadth and depth of undergraduate and graduate academic programs and professional degree programs
- Accommodate the expansion of high-quality research programs
- Allow the Campus to expand its contribution to the public cultural life and economic well being of the region through public programs, events, and services

- Develop facilities to foster a dynamic intellectual and social community, specifically:
  - Locate new facilities on the main campus to build on the established foundation of human and physical resources already in place and to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration
  - Provide facilities and spaces that will enrich the collaborative learning environment for the on-campus student community and encourage academic, personal, and social development
- Develop a physical environment that will support educational opportunities for an increasingly diverse population
- Retain flexibility that will allow continuing evolution of the campus over time in response to changing demographics, societal needs, technological developments and new external challenges
- Respect and reinforce the Physical Planning Principles and Guidelines to maintain the unique character of the UC Santa Cruz campus

### 1. Alternatives to the 2005 LRDP

The University evaluated four alternatives to the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005): Satellite Campus at Former Fort Ord Military Base; Reduced Enrollment Growth; Southerly Expansion; and No Project.

#### i. Satellite Campus at Former Fort Ord Military Base

Under this alternative, a satellite campus in Monterey County would accommodate about 2,200 of the students and about 480 of the employees included in the growth proposed under the 2005 LRDP, and about 1.3 million gsf of the proposed building space. The remainder of the additional students and employees (about 4,750 students and about 1,040 faculty and staff) and the remainder of the proposed development (about 2.8 million gsf) would be accommodated at the main campus, including 2300 Delaware Avenue. The new satellite campus would be developed on land owned by the University of California at the University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (UC MBEST) at the former Fort Ord Military reservation. The UC MBEST site would not accommodate the entire building program or population proposed under the 2005 LRDP (January 2005), so the remainder of the building program and population would be accommodated at the main campus.

This alternative would result in impacts on the UC Santa Cruz campus and in the Santa Cruz area that would be roughly equal to or less significant than the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). Under this alternative, the magnitude of potentially significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR in the areas of aesthetics, biological resources on the main campus, geology, degradation of water quality from construction storm water runoff, pressure grouting for construction on karst, recreational facilities in the Santa Cruz area, on-campus intersection operations, and alternative modes of transportation, would be reduced, although all of the mitigation measures identified for the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) for these impact areas would still be required to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. It is likely that the potentially significant impact from emissions of toxic air contaminants from routine campus operations would be avoided under this alternative. The Satellite Campus Alternative also would lessen the magnitude of significant unavoidable impacts of the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) in the areas of cultural resources, effects of increased impervious surface on water quality, population and housing, off-campus freeway operations and intersection operations (ten off-campus intersections rather than 11), and utilities. Although lessened, these impacts of the Satellite Campus Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable even after implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

This alternative has the potential to result in significant population and housing, traffic, and water demand impacts in the former Fort Ord area, which are impacts that would not occur with the 2005 LRDP. Water allocation limitations in this area may prohibit the University from providing on-campus housing consistent with the 2005 LRDP goals (50 percent of undergraduates and 25 percent of graduate students). While there would be sufficient water to support the uses identified for the first three phases of the UC MBEST Master Plan, that plan did not contemplate housing new students on the

Fort Ord satellite campus. Because housing is a proportionately higher water user than other land uses, there may not be sufficient water to attain the housing goals of the 2005 LRDP. Furthermore, regional traffic impacts and traffic in the former Fort Ord area may increase from students commuting to the satellite campus from the main campus as well as from home. Therefore, impacts to population and housing and/or utilities in the former Fort Ord area, and/or regional traffic could be significant and unavoidable.

This alternative also would not meet key objectives of the 2005 LRDP, including maintaining a well-integrated intellectual and social community and expansion of existing high quality research programs on the main campus, because the provision of duplicate programs and services would add additional costs both for the University and for the students, it would not support the University's important sustainability goals, and it would require abandonment of the University's plans for a the UC MBEST Center.

For the foregoing reasons, the Satellite Campus at Former Fort Ord Military Base Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

**ii. Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative**

The 2005 LRDP, which is the Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006), has been revised to be consistent with the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative analyzed in the Draft EIR. Under this alternative, future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate 19,500 FTE students on campus by 2020-21, which constitutes an increase of about 5,450 students over the 2003-04 enrollment level. This represents about 22 percent less enrollment growth than projected under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) and analyzed in the Draft EIR. The total campus population increase would be reduced by about 20 percent compared to the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005).

The Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative allows for 22 percent less building space than the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), which would reduce the footprint of development by about five percent (or 14 acres). Like the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative provides on-campus student housing to accommodate 50 percent of the undergraduate students and 25 percent of the graduate students, but the number of new beds would be reduced. The number of campus employee housing units provided under the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative would be 125 units, which is the same as under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). The Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative provides for growth within essentially the same development footprint identified in the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), except that one proposed development area in the central campus would be reduced in size by about 14 acres. The north campus, including a new campus entrance, would be developed as envisioned in the Draft 2005 LRDP.

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives and would reduce the magnitude of potentially significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology, degradation of water quality from construction storm water runoff, pressure grouting for construction on karst, recreational facilities, on-campus intersection operations, and alternative modes of transportation, ,

although all of the mitigation measures identified for the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) for these impact areas would still be required to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. The Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative also would lessen the magnitude of significant unavoidable impacts of the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) in the areas of cultural resources, effects of increased impervious surface on water quality, population and housing, off-campus intersection and freeway operations, and utilities. Although lessened, these significant and unavoidable impacts from the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative would remain even after implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

### iii. Southerly Expansion Alternative

This alternative would accommodate the same population and building space as the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) but would not allow development in the north campus. The northern areas would remain essentially undeveloped, and the facilities needed to serve the increased campus population would be provided by increased development within the central, south-central, and southeastern portions of the campus. Instead, development would occur as infill in currently developed areas on the central and lower campus. Faculty and staff housing would be constructed in the lower portion of the East Meadow near the intersection of Glenn Coolidge Drive and Hagar Drive. Under this alternative, the north campus loop road would not be developed. The new entrance to the campus off of Empire Grade Road envisioned under the 2005 LRDP would not be developed. This alternative would avoid all of the potentially significant impacts on biological resources as well as the increased potential for wildland fire hazards associated with development of the north campus. However, this alternative would result in increased potential for impacts on California red-legged frog, wildlife movement and western burrowing owl, and significant aesthetic impacts associated with development in the lower campus meadows. Population-related impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

This alternative would be in conflict with the key planning principles and project objectives developed to maintain the unique character of the UC Santa Cruz campus, including maintaining the open space and meadows of the lower and central campus, maintaining UC Santa Cruz's core configuration and developing a walkable campus, respecting the natural environment and preserving open space as much as possible, respecting major landscape and vegetation features, and protecting historic and prehistoric cultural resources. Although this alternative would meet other objectives of the proposed project, it would have potentially significant aesthetic, cultural resource, and land use planning impacts.

For the foregoing reasons, the Southerly Expansion Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

### iv. No Project Alternative

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR evaluated the "No Project Alternative," in order to allow The Regents to compare the impacts of

approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving it. The No Project Alternative describes the environmental conditions existing at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation, along with a discussion of what would be reasonably expected to occur at the site in the foreseeable future, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project Alternative, development on the Campus would continue to be governed by the 1988 LRDP. Enrollment could grow to 15,000 students, which would be an increase of about 950 students above 2003-04 enrollment. Faculty and staff population could also increase to support this enrollment growth as well as new program initiatives, changes in the academic program, regulatory requirements, and improvement of faculty/student ratios. The Campus would be able to develop up to 2.7 million gsf of additional new building space, which would include two new colleges, and up to 3,200 net new parking spaces. Campus development potentially could be extended to the north of existing development, and a north campus loop road and associated housing and academic development could be built, as described in the 1988 LRDP. Although substantial growth in student housing on campus would be permitted under the No Project Alternative, under current conditions it appears unlikely that this level of development would occur. Development of a north loop road, major expansion into the north campus, and development of two new residential colleges also appear unlikely under current conditions.

The No Project Alternative would avoid most of the significant environmental impacts of development under the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005), because most of these impacts are population driven, and population would not increase over that approved in the Campus' existing LRDP, approved by The Regents in 1989. While a substantial amount of additional development is allowed under the No Project Alternative, it is unlikely that all of the development allowed under the 1988 LRDP would occur without substantial enrollment growth. Therefore, the potential for impacts to cultural and biological resources, and possibly impacts to water quality and hydrology associated with this alternative would be reduced. Therefore, this alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Because some development would be allowed under the No Project Alternative, this alternative would meet some of the objectives of the proposed project. However, this alternative would have limited potential to support the breadth and depth of undergraduate and graduate academic programs and professional degree programs or to allow the Campus to expand its contribution to the public cultural life and economic well being of the region through public programs, events and services.

For the foregoing reasons, the No Project Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

### v. Environmentally Superior Alternative

The Regents finds that, in the short term, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid almost all of the significant

impacts of the development under the 2005 LRDP. If, however, the campus does not accommodate its share of the University's projected systemwide enrollment demand, the University would pursue other alternatives to meet that demand, including additional growth on other campuses, which would result in impacts that cannot be known at this time. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of supporting the breadth and depth of undergraduate and graduate academic programs and professional degree programs or to allowing the Campus to expand its contribution to the public cultural life and economic well being of the region through public programs, events and services.

The CEQA Guidelines require that, if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Accordingly, the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative (Draft EIR, Volume II, Section 5) was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. As explained in the EIR, this alternative would result in impacts that would be similar to or, in most cases, less than the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005). It would be superior to the Draft 2005 LRDP (January 2005) in that it would lessen most of the potentially significant and significant unavoidable impacts of the Draft 2005 LRDP, particularly population-related off-campus impacts in the areas of population and housing, traffic congestion and water demand, and would support most of the objectives of the project. As discussed above, subsequent to publication of the Draft EIR, the University determined to propose the environmentally superior Reduced Enrollment Alternative as the 2005 LRDP, and the 2005 LRDP has been amended accordingly to reflect this change [see Final Draft 2005 LRDP (September 2006)].

## E. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

### 1. Impacts That Remain Significant

As discussed above, The Regents has found that the following impacts of the project remain significant following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR. These impacts remain significant even with the revisions to the project to reflect the lower enrollment growth associated with the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative (the environmentally superior alternative). Mitigation of some of these impacts requires measures that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency or agencies, as described in the Final EIR, and can and should be implemented by such agency or agencies. If any of the identified mitigation measures are not implemented by the agency or agencies that can and should implement them, the impact may remain significant and unavoidable.

**Impacts of the Final Draft 2005 LRDP**

| Number | Impact |
|---|---|
| **LRDP Impact AIR-2** | Daily operational emissions may contribute substantially to a violation of air quality standards or hinder attainment of the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | regional air quality plan. |
| **LRDP Impact AIR-4** | Growth associated with the 2005 LRDP would conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan. |
| **LRDP Impact CULT-3** | If a unique archaeological or historic resource cannot be preserved intact, implementation of the 2005 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource. |
| **LRDP Impact HYD-3** | Increased surface runoff could result in siltation or erosion, which could increase the amount of urban pollutants in storm water runoff. |
| **LRDP Impact NOIS-1** | Construction could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise. |
| **LRDP Impact POP-1** | 2005 LRDP would induce substantial population growth in the study area. |
| **LRDP Impact POP-2** | Cumulative demand for housing would exceed the projected supply. |
| **LRDP Impact TRA-2** | Campus growth would cause unacceptable levels of service at ten off-campus intersections. |
| **LRDP Impact TRA-6** | Campus growth under the 2005 LRDP would contribute to unacceptable freeway level-of-service operations. |
| **LRDP Impact UTIL-7** | Expansion of heating water generation and conveyance facilities would result in significant air quality impacts. |
| **LRDP Impact UTIL-9** | Cumulative demand for water would require development of new water supplies and infrastructure which could result in significant environmental impacts. |

### 2. Overriding Considerations

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, The Regents 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 Regents' review of the Final EIR and other information in the record of proceedings, including but not limited to the 2005 LRDP.

A. The University is charged, under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, with providing the opportunity for undergraduate education to the top one-eighth of all graduates of all California public high schools. The University is also charged with admitting those students who complete coursework in the lower division transfer curriculum at community colleges and who meet minimum grade point average requirements. The University serves as the state's primary research agency, and is the primary public institution in the state offering doctoral and certain professional degrees.

B. The 2005 LRDP will help provide the additional capacity necessary to accommodate the expected increase in student demand for a University education to 2010 and beyond.

C. The 2005 LRDP will advance California's economic, social and cultural development, which depends upon broad access to an educational system that prepares all of the state's inhabitants for responsible citizenship and meaningful careers.

D. The 2005 LRDP supports the campus in its objective of creating a physical framework to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus, including infrastructure and instruction, research, support, and residential facilities;; a dynamic intellectual and social community; and educational opportunities for an increasingly diverse population. The 2005 LRDP will retain flexibility to allow continuing evolution of the campus over time and maintain the unique character of the UC Santa Cruz campus.

E The 2005 LRDP designates land to accommodate a goal of housing 50 percent of undergraduate students, 25 percent of graduate students, 25 percent of faculty and three percent of staff, enabling the campus to sustain and expand its residential character and provide opportunities for members of the campus community to live locally and participate fully in the life of the campus. Meeting a portion of the increased demand for affordable housing within the local community is expected to help the campus recruit high quality faculty.

F. The 2005 LRDP will allow for the development of academic and administrative facilities to remedy existing space shortages; correct deficiencies in

existing facilities; accommodate planned academic and public service programs; and provide capacity for future program expansion.

G. The 2005 LRDP will constitute a significant economic benefit to the Santa Cruz area. UC Santa Cruz has a significant beneficial impact on the area's economy. The total economic impact of UC Santa Cruz in the Santa Cruz area is much greater than the sum of the direct expenditures made by UC Santa Cruz and its affiliated organizations and populations. Each dollar spent locally by UC Santa Cruz cycles through the area economy, generating additional income and employment.

H. UC Santa Cruz provides many direct services for both on-campus and off-campus users, including but not limited to: library services; recreation facilities; and academic and support services. As the 2005 LRDP is implemented, the level of these services will grow.

I. UC Santa Cruz provides many indirect community contributions in the form of education, artistic, and cultural enrichment to residents of the Santa Cruz area through such functions as extension courses, performing arts events, art exhibits, sporting events, conferences and workshops.

J. The campus is the largest employer in Santa Cruz County. This is particularly significant because of the quality and diversity of new jobs that are related to the implementation of the 2005 LRDP.

K. The increased economic activity resulting from campus growth is also expected to result in secondary growth in non-University businesses in the Santa Cruz area. Implementation of the 2005 LRDP also will provide construction employment, as individual building projects are developed.

L. The Final Draft 2005 LRDP, when compared to the other alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative) provides the best available balance between maximizing attainment of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts.

## F. 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 this project are located in the office of Physical Planning and Construction in Barn G, University of California, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, California. The custodian for this record of proceedings is Physical Planning and Construction.

## G. SUMMARY

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents has made one of more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR:

a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment.

b. Those changes or alterations are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR that would otherwise avoid or substantially lessen the identified significant environmental effects of the project.

2. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

a. All significant effects on the environment due to 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 Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.E, above.

## II. APPROVALS

The Regents hereby takes the following actions.

A. The Regents has certified the Final EIR in Section I., above.

B. The Regents hereby adopt and incorporate into the 2005 LRDP all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Section II.B of the Findings, above.

C. The Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project contained in the Final EIR and discussed in Section II.C of the Findings, above.

D. The Regents hereby adopts these Findings in their entirety as its findings for these actions and approvals.

E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the project, and adopted findings and a statement of overriding considerations, The Regents hereby approves the 2005 Long Range Development Plan for the University of California, Santa Cruz Campus.