CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
89 SOUTH CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 200
VENTURA, CA 93001-2801
(805) 585-1800

Th11a & Th12a

DATE: March 27, 2025

TO: Commissioners and Interested Persons

FROM: Steve Hudson, District Director
Barbara Carey, District Manager
Michelle Kubran, Coastal Program Analyst
Sam Fearer, Coastal Program Analyst

SUBJECT: **Proposed Major Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 to the University of California Santa Barbara** Certified Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and **Notice of Impending Development (NOID) UCS-NOID-0001-25** for the San Benito Housing Project**,** for Public Hearing and Commission Action at the April 10, 2025 Commission Meeting in Santa Barbara.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that the Commission, after public hearing, **approve** Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 to the certified Long Range Development Plan, with three (3) suggested modifications, and **approve** Notice of Impending Development (NOID) UCS-NOID-0001-25, as conditioned. Staff is recommending seventeen (17) special conditions for the subject NOID to assure consistency with the policies and provisions of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), as amended.

UCSB Long Range Development Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1:
The University of California Santa Barbara is proposing an amendment to its certified 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) to allow for the construction of the "San Benito Student Housing Project" (San Benito). The proposed amendment is project-driven and has been submitted in conjunction with a related Notice of Impending Development (NOID) for the proposed project (UCS-NOID-0001-25). The amendment is proposed in order to accommodate a proposed dormitory complex on the southern portion of the Facilities Management (FM) Site, located at the corner of Mesa Road and Stadium Road, on the University's Main Campus. The proposed amendment includes the modification of LRDP policies and figures to: concentrate all housing development and increase the maximum building height from 65 ft. to 81 ft. in the southern portion of the FM Site (south of Mesa Road), amend the LRDP ESHA map to reflect wetland and ESHA delineations at the FM Site, allow minor development encroachments into the required 50 ft. wetland buffer in the southern portion of the FM Site, modify parking requirements for the FM Site,

allow for retention of treated runoff off-site at the East Storke Wetlands, and revise land use designations at Main Campus.

UCSB Notice of Impending Development No. UCS-NOID-0001-25:

The related Notice of Impending Development (NOID) No. UCS-NOID-0001-25, for the San Benito Project proposes: the construction of seven new residential and support buildings up to 81 feet in height with 2,224 beds for students and 14 beds for staff; construction of a new Central Utility Plant (CUP) and vehicle accessway; roadway changes to Stadium Road; new bicycle parking; new pedestrian and bicycle paths; tree removal and replacement; enhancement of an existing on-site wetland; and excavation and revegetation at East Storke Wetlands for treated-runoff-supported wetland habitat restoration.

Proposed Development and Siting

Development for the San Benito Project is proposed to occur both within the roughly six-acre southern portion of the nine-acre Facilities Management (FM) Site, located east of Stadium Road and south of Mesa Road, and at offsite locations within the University as well. All previously-existing buildings at the southern portion of the FM Site were demolished after approval of UCS-NOID-0003-04, and the site is currently fenced and vacant, with asphalt and building foundations remaining. No new development is proposed at the northern portion of the FM Site, which currently holds the University's Public Safety Building.

Proposed development at the southern portion of the FM Site would include six new dorms, one new student support building, and a CUP. Proposed offsite development would include changes to existing parking at Parking Lot 30, roadway and circulation changes along Stadium Road, the creation of new pedestrian and bicycle paths between the project site and Main Campus, drainage improvements and realignments at Main Campus south of the FM Site, restoration activities and the creation of an offsite stormwater retention basin at the East Storke Wetlands site west of the FM Site, and mitigation tree plantings at the West Campus Mesa. The proposed retention basin at the eastern end of the East Storke Wetlands site – as required to meet RWQCB requirements for the proposed development at the FM Site – would include excavation and revegetation for wetland habitat restoration, and would utilize treated runoff directed from Main Campus through drainage improvements proposed with the project.

Biological Resources and Water Quality

The project site and vicinity contain significant biological resources, including an on-site wetland and oak woodland habitat and the East Storke Wetlands, all of which have been designated in the LRDP as ESHA. The LRDP generally requires a 100 ft. buffer for new development in order to protect ESHA and wetland resources from the direct effects of nearby disturbance. In this case, the LRDP notes that in light of the significant benefits of clustering development in specific locations, new development on the subject site is allowed to be constructed with a minimum 50 ft. buffer from the adjacent on-site wetland and oak woodland habitat. To confirm the biological resources on site, the University's biologist conducted an ESHA and wetland assessment in May 2024, and the proposed project was designed according to this assessment. However,

Commission staff found discrepancies between the assessment's vegetation map and wetland delineation and requested the University conduct another wetland delineation to determine the full extent of the on-site wetland. The revised wetland delineation was completed in September 2024, but at this point, the University had already completed the proposed plans and was unable to move the structures or redesign the proposed structures in order to meet the 50 ft. buffer across the entire site. The encroachment into the buffer would result in a reduction of approximately 448 sq. ft., or less than 1 percent, of the total buffer area, which is generally minimal and would not result in a significant disruption to habitat values of the adjacent wetland and oak woodland. Additionally, a majority of the wetland would be protected by a 50 ft. buffer, and the University proposes to restore the buffer through the removal of existing hardscape and the planting of native vegetation. In order for the proposed project to be consistent with the LRDP however, the University is proposing to add language to Policy LU-10 and Policy ESH-31 to allow for de minimis encroachments (those that are less than 0.5% of total buffer area) into the buffer.

In addition to restoration of the wetland/ESHA buffer, the University proposes to restore the wetland and ESHA itself to enhance the functionality of the on-site wetland and oak woodland and to establish diverse flowering shrubs in order to support nectar feeding insects and birds. Non-native species within the ESHA/wetland and associated buffer would be removed through various removal methods, and restorative grading would be conducted to widen and slightly deepen the wetland. Native plants would be installed to either establish or enhance five plant communities: oak woodland, wetland, riparian, mixed woodland, and coastal sage scrub. **Special Condition 2** is necessary to ensure that the proposed restoration is implemented according to the proposed restoration plan as well as require certain restoration and monitoring methods that were not provided for in the proposed plan, such as the use of local genetic stock for all native seeds and plants and to require a final comprehensive report at the end of the five-year monitoring period. Additionally, **Special Condition 5** is necessary to require a biological monitor to be present during all site preparation and grading activities within ESHA, wetland, and their buffers to ensure sensitive species on and near the project site are protected to the maximum extent possible during construction activities.

To address the impact of night lighting on wetland and ESHA adjacent to proposed development, **Special Condition 10** requires that exterior night lighting installed on the project site to be of low intensity, low glare design, and be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject site to prevent spill-over onto adjacent environmentally sensitive habitat areas, wetlands, and wildlife habitat. Additionally, **Special Condition 11** requires use of interior or exterior design features, such as dark tinting and window shading, to minimize nighttime light spillover to the maximum extent feasible. **Special Condition 11** is also necessary to require all windows located along the perimeter facades of the proposed buildings, as well as the windows for the proposed market, to be comprised of bird-safe, non-glare glass and that any window located on perimeter facades over 65 ft. in height or within 50 ft. of wetlands or other ESHA shall use bird-safe, non-glare glass or exterior design features to effectively screen window glare.

The proposed project would also remove 167 trees (37 coast live oaks, 11 other native trees, and 119 non-native trees). The LRDP requires specific mitigation ratios for trees that are removed as part of new development (10:1 for oak trees, 3:1 for other native or breeding/nesting trees, and 1:1 for non-native trees). The University is proposing to replace all removed trees at the required mitigation ratios with the exception of eight coast live oaks that were voluntarily planted by the University in 2018. The University is proposing to replace these eight oaks at a mitigation ratio of 1:1, which is inconsistent with the requirements of the LRDP which do not provide for a reduced replacement ratio to be approved in the case of oak trees planted voluntarily (i.e., not as mitigation for oak tree impacts). However, in this case, the eight voluntarily planted oak trees are small and do not provide significant habitat value as nesting within these trees by raptors or other sensitive species has not been observed. As such, it is appropriate to allow 1:1 replacement of these oaks, although the University did not propose such a change as part of the LRDPA. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is suggested to include language in Policy LU-10 to allow for the eight voluntarily planted oak trees on site to be replaced at a 1:1 mitigation ratio. Additionally, the proposed replacement trees will be planted in three different areas: on the FM site, at the East Storke Wetland restoration site, and at the West Campus Mesa, and while the University has provided restoration and landscaping plans for the proposed project, some information, such as specific oak tree planting locations at the East Storke Wetland, is missing. Therefore, **Special Condition 3** is necessary to require the University to submit final tree mitigation and monitoring programs that include all necessary information prior to authorization of the NOID.

Current water quality regulations require new construction to retain stormwater on site from a storm in the 95th percentile. The FM site, however, does not contain enough area to incorporate a retention basin that is large enough to hold the required amount of stormwater runoff. Onsite alternatives, such as the use of cisterns to capture and retain water, were analyzed but were determined to be infeasible since the captured stormwater would have to be treated for use indoors and the quantity of the stored water would be in excess of the site's irrigation needs. Therefore, after studying onsite alternatives, an offsite location was pursued that would act as a mitigation site to collect the same amount of water from the housing project watershed that would otherwise be required to be retained onsite the FM site. The East Storke Wetland, which is adjacent to and west of the housing project site, was determined to be the most suitable location for the required stormwater retention as it did not have any infrastructure constraints and would provide an opportunity to restore an environmentally sensitive habitat area that has become degraded and invaded by non-native species. The proposed restoration at the East Storke Wetlands would create or enhance six different habitat types over approximately 1.5 acres: emergent vegetation, intermittent flooded habitat, transitional habitat tolerant of dense clay soils, upland habitats with flowering plants, adjacent oak woodland habitat, and seasonally open water. The University has submitted a restoration plan for the proposed wetland restoration site; however, some details and required mitigation, such as for impacts to southern tarplant, are missing from the plan. Therefore, **Special Condition 2** is necessary to require a final habitat restoration, monitoring and management program to be submitted that is in substantial conformance with the submitted Seasonal Pond Restoration Plan, dated January 2025,

but that also includes a complete set of final project plans, including grading plans with cross sections, site plans, and revegetation and restoration plans.

Visual Resources

The University is proposing to increase the maximum building height at the project site, as required by the LRDP, from 65 ft. to 81 ft. The University has submitted photo simulations to show the difference between the LRDP building of 65 ft. tall buildings and the proposed project. The submitted visual analysis shows that although the proposed buildings (which range in height from 72 ft. adjacent to Mesa Road to 81 ft. at the south side of the site) would be more visible from nearby public viewpoints than the 65 ft. tall buildings allowed by the LRDP, the difference would not result in a significant impact to visual resources. Further, the proposed development has been designed to fit within the previously disturbed site and would therefore not require a significant amount of grading or result in any significant alteration of natural landforms. However, while the buildings proposed as part of the NOID are sited and designed such that the shorter buildings are in the most visible locations and step up to the highest structures, the proposed LRDPA includes a blanket maximum height of 81 ft. for the entire site. So, the LRDP, as proposed to be amended, would not ensure that buildings on the site will incorporate a stepped-level siting and design that is necessary to minimize impacts to visual resources. While the Commission agrees that the proposed project will minimize impacts to visual resources, the University's proposal to allow a maximum building height of 81 ft. for the entire site is inconsistent with protecting the visual quality of the subject area. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to specify the maximum allowable height for each proposed building. Additionally, **Suggested Modification 3** is necessary to modify proposed changes to Figure D.4 to reference Policy LU-10 instead of including the proposed height limit value of 81 ft.

Additionally, while the proposed height increase will not have a significant impact on visual resources, light emanating from the structures, particularly at night, as well as glare during the day, may have a significant impact on visual resources, especially for the floors above 65 ft. Therefore, **Special Condition 11** is necessary to require all windows located on building facades along the perimeter of the site and above 65 ft. on the building to be designed to minimize glare to the maximum extent feasible through window design features, such as perforated exterior window screening as well as require window design features, such as dark tinting or automated window shading, to effectively minimize nighttime light spillover to the maximum extent feasible. **Special Condition 11** also requires all building exteriors to be limited to earth tone colors that are compatible with the surrounding environment, including shades of green, brown, and medium gray.

Public Access

LRDP Policy TRANS-15 requires one parking space per four student bed spaces for all new dormitory housing. LRDP Policy LU-10, which provides the build-out provisions of the proposed housing site, requires parking for the project to be provided on site and in the adjacent Lot 30. The LRDP includes these requirements, because inadequate on-site parking has the potential to create or exacerbate existing parking problems and

discourage access to the coast by both directly using coastal access parking spaces and indirectly by raising the level of difficulty to find available parking. The proposed project, however, would not provide any additional campus parking. Instead, the University is proposing to change the requirements of Policy LU-10 to allow for a reduction of the parking ratio required by Policy TRANS-15. The submitted NOID, however, does not propose to reduce the required parking ratio for the proposed project. Rather, the University is proposing to provide the amount of parking required by the LRDP, but accommodate student residential parking generated by the project in existing parking lots on campus and provided a parking analysis to support the University's assertion that there is a sufficient amount of parking already available on campus. This approach is consistent with Policy TRANS-18, which allows for residential parking to be assigned to existing parking locations with available capacity. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to delete the proposed reference to Policy TRANS-15B in Policy LU-10 since the project, as proposed, would be consistent with the requirements of Policy TRANS-15. Additionally, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to modify Policy LU-10 to acknowledge all of the parking lots and structures that would serve the proposed project (Lot 38 and Structures 22 and (50) in addition to the site itself and Lot 30.

In addition, the project includes bicycle and pedestrian amenities, including two bicycle parking lots to accommodate 1,924 bicycles and a new bike path that would connect to the University's existing bicycle path network. The project also includes the extension of an existing Metropolitan Transit District bus line and a new bus stop adjacent to the project site.

Development and Hazards

The proposed development would be located at multiple sites, including at the FM Site, the East Storke Wetlands, and the West Campus Mesa. The East Storke Wetlands site and the West Campus Mesa site are designated as "Open Space" by the certified 2010 LRDP. The majority of the greater FM Site (both north and south of Mesa Road) is designated as "Housing" by the certified 2010 LRDP, with areas of designated Open Space located along the site's southern and northeastern bounds. The proposed CUP and service driveway would be located at the southeastern portion of the project site, within an area currently designated as "Academic and Support" (north) and "Recreation" (south). To address inconsistencies between proposed development and allowed uses within existing land use designations, the proposed LRDP amendment would convert a portion of the existing Open Space at the southwestern corner of the project site to a Housing designation and would convert a portion of the existing Recreation designation at the southeastern end of the project site to Academic and Support. Additionally, the proposed LRDP amendment would amend the LRDP ESHA map to reflect updated wetland and ESHA delineations, modify existing site-specific policy language in LRDP Policy LU-10 to allow a <0.5% encroachment into wetland buffer for proposed development at the project site, and revise LRDP Policy ESH-38 to allow the use of clean (filtered and treated) runoff to support ESHA restoration at the East Storke Wetlands site, in order to accommodate all proposed development in a manner consistent with these site-specific policies. The proposed amendment would also include a height increase at the southern portion of the FM Site, which is located closer

to the core of Main Campus, from a maximum height of 65 ft to 81 ft, and thus would enable the University to abandon potential for future buildout of the northern portion of the site while still meeting University housing goals for the project. The proposed consolidation of new development and increase in maximum height allowed at the southern portion of the FM Site would reduce potential adverse impacts upon on coastal resources to the maximum extent feasible pursuant to Section 30250 of the Coastal Act. With the proposed amendment, development of the proposed project both at the project site and at all offsite areas would be consistent with the land use designations of the certified 2010 LRDP.

However, the project proposed pursuant to the subject NOID is only consistent with the certified LRDP if the proposed amendment to the LRDP is approved. Therefore, **Special Condition 1** is necessary to ensure that the proposed amendment to the LRDP is deemed legally adequate prior to authorization of the impending development. Further, the **Suggested Modifications 1-3** are necessary to provide further clarification on allowed structure heights across the FM Site and to allow for demolition of existing facilities the northern portion of the site.

Regarding potential geological hazards associated with the proposed development, a geotechnical design report was prepared for the project and included a number of geotechnical recommendations to increase the stability and geotechnical safety of the site for the proposed development. These recommendations were incorporated into the University's siting of all proposed new buildings. However, to ensure that all recommendations of the geotechnical consultants are incorporated into the project plans, **Special Condition 15** is necessary to require the University to submit project plans certified by the consulting geologic and geotechnical engineering consultant as conforming to their recommendations. Additionally, **Special Condition 7** requires the University to submit interim erosion control plans which provide for the stabilization of all temporary stockpiled fill and disturbed areas on site and to utilize all best management practices including, but not limited to, the installation of temporary sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins or silt traps), temporary drains and swales, sand bag barriers, and silt fencing during construction activity to minimize erosion on the project site. Additionally, although proposed new development at and adjacent to the project site – including proposed drainage improvements – have been sited and designed to minimize risks associated with flooding and sea level rise, **Special Conditions 7 and 8** are necessary to minimize risk of erosion, and other impacts to coastal resources, both during construction and following project completion and **Suggested Modifications 1-3** are necessary to prohibit height increases and allow for future demolition of existing facilities at the northern portion of the FM Site, as may be necessary for adaptive management of the site. Further, **Special Condition 16** is necessary to require that the University shall assume all risks and waive any claim of liability against the Commission as a condition of project approval.

Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

Archaeological surveys covering all areas of proposed grading and ground disturbance were prepared for the proposed project. The studies identified several previously-recorded archaeological resource sites within the proposed project area but also

confirmed that the sites had been largely removed during previous development activities, and suggested a low likelihood of encountering intact buried archaeological deposits during the proposed ground disturbance activities. However, the project still has the potential to adversely impact archaeological resources and the University has proposed to have an archaeological monitor and tribal representative onsite during ground disturbance activities that would occur within 100 ft. of identified archaeological sites. Because there is still potential for adverse effects to archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources to occur due to inadvertent disturbance during grading and ground-disturbing activities, **Special Condition 14** is necessary to require that a qualified archeological and tribal cultural resource specialist shall be invited and shall be present on site during all proposed ground-disturbing activities, and that if an area of archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources is discovered during the course of the project, project activities with the potential to impact such resources shall cease until further analyzed.

The standard of review for the proposed amendment to the LRDP is consistency with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The standard of review for the proposed NOID is consistency with the policies and provisions of the certified 2010 UCSB LRDP. The LRDP amendment, subject to three (3) suggested modifications, is consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The proposed NOID, subject to seventeen (17) special conditions, is consistent with the policies and provisions of the certified LRDP, if amended and modified pursuant to LRDP Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1.

The LRDP Amendment was filed as complete pursuant to Section 13549 of the California Code of Regulations on March 13, 2025. The NOID shall not be deemed filed as complete until the Commission has acted on the subject LRDP Amendment. According to Section 13537 of the California Code of Regulations, the Commission has 90 days from the date of filing to act on the LRDP Amendment. The motions and resolutions for Commission action can be found starting on **page 12**.

Table of Contents

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 - Vicinity Map

Exhibit 2 - Aerial Overview & Project Locations

Exhibit 3 - Existing and Proposed Development

Exhibit 4 - Proposed Buffer Encroachments

Exhibit 5 - Elevations

Exhibit 6 - Proposed Grading Plans

Exhibit 7 - Proposed Landscaping Plans

Exhibit 8 - Project Drainage Management Flow Areas

Exhibit 9 - Proposed FM Slope Restoration Plans

Exhibit 10 - Proposed East Storke Wetlands Site Restoration Plans

Exhibit 11 - Certified LRDP Figures

Exhibit 12 - Proposed LRDP Figures

Exhibit 13 - University of California Board of Regents Amendment Request

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Substantive File Documents

I. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

A. STANDARD OF REVIEW

LRDP Amendment:
The standard of review for the proposed amendment to the certified LRDP, pursuant to Sections 30605, 30512(c), and 30514(b) of the Coastal Act, is that the proposed amendment meets the requirements of and is in conformance with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

Pursuant to Section 13551(b) of the California Code of Regulations, the University resolution for submittal must indicate whether the LRDP amendment will require formal adoption by the Board of Regents after the Commission approval, or is an amendment that will take effect automatically upon the Commission's approval pursuant to Coastal Act Sections 30512, 30513 and 30519. Because this approval is subject to suggested modifications by the Commission, the University must act to accept the adopted suggested modifications and the requirements of Section 13547, which provides for the Executive Director's determination that the University's action is legally adequate, within six months from the date of Commission action on this application before the LRDPA shall be effective.

Notice of Impending Development:
Section 30606 of the Coastal Act and Title 14, Sections 13547 through 13550 of the California Code of Regulations govern the Coastal Commission's review of specific development where there is a certified LRDP. Section 13549(b) requires the Executive Director or her designee to review the notice of impending development (or development announcement) within ten days of receipt and determine whether it provides sufficient information to determine if the proposed development is consistent with the certified LRDP. The notice is deemed filed when all necessary supporting information has been received.

Pursuant to Section 13550(b) of the regulations, within thirty days of filing the notice of impending development, the Executive Director is to report to the Commission on the nature of the development and make a recommendation regarding the consistency of the proposed development with the certified LRDP. After a public hearing, by a majority of its members present, the Commission determines whether the development is consistent with the certified LRDP and whether conditions are required to bring the development into conformance with the LRDP. No construction shall commence until after the Commission votes to impose any conditions(s) necessary to render the proposed development consistent with the certified LRDP.

B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Section 30503 of the Coastal Act requires public input in preparation, approval, certification and amendment of any LRDP. The University held public hearings and received written comments regarding the projects from public agencies, organizations and individuals. The hearings were duly noticed to the public consistent with Sections

13552 and 13551 of the California Code of Regulations which require that notice of availability of the draft LRDP amendment (LRDPA) be made available six (6) weeks prior to the Regents approval of the LRDP amendment and Final EIR. Notice of the Commission's hearing on the subject amendment has been distributed to all known interested parties.

II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

A. LRDP AMENDMENT NO. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1: DENIAL AS SUBMITTED

Motion I:

> *I move that the Commission certify the University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 as submitted.*

Staff recommends a **NO** vote. Failure of this motion will result in denial of the Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion to certify passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution I:

The Commission hereby denies certification of the University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 and adopts the findings stated below on the grounds that the amendment is inconsistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the amendment would not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act because there are feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant adverse effects that the approval of the amendment would have on the environment.

B. LRDP AMENDMENT NO. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1: CERTIFICATION WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

Motion II:

> *I move that the Commission certify the University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 if modified as suggested in the staff report.*

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 as modified. The motion to certify passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed Commissioners.

Resolution II:

The Commission hereby certifies the University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 as modified and adopts the findings stated below on the grounds that the amendment as modified is consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the amendment if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the amendment on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the amendment on the environment.

C. NOID NO. UCS-NOID-0001-25: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

Motion III:

> *I move that the Commission determine that the development described in the Notice of Impending Development No. UCS-NOID-0001-25 (San Benito Project), as conditioned, is consistent with the certified University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan.*

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in a determination that the development described in the Notice of Impending Development UCS-NOID-0001-25 as conditioned, is consistent with the certified University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan, and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution III:

The Commission hereby determines that the development described in the Notice of Impending Development No. UCS-NOID-0001-25, as conditioned, is consistent with the certified University of California at Santa Barbara Long Range Development Plan, as amended pursuant to LRDP Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 for the reasons discussed in the findings herein.

III. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT NO. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1

Staff recommends that the Commission certify the proposed amendment to the University's certified 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), with three (3) suggested modifications as shown below. Existing language of the certified 2010 LRDP is shown in straight type. Language proposed to be added by the University in this amendment is shown <u>underlined</u>. Language proposed to be deleted by the University in this amendment is shown as ~~strikethrough~~. Language recommended by Commission staff to be inserted is shown in <u>double underline</u>. Language recommended by Commission staff to be deleted is shown in ~~double strikethrough~~. Other suggested modifications that do not directly change LRDP text (e.g., revisions

to maps, figures, instructions) are shown in italics.

1. Facilities Management Text Changes

Text on Page D-10 regarding development at the Facilities Management Site shall be modified as follows:

> **Facilities Management (San Benito ~~Mesa Verde~~)**
>
> The 9-acre Facilities Management site would be redeveloped to provide a maximum of 550 units of largely undergraduate student housing~~, with the potential for some housing for faculty, staff, or families located along the property's northern edge~~. The site is well suited to housing since it is 20 feet below the surrounding mesa and could accommodate relatively high structures without appearing obtrusive. The first level could accommodate some maintenance facilities or even non-residential neighborhood-serving uses. ~~Parking would be provided at the target ratio of one space for every four beds for student housing and 2 spaces for each family unit, including guest parking.~~

2. Facilities Management Site Policy Changes

Policy LU-10 (Pages D-17-18) shall be modified as follows:

> **Policy LU-10** – Residential ~~D~~development at the **Facilities Management Housing** site shall be located within the southern portion (south of Mesa Road) of the approximately 9-acre potential development envelope designated as Housing in Figure D.3. No new development, other than repair and maintenance of existing facilities at their existing heights, demolition of existing facilities, passive public access and recreation, and wetland/habitat restoration shall be allowed on the northern portion of the site. Existing facilities on the northern portion of the site may remain until such time as removal may be required by implementation of the Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy, or at the University's discretion. ~~and~~ Housing development shall be consistent with the following build-out provisions:
>
> - ~~a maximum of 200 faculty/staff/ family housing units;~~
> - a maximum of up to 2,250 student bed spaces;
> - Up to 900,000 GSF development;
> - ~~Heights shall not exceed 65~~ 81 feet on the southern portion of the site and ~~35 feet on the northern portion of the site as shown in Figure D.4;~~
> - Site coverage up to 50 percent; and
> - Maximum onsite population of 3,000
>
> a. Housing unit build-out on this site shall be counted toward the housing development cap consistent with Policy LU-02.

b. Academic and support build-out on this site shall not exceed 185,000 GSF. New academic and support build-out on this site shall be counted toward the 3.6 million GSF campus-wide Academic and Support development cap consistent with Policy LU-01.
c. Bicycle parking serving the development shall be provided on the site. Vehicular parking serving the entire site shall be provided on-site to the extent feasible and in Structure/Lot 22, 30, 38, and 50~~, or consistent with the requirements of Policy TRANS-15B~~.
d. Development on the FM site shall be consistent with the Adopted UCSB Sea Level Rise Strategy and associated LRDP policies.~~Early in the project planning process for the FM site, a site-specific flooding/Sea Level Rise (SLR) study shall be prepared to address the current levels of flooding/SLR and anticipated future levels given the expected life of the new structures. The parameters of the study shall be carried out consistent with Policy SH-04.~~
e. Mesa Road and Stadium Roads shall not be realigned further west due to the presence of ESHA.
f. The ESHA buffer on the north side of the wetland on the FM site may be reduced to a minimum of 50 feet consistent with the allowed buffer reductions in Policy ESH-31 and where fully mitigated consistent with Policy ESH-17. De minimis encroachment into the buffer (<0.5% of total buffer area) is allowed if necessary to accommodate design constraints of a student housing project.
g. The fire reduction/fuel modification plan shall certify that no fire/fuel modification activities shall occur within the wetland or ESHA area.
h. A total of eight (8) voluntary oak tree plantings located along the perimeter of the southern site to be removed for site development shall be replaced at a mitigation ratio of 1:1.
i. Heights at the southern portion of the site shall not exceed the maximum height for each building, described in the following table:

Building Number	Building Height (ft)
1	22.5
2	72.5
3	73.7
4	72
5	80.7
6	80.3
7	81

3. Figure Legend/Key Changes

Within the legend of Figure D.4 "Height Limits," the height limit value next to the yellow box shall be modified as follows: ~~81 feet~~See Policy LU-10

IV. NOTICE OF IMPENDING DEVELOPMENT NO. UCS-NOID-0001-25 SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Consistency with the LRDP

Prior to the commencement of any development, certification of the Long Range Development Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 by the Coastal Commission must be final and effective in accordance with the procedures identified in California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 5.5, Section 13547.

2. Final Habitat Restoration, Monitoring, and Management Program

Prior to the authorization of the notice of impending development (NOID), the University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a Final Habitat Restoration, Monitoring, and Management Program prepared by a qualified environmental resource specialist(s) with experience in wetland and upland restoration. The program shall provide for the revegetation for all wetland and upland areas of the project site that will be either temporarily or permanently disturbed by project activities.

A. The program shall be in substantial conformance with the Facilities Management Slope Restoration Plan (dated January 2025) and Seasonal Pond Restoration Plan (dated January 2025) and shall include the following:

   1. *East Storke Wetland Restoration Project*. The University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, two (2) complete sets of final project plans, including grading plans with cross sections, site plans, and revegetation and restoration plans.

   2. *Facilities Management Slope Restoration Project*. The University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, two (2) complete sets of final project plans, including grading plans with cross sections, site plans, and revegetation and restoration plans.

   3. *Tree Mitigation and Monitoring.* A Final Tree Mitigation and Monitoring Program, as detailed in **Special Condition 3**.

   4. Provision for collection and maintenance, as appropriate, of native wetland and upland plant species, that would be impacted by the project, for future planting. Native wetland and upland plant seeds shall also be collected in anticipation of future plantings. The plan must include a description of the method for collecting, storing, and re-using existing wetland and upland plants, cuttings, and seeds. All native seeds and plants proposed for use in the East Storke Wetland Restoration, Facilities Management Slope Restoration, and Tree Mitigation must be of local genetic origin.

   5. Sufficient technical detail including, at a minimum, a planting program including a description of planned site preparation, method and location of

exotic species removal, methods of invasive species eradication including adherence to **Special Condition 4C** should herbicide use be employed, timing of planting, plant locations and elevations on the baseline map, and maintenance timing and techniques.

6. Documentation of success criteria, which provide a mechanism for making adjustments to the restoration or enhancement project when it is determined, through monitoring, or other means that the program techniques are not working.

7. Documentation of the necessary management and maintenance requirements, and provisions for timely remediation should the need arise.

B. Monitoring Program. Said monitoring program shall set forth the methods, criteria, and success criteria by which the success of the restoration projects shall be determined. The monitoring programs shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Description of the sampling methods (transects, quadrats, photo plots, etc.) that will be employed to track the success of the restoration programs.

2. Interim and Final Success Criteria. Interim and final success criteria shall include, as appropriate: species richness, species diversity, total ground cover of native vegetation, vegetative cover of dominant native species, wildlife usage, hydrology, and presence and abundance of sensitive species or other individual “target” species. The success criteria may be based on appropriate reference sites identified for each habitat type or from peer-reviewed literature.

3. As-Built and Interim Monitoring Reports. The University shall submit an “as-built” report documenting the physical and biological site conditions of the restoration sites within 30 days of completion of the initial grading and plant and seed bank salvage. Following each subsequent year of restoration activities, the University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, on an annual basis, for a period of five (5) years, a written monitoring report, prepared by a qualified environmental resource specialist indicating the progress and relative success or failure of the restoration projects. These reports shall also include recommendations and requirements for additional restoration activities in order for the project to meet the success criteria. These reports shall also include photographic documentation to capture the progress of the restoration efforts. Each report shall be cumulative and shall summarize all previous results. Each report shall also include a “Performance Evaluation” section where information and results from the monitoring programs are used to evaluate the status of the revegetation projects in relation to the interim and final success criteria.

4. Final Reports. At the end of the five-year period, final detailed reports on the restoration projects shall be submitted for the review and approval of the

Executive Director. The final reports shall also address long-term maintenance and management recommendations for the site as appropriate. If one or more of the restoration projects has, in part, or in whole, been unsuccessful, based on the success criteria specified in the respective restoration plans, the University shall submit within 90 days a revised or supplemental restoration program to compensate for those portions of the original program which did not meet the approved success criteria. The revised or supplemental program shall be submitted to the Executive Director, for review and approval.

5. Monitoring Period and Mid-Course Corrections. During the five-year monitoring period, all artificial inputs (e.g., irrigation, soil amendments, plantings) shall cease except for the purposes of providing mid-course corrections or maintenance to insure the long term survival of the restored sites. If these inputs are required beyond the first two years, then the monitoring program shall be extended for every additional year that such inputs are required, so that the success and sustainability of the restoration project(s) are ensured. The restoration sites shall not be considered successful until they are able to survive without artificial inputs.

6. The University shall monitor and provide annual and final reporting, subject to the requirements of this condition described above, for a total of ten (10) years for coast live oak seedlings planted at the West Campus Mesa location, as described in **Special Condition 3**.

C. The University shall undertake development in accordance with the final approved restoration plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final restoration plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final restoration plans shall occur without a new notice of impending development, unless the Executive Director determines that a new notice of impending development is not legally required.

3. <u>Final Tree Mitigation and Monitoring Programs</u>

Prior to the authorization of the notice of impending development (NOID), the University shall submit for the review and approval by the Executive Director, final tree mitigation and monitoring programs, prepared by a qualified biologist, arborist, or other resource specialist, for each proposed replacement tree planting area, which specifies replacement tree locations, tree size planting specifications, and a monitoring program with specific success criteria for each year of the program to ensure that the replacement and planting program is successful. All trees removed shall be replaced in conformance with the standards set forth through LRDP Appendix 2, Section 2.4.1 Tree Removal Replacement Planting Program and Mitigation, except as otherwise permitted through LRDP Policy LU-10. The final tree mitigation and monitoring programs shall collectively provide, at a minimum, the following: (A) 3:1 replacement with native trees for the removal of 11 native trees; (B) 1:1 replacement with native or ornamental trees for the removal of 119 ornamental trees; (C) 10:1 replacement with oak seedlings, less than one year old, grown from acorns collected in the area, for the removal of 29 oak

trees; and 1:1 replacement with oak seedlings, less than one year old, grown from acorns collected in the area for the removal of eight (8) oak trees. Additionally, any ornamental tree, or voluntarily planted oak tree (eight total located at the FM Site), discovered to be a breeding/nesting tree through surveys required by **Special Condition 5** shall be replaced 3:1 with native trees. All trees shall be planted on site to the greatest extent feasible with the remainder planted in ESHA or Open Space. Oak tree plantings shall be supplemented with a mycorrhizal inoculant, preferably oak leaf mulch or from clippings of locally-indigenous species lawfully removed from the site or from sites within the vicinity of the planting site, at the time of planting to help establish plants. The University shall commence implementation of the approved tree replacement and planting programs concurrently with the commencement of tree removal or as soon as feasible, accounting for project-related site constraints, and no later than upon conclusion of proposed construction.

Annual monitoring reports on the replacement trees shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Executive Director for each of the five years of the restoration, enhancement, and monitoring programs. Monitoring and annual reporting shall be provided for an additional five years (ten years total) for all coast live oak seedlings planted at the East Storke Wetland and West Campus Mesa locations. If monitoring indicates the replacement trees are not in conformance with or have failed to meet the success criteria specified in the monitoring programs approved pursuant to this NOID, the University shall submit revised or supplemental planting plans for the review and approval of the Executive Director. The revised planting plans shall specify measures to remediate those portions of the original plans that have failed or are not in conformance with the original approved plans.

4. <u>Management of Sensitive Habitats</u>

By acceptance of UCS-NOID-0001-25, the University agrees to implement the following habitat protection measures with the proposed development:

A. *Timing of Development:*
    1. All grading and vegetation removal activities approved pursuant to UCS-NOID-0001-25 shall not occur during the rainy season (November 1-March 31). This period may be extended for a limited period of time if the situation warrants such a limited extension, if approved by the Executive Director prior to commencement of said activities.
    2. All project activities at the Facilities Management (FM) Site approved pursuant to UCS-NOID-0001-25 shall be prohibited between one hour after sunset and one hour before sunrise, except as approved through the NOID or where otherwise approved in writing by the Executive Director for good cause prior to commencement of said activities.

B. *Mowing:* No mowing or disking for fuel modification or any other use shall occur within wetland, riparian, native grassland, or other environmentally sensitive habitat, except as necessary for maintenance of stormwater management systems and

bioswales or where required for habitat restoration purposes as authorized through UCS-NOID-0001-25.

C. *Herbicide Use:*

a. Herbicide use shall be restricted to the use of aquatic safe herbicides (e.g. Glyphosate Aquamaster™, previously Rodeo™) registered in California by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation appropriate for the respective task/target invasive(s) and shall explicitly comply with label instructions. Adjuvants shall be limited to crop oil concentrates or modified seed oils. Adjuvants and herbicides shall be applied in complete conformance to the label instructions for intended use and shall be monitored on site by Qualified Licensed Applicators (QLAs) or Pest Control Advisors (PCAs). All applicable best management practices shall be applied to avoid wildlife exposure to herbicides in the herbicide use area and nearby surroundings. No use of any herbicide shall occur during the rainy season (November 1 – March 31) unless otherwise allowed by the Executive Director for good cause. In no instance shall herbicide application occur if wind speeds on site are greater than 5 mph or 48 hours prior to predicted rain. In the event that rain does occur, herbicide application shall not resume again until 72 hours after rain.

b. Use, application, storage, safety, and disposal of all herbicides and adjuvants shall comply with the requirements of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, California State Water Resources Control Board, state and federal OSHA regulations, and manufacturer instructions on product labels, Material Safety Data Sheets, and current practices.

c. Herbicide mixing and preparation shall occur at least 100 ft. from all water bodies. Area where herbicide use is employed will also be marked with a non-toxic material (e.g. Blazon, Turfmark).

D. *Fencing:* Permanent fencing in open space and adjacent to sensitive habitat areas shall be designed so as to permit the free passage of wildlife. Any permanent fencing in or near open space or habitat areas shall be designed so that the distance from the ground to the first rung is at least 18 inches. Fencing may be repaired and/or replaced when necessary, in a manner that complies with UCS-NOID-0001-25. All permanent fencing shall be shown on all final plans.

5. <u>Biological Surveys and Construction Monitoring</u>

The University shall retain the services of a qualified biologist or environmental resource specialist (hereinafter, “environmental resource specialist”) to conduct sensitive species surveys (including aquatic species, birds, and terrestrial species) and monitor all construction activities which may impact such species, including demolition, grading, excavation, and vegetation removal. **Prior to commencement of approved development,** the University shall submit the name and qualifications of the environmental resource specialist, for the review and approval of the Executive Director. The University shall have the environmental resource specialist ensure that all project construction and operations are carried out consistent with the following:

A. The University and environmental resource specialist shall hold a pre-construction meeting followed by weekly updates for all construction personnel about the environmental sensitivity of the site, the construction/BMP requirements and reporting rules to avoid adverse impacts, and the particular species of concern.

B. The environmental resource specialist shall conduct surveys 30 calendar days prior to commencement, or recommencement, of the approved development to detect any active sensitive species, reproductive behavior, and active nests within 500 feet of the project site. Follow-up surveys must be conducted one week prior to the initiation of construction and nest surveys must continue on a monthly basis throughout the nesting season or until the project is completed, whichever comes first. If an active nest is located, all work within 500 feet of the nest shall be postponed until such nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no attempt of a second nesting.

C. If an active nest of any federally or state listed threatened or endangered species, species of special concern, or song bird species is found within 300 ft. of the project, or an active nest for any species of raptor is found within 500 ft. of the project, the University shall retain the services of an environmental resources specialist with experience conducting bird and noise surveys to monitor bird behavior and construction noise levels. The nest shall not be removed or disturbed. The environmental resources specialist shall be present at all relevant construction meetings and during all significant construction activities (those with potential noise impacts) to ensure that nesting birds are not disturbed by construction related noise. The environmental resources specialist shall monitor birds and noise every day at the beginning of the project and during all periods of significant construction activities. Construction activities may occur only if construction noise levels are at or below a peak of 65 dB at the nest(s) site. If construction noise exceeds a peak level of 65 dB at the nest(s) site, sound mitigation measures such as sound shields, blankets around smaller equipment, mixing concrete batches off-site, use of mufflers, and minimizing the use of back-up alarms shall be employed. If these sound mitigations measures do not reduce noise levels, construction shall cease and shall not recommence until either new sound mitigation can be employed or the birds have fledged.

D. If an active nest of a federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species, bird species of special concern, or any species of raptor or heron is found, the University shall notify the appropriate State and Federal agencies within 24 hours, and shall develop an appropriate action specific to each incident. The University shall notify the California Coastal Commission in writing by email within 24 hours and consult with the Commission regarding determinations of State and Federal agencies.

E. The environmental resources specialist shall be present during all approved site preparation and grading activities that would occur in ESHA, wetland, and associated buffers.

F. The environmental resource specialist shall be present during all tree and vegetation removal activities and shall be present during all subsequent construction activities during the bird nesting/breeding season if an active nest is identified, until the birds have fledged.

G. The environmental resource specialist shall require the University to cease work should any breach in permit compliance occur, or if any unforeseen sensitive habitat issues arise. If unforeseen impacts or damage occur to sensitive habitats or wildlife species, the University shall be required to submit a revised or supplemental program to adequately mitigate such impacts. The revised or supplemental program shall be processed as a new notice of impending development. If significant impacts or damage occur to sensitive habitats or to wildlife species, the University shall be required to submit a revised or supplemental program to adequately mitigate such impacts. Any native vegetation which is inadvertently or otherwise destroyed or damaged during implementation of the project shall be replaced in kind at a ratio of 3:1 or as otherwise specified by the LRDP, whichever is greater. The revised, or supplemental, program shall be processed as a new NOID.

H. For the purpose of this special condition, “sensitive species” shall be taken to mean any special-status wildlife species. Special-Status Species are species listed as Endangered, Threatened, or Rare under the federal or state Endangered Species Acts, Candidate Species, California Fully Protected Species, and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15380(d), all other species tracked by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which are considered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to be those species of greatest conservation concern, and locally important species including raptors, herons, and songbirds.

6. <u>Construction Staging Area and Fencing</u>

A. All construction plans and specifications for the project shall indicate that impacts to wetlands and environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) shall be avoided and that the California Coastal Commission has not authorized any development in wetlands or other environmentally sensitive habitat other than for restoration/enhancement. Said plans shall clearly identify all wetlands and ESHA and their associated buffers in and around the construction zone. **Prior to commencement of approved development,** the University shall submit a final construction staging and fencing plan for the review and approval of the Executive Director which indicates that the construction zone, construction staging area(s) and construction corridor(s) shall avoid impacts to wetlands and other sensitive habitat consistent with this approval. The plan shall include the following requirements and elements:

(1) Protective fencing shall be used around all ESHA, wetland areas, and their associated buffers that may be disturbed during construction activities, except where development is explicitly authorized through UCS-NOID-0001-25.

(2) Construction equipment, materials, or activity shall not be placed/occur within any ESHA, wetlands or their buffers, or in any location which would result in impacts to wetlands or other sensitive habitat, except where development is explicitly authorized through UCS-NOID-0001-25.
(3) No grading, stockpiling or heavy equipment shall occur within ESHA, wetlands or their buffers, except where development is explicitly authorized through UCS-NOID-0001-25.
(4) No construction materials, debris, or waste shall be placed or stored where it may enter sensitive upland habitat or wetlands, storm drains, receiving waters, or be subject to wind erosion and dispersion.
(5) The plan shall include, at a minimum, a site plan that depicts the following components: limits of the staging area(s); construction corridor(s); construction site; location of construction fencing and temporary job trailers with respect to existing wetlands and sensitive habitat; and public access routes through/around the site.
(6) The plan shall indicate that construction equipment, materials or activity shall not occur outside the designated staging area(s), construction zone, or corridors identified on the site plan required by this condition.
(7) During construction, washing of concrete trucks, paint, equipment, or similar activities shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Wash water shall not be discharged to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, creeks, or wetlands. Areas designated for washing functions shall be at least 100 feet from any storm drain, water body or sensitive biological resources. The location(s) of the washout area(s) shall be clearly noted at the construction site with signs. In addition, construction materials and waste such as paint, mortar, concrete slurry, fuels, etc. shall be stored, handled, and disposed of in a manner which prevents storm water contamination.

B. The University shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Executive Director to determine if a notice of impending development or amendment to the Long Range Development is required to authorize such work.

7. <u>Final Interim Erosion Control Plans and Construction Responsibilities</u>

A. By acceptance of UCS-NOID-0001-25, the University agrees to implement the erosion control measures and construction best management practices contained in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for UCSB San Benito Student Housing, prepared by KPFF Consulting Engineers, dated February 2025, as well as the following requirements:

1. Erosion Control Plan

(a) The plan shall delineate the areas to be disturbed by grading or construction activities and shall include any temporary access roads, staging areas and stockpile areas. The natural areas on the site shall be clearly delineated on the plan and on-site with fencing or survey flags.

(b) The plan shall include a narrative report describing all temporary run-off and erosion control measures to be used during construction.

(c) The plan shall identify and delineate on a site or grading plan the locations of all temporary erosion control measures.

(d) The plan shall specify that grading shall take place only during the dry season (April 1 – October 31). This period may be extended for a limited period of time if the situation warrants such a limited extension, if approved by the Executive Director. The University shall install or construct temporary sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps), temporary drains and swales, sand bag barriers, silt fencing, and shall stabilize any stockpiled fill with geofabric covers or other appropriate cover, install geotextiles or mats on all cut or fill slopes, and close and stabilize open trenches as soon as possible. Basins shall be sized to handle not less than a 10-year, 6-hour duration rainfall intensity event.

(e) The erosion control measures shall be required on the project site prior to or concurrent with the initial grading operations and maintained throughout the development process to minimize erosion and sediment from runoff waters during construction. All sediment should be retained on-site, unless removed to an appropriate, approved dumping location either outside of the coastal zone or within the coastal zone to a site permitted to receive fill.

(f) The plan shall also include temporary erosion control measures should grading or site preparation cease for a period of more than 30 days, including but not limited to: stabilization of all stockpiled fill, access roads, disturbed soils and cut and fill slopes with geotextiles and/or mats, sand bag barriers, silt fencing; temporary drains and swales and sediment basins. The plans shall also specify that all disturbed areas shall be seeded with native grass species and include the technical specifications for seeding the disturbed areas. These temporary erosion control measures shall be monitored and maintained until grading or construction operations resume.

(g) All temporary, construction related erosion control materials shall be comprised of bio-degradable materials (natural fiber, not photo-degradable plastics) and must be removed when permanent erosion control measures are in place. Bio-degradable erosion control materials may be left in place if they have been incorporated into the permanent landscaping design.

2. Construction Best Management Practices

(a) No demolition or construction materials, debris, or waste shall be placed or stored where it may enter sensitive habitat, receiving waters or a storm drain, or be subject to wave, wind, rain, or tidal erosion and dispersion.

(b) No demolition or construction equipment, materials, or activity shall be placed in or occur in any location that would result in impacts to environmentally sensitive habitat areas, streams, wetlands or their buffers.

(c) Any and all debris resulting from demolition or construction activities shall be removed from the project site within 24 hours of completion of the project.

(d) Demolition or construction debris and sediment shall be removed from work areas each day that demolition or construction occurs to prevent the accumulation of sediment and other debris that may be discharged into coastal waters.

(e) All trash and debris shall be disposed in the proper trash and recycling receptacles at the end of every construction day.

(f) The University shall provide adequate disposal facilities for solid waste, including excess concrete, produced during demolition or construction.

(g) Debris shall be disposed of at a permitted disposal site or recycled at a permitted recycling facility authorized to receive the debris materials. If the disposal site is located in the coastal zone, the disposal site must have a valid coastal development permit, or NOID as applicable, for the disposal of fill material. If the proposed disposal site is not authorized to receive fill, a coastal development permit, or NOID as applicable, will be required prior to the disposal of material.

(h) All stockpiles and construction materials shall be covered, enclosed on all sides, shall be located as far away as possible from drain inlets and any waterway, and shall not be stored in contact with the soil.

(i) Machinery and equipment shall be maintained and washed in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents shall not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems.

(j) The discharge of any hazardous materials into any receiving waters shall be prohibited.

(k) Spill prevention and control measures shall be implemented to ensure the proper handling and storage of petroleum products and other construction materials. Measures shall include a designated fueling and vehicle maintenance area with appropriate berms and protection to prevent any spillage of gasoline or related petroleum products or contact with runoff. The area shall be located as far away from the receiving waters and storm drain inlets as possible.

(l) Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Good Housekeeping Practices (GHPs) designed to prevent spillage and/or runoff of demolition or construction-related materials, and to contain sediment or contaminants associated with demolition or construction activity, shall be implemented prior to the on-set of such activity.

(m) All BMPs shall be maintained in a functional condition throughout the duration of construction activity.

B. The final Interim Erosion Control and Construction Best Management Practices Plan shall be in conformance with the site/ development plans approved by the Coastal Commission. Any necessary changes to the Coastal Commission approved site/development plans required by a qualified, licensed professional shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final plans shall occur without a new notice of impending development unless the Executive Director determines that a new notice of impending development is not legally required.

8. Final Drainage and Polluted Runoff Control Program

Prior to commencement of approved development, the University shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Director, final drainage and runoff control plans, including supporting calculations. The plan shall be prepared by a licensed engineer and shall incorporate structural and non-structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to control the volume, velocity and pollutant load of storm water leaving the developed site. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the consulting engineer to ensure the plan is in conformance with engineer's recommendations. In addition to the specifications above, the plan shall be in substantial conformance with the following requirements:

A. Selected BMPs (or suites of BMPs) shall be designed to treat, infiltrate or filter the amount of storm water runoff produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour runoff event for volume-based BMPs, and/or the 85th percentile, 1-hour runoff event, with an appropriate safety factor (i.e., 2 or greater), for flow-based BMPs.

B. Post-development peak runoff rates and average volumes shall not exceed pre-development conditions;

C. Appropriate structural and non-structural BMPs (site design, source control and treatment control) shall be designed and implemented to minimize water quality impacts to surrounding coastal waters;

D. Impervious surfaces, especially directly connected impervious areas, shall be minimized, and alternative types of pervious pavement shall be used where feasible;

E. Irrigation and the use of fertilizers and other landscaping chemicals, including rodenticides, shall be minimized;

F. Debris and other water pollutants removed from structural BMP(s) during clean-out shall be contained and disposed of in a proper manner;

G. There shall be no net reduction in clean storm water runoff to the adjacent wetlands.

H. Runoff shall be conveyed off site in a non-erosive manner.

I. Energy dissipating measures shall be installed at the terminus of outflow drains.

J. The plan shall include provisions for maintaining the drainage system, including structural BMPs, in a functional condition throughout the life of the approved development. Such maintenance shall include the following: (1) BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned and repaired when necessary prior to the onset of the storm season, no later than September 30th each year, and (2) should any of the

project's surface or subsurface drainage/filtration structures or other BMPs fail or result in increased erosion, the University shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the drainage/filtration system or BMPs and enhancement of the eroded area. It is the University's responsibility to maintain the drainage system and the associated structures and BMPs according to manufacturer's specifications, and to ensure proper functioning throughout the life of the project. Should repairs or enhancement become necessary, prior to the commencement of such repair or enhancement work, the University shall submit a repair and enhancement plan to the Executive Director to determine if an amendment or new notice of impending development is required to authorize such work.

K. The University shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final plans shall occur without a new notice of impending development unless the Executive Director determines that a new notice of impending development is not legally required.

9. Final Landscaping Plans

Prior to commencement of approved development, the University shall submit a final landscaping plan, that is in substantial conformance with the Landscaping Plan submitted January 2025, prepared by a licensed landscape architect or a qualified resource specialist, for review and approval by the Executive Director. The plan shall incorporate the following criteria:

A. All disturbed areas on the project site shall be planted and maintained for erosion control purposes as soon as feasible and no later than (60) days after construction is completed. All landscaping shall consist of drought resistant plants/shrubs and trees. No plant species listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Invasive Plant Council, or by the State of California shall be employed or allowed to naturalize or persist on the site. No plant species listed as a 'noxious weed' by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government shall be utilized or maintained within the property.

B. Plantings shall be maintained in good growing condition throughout the life of the project and, whenever necessary, shall be replaced with new plant materials to ensure continued compliance with applicable landscape requirements.

C. Rodenticides containing any anticoagulant compounds (including, but not limited to, Warfarin, Brodifacoum, Bromadiolone or Diphacinone) shall not be used.

D. No mowing, disking, fuel management, or any other use shall occur within wetland, riparian, native grassland, open space or other environmentally sensitive habitat and buffer, except as necessary for maintenance of stormwater management systems and bioswales or where required for habitat restoration purposes as authorized through UCS-NOID-0001-25.

E. The University shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final plans shall occur without a new notice of impending development unless the Executive Director determines that a new notice of impending development is not legally required.

10. Lighting Plan

Prior to commencement of construction, the University shall submit two (2) sets of Final Lighting Plans for review and approval by the Executive Director. The Final Lighting Plan shall conform to and incorporate the following requirements:

(1) The lighting plan shall identify the locations of all existing exterior lighting fixtures on the project site that do not meet the design and efficiency standards set forth in subsection (2) below.

(2) Exterior night lighting shall be designed, installed, and, where applicable, retrofitted to minimize to the greatest extent possible all forms of light pollution, including light trespass, glare, and sky glow consistent with the following:

i) Lighting shall be of low glare design.

ii) No skyward-casting lights shall be used.

iii) Lighting shall use the best available visor technology to minimize light spill and direct/focalize lighting downward, toward the targeted area(s) only. Light shielding shall be shielded to direct light downward onto the subject site and prevent light trespass into campus open space, wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat, ESHA/wetland buffer, and the Goleta Slough.

iv) The lowest intensity lighting shall be used that is appropriate to the intended use of the lighting. Lighting shall use the best available technology and a lighting spectrum designed to minimize lighting impacts on sensitive species and habitat.

v) Where safety goals would be adequately met without overhead lighting, such as along pathways, ground-level directive lights or standards less than three feet in height shall be used.

vi) Programmable timing devices shall be utilized to turn off unnecessary lights where feasible.

(3) Maximum color temperature of lighting fixtures shall contain a maximum color temperature of 3,000 degrees Kelvin (K), unless it can be demonstrated that such features would not meet required safety measures.

(4) All lighting fixtures shall be the minimum lumens (intensity) required for safety and security. No non-security or non-safety lighting and no lighting for aesthetic purposes are allowed.

(5) Security lighting attached to the structures shall use a control device or automatic switch system or equivalent functions to minimize lighting.

(6) All lighting fixtures shall be shielded and directed downward and away from wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat to minimize light shining on adjacent properties or natural areas. Shielded shall mean that the light rays are directed onto the site, and the light source (e.g., bulb, tube, etc.) is not visible beyond the site of the light source.

(7) No permanently installed lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness.

(8) Stand-alone light fixtures shall be limited to the minimum standard (pole) height and height of the light mounting necessary to achieve the identified lighting design objective, and no taller than a maximum height of 20 feet.

(9) Light trespass shall be no greater than 0.01 foot-candles along the site boundary next to campus open space, wetlands, and other environmentally sensitive habitat, ESHA/wetland buffer, and the Goleta Slough. Lighting not adjacent to such habitats/areas shall not produce light trespass greater than one foot-candle (10.76 lumens) beyond the site of the light source.

(10) No night work may occur within 50ft of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat, except as specified through **Special Condition 4**. Nighttime construction work may occur outside of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat provided the lighting substantially conforms with the requirements of this condition, and those of **Special Condition 4**.

(11) Existing “globe” style outdoor light installations on the project site and the vicinity of the project site shall be replaced with new light fixtures consistent with design and efficiency standards set forth in subsection (2) above. Replacement bulbs or fixtures shall be upgraded to incorporate best available technology over the life of the installation.

(12) The lighting plan shall identify the locations of all proposed and retrofitted exterior lighting fixtures and an arrow showing the direction of light being cast by each fixture, the lighting specifications, and the height of the fixtures.

(13) The lighting plan shall be accompanied by an analysis of the lighting plan prepared by a qualified biologist that documents that the lighting plan is effective at preventing lighting impacts upon adjacent wetlands and other environmentally sensitive habitat.

The lighting plan shall be undertaken concurrent with project construction and fully implemented by such time as the San Benito Housing Development is occupied.

11. <u>Structural Appearance</u>

The following design features shall be incorporated into the final project plans for the San Benito Housing Development:

A. All walls and building exteriors shall be limited to colors compatible with the surrounding environment (earth tones) including medium shades of green, brown, and gray with no white or light shades and no bright tones. All wall and building colors shall be maintained throughout the life of the structures.

B. All windows located along perimeter facades and at the proposed market area shall be comprised of bird-safe, non-glare glass. Such windows shall have a "Reflectivity Out" (exterior reflectance) coefficient not exceeding a maximum value of thirteen percent (13%). All bird-safe, non-glare windows shall be maintained throughout the life of the structures.

C. All windows located on perimeter facades over 65ft in height or within 50ft of wetlands or other environmentally sensitive habitat shall incorporate:

    a. *Glare Minimization*. Bird-safe, non-glare glass, as specified through Section B, shall be used to reduce window glare to the maximum extent feasible. If any window is proposed without bird-safe, non-glare glass, exterior fixed design features (e.g., perforated exterior window screening) shall be incorporated that will effectively screen window glare to the maximum extent feasible. All such window glare minimization features shall provide full window coverage, shall be of fixed location, and shall be maintained throughout the life of the structures.

    b. *Light Spillover Minimization.* Interior or exterior fixed design features (e.g., dark tinting, interior or exterior window shading) shall be incorporated that will effectively minimize nighttime light spillover to the maximum extent feasible, and as required through **Special Condition 10**. All window light spillover minimization features shall provide full window coverage, shall be of fixed location, and shall be maintained throughout the life of the structures.

12. Bus Service and Transit Plan

Prior to occupancy of the San Benito Housing Development, the University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a transit plan prepared in consultation with the Metropolitan Transit District for regular bus and/or shuttle service between the development (Stadium Road) and offsite locations. The University shall coordinate with the Metropolitan Transit District on the development of the plans. The plans shall include the locations of stops, hours of service of the bus/shuttle, and frequency of service. Prior to occupancy of the San Benito Housing Development, the University shall submit, for review and approval of the Executive Director, evidence that the shuttle/bus service is in place for the student housing development. The bus/shuttle service shall be implemented according to the final approved plans. The University may discontinue or modify the bus service pursuant to approval by the Executive Director if the University submits evidence the bus/shuttle service is not being adequately used by residences of the student housing project.

13. Removal of Site Materials

Prior to the authorization of the notice of impending development (NOID), the University shall provide evidence to the Executive Director of the location of the disposal site(s) for all debris material (e.g. soil, wood, brush, metal, fluids, concrete, etc.) from the project site. If a disposal site is located in the Coastal Zone, the disposal site must have a valid NOID or CDP for the disposal of such material. If a disposal site does not have a NOID or CDP, such a NOID or CDP will be required prior to the disposal of material.

14. Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

A. **Prior to the commencement of approved development,** the University shall contact all tribes who have requested consultation on this project to give notice that ground disturbance shall be scheduled beginning on or around a specific date. A qualified archaeologist and appropriate Native American consultant with qualifications acceptable to the Executive Director shall be present on-site during all ground-disturbing activities subject to the notice of impending development (NOID). If an area of archeological and/or tribal cultural resources is discovered during the course of the project, project activities with the potential to impact such resources shall cease and shall not recommence until the archaeologist and Native American consultant, in consultation with Native American Tribes listed on an updated Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) contact list, analyze the significance of the find and prepare a supplementary archaeological plan for the review and approval of the Executive Director.

B. Should human remains be discovered on-site during the course of the project, immediately after such discovery, the on-site archaeologist and Native American monitor shall notify the county coroner within 24 hours of such discovery, and all construction activities shall be temporarily halted until the remains can be identified. An “exclusion zone” may be established around the discovery area. If the county coroner determines that the human remains are those of a Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The NAHC shall deem the Native American most likely descendant (MLD) to be invited to participate in the identification process pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The University shall comply with the requirements of Section 5097.98 and work with the MLD person(s) to preserve the remains in place, move the remains elsewhere onsite, relinquish the remains to the descendants for treatment, or determine other culturally appropriate treatment. Within five (5) calendar days of notification to NAHC, the University shall notify the Executive Director of the discovery of human remains and identify any changes to the proposed development or mitigation measures that may be needed related to the inadvertent discovery. The Executive Director shall maintain confidentiality regarding the presence of human remains on the project site. The Executive Director shall determine whether the identified changes are de minimis in nature and scope.

C. If UCSB seeks to recommence project activities within an exclusion zone following discovery of tribal cultural and/or archaeological resources (excluding the discovery of human remains, which shall follow Section 5097.98 as noted in

(B) above), UCSB shall submit a Supplementary Archaeological Plan (SAP) prepared by the project archaeologist in consultation with the Native American Tribes listed on the NAHC list. The SAP shall be submitted for the review and written approval of the Executive Director. If the Executive Director approves the SAP and determines that the SAP's recommended changes to the proposed development or mitigation measures are de minimis in nature and scope, construction may recommence after this determination is made by the Executive Director in writing. If the Executive Director approves the SAP but determines that the changes therein are not de minimis, construction may not recommence until after a new NOID is approved by the Commission.

15. Plans Conforming to Geologic and Geotechnical Consultant Recommendations

The University agrees to comply with the recommendations contained in all of the geology, geotechnical, and/or soils reports submitted for UCS-NOID-0001-25. These recommendations, including recommendations concerning foundations, sewage disposal, and drainage, shall be incorporated into all final design and construction plans, which must be reviewed and approved by the geologic and geotechnical consultant prior to commencement of development. **Prior to the commencement of approved development,** the University shall submit, for review and approval by the Executive Director, evidence of the geologic and geotechnical consultant's review and approval of all final project plans. The final plans approved by the consultant shall be in substantial conformance with the plans approved by the Commission relative to construction, grading, and drainage.

16. Assumption of Risk, Waiver of Liability, and Indemnity Agreement

The University acknowledges and agrees (i) that the site may be subject to hazards including but not limited to flooding, fire, earth movement, erosion, and sea level rise; (ii) to assume the risks to the University and the property that is the subject of this permit of injury and damage from such hazards in connection with this permitted development; (iii) to unconditionally waive any claim of damage or liability against the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees for injury or damage from such hazards; and (iv) to indemnify and hold harmless the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees with respect to the Commission's approval of the project against any and all liability, claims, demands, damages, costs (including costs and fees incurred in defense of such claims), expenses, and amounts paid in settlement arising from any injury or damage due to such hazards.

17. Required Approvals

The University acknowledges and agrees to obtain all other necessary local State or Federal permits that may be necessary for all aspects of the proposed project (including, but not limited to California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Regional Water Quality Control Board). The University shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, either evidence of final required approvals or evidence that no approval is needed. Any change in the approved project which may be required by the

above-stated agencies shall be submitted to the Executive Director in order to determine if the proposed change shall require a new notice of impending development pursuant to the requirements of the Coastal Act and the California Code of Regulations.

V. FINDINGS FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT, AS SUGGESTED TO BE MODIFIED, AND THE NOTICE OF IMPENDING DEVELOPMENT, AS CONDITIONED

The following findings support the Commission's approval of the LRDP amendment if modified as suggested in Section III above, and approval of the Notice of Impending Development, as conditioned by Special Conditions 1-17 set forth in Section IV above. The Commission hereby finds and declares as follows:

A. LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT (LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1) DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The University of California Santa Barbara is proposing an amendment to its certified 2010 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) to allow for the construction of the "San Benito Student Housing Project" (San Benito). The proposed amendment is project-driven and has been submitted in conjunction with a related Notice of Impending Development for the proposed project (UCS-NOID-0001-25). The amendment is proposed in order to accommodate a proposed dormitory complex on the southern portion of the Facilities Management (FM) Site, located at the corner of Mesa Road and Stadium Road, on the University's Main Campus. The proposed project would also include the creation of an offsite stormwater retention basin, located at the University's Storke Campus, in order to meet Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

Development for the San Benito Project is proposed to occur both within the roughly six-acre southern portion of the nine-acre FM Site, immediately east of Stadium Road and south of Mesa Road, and at several offsite locations as well. The southern portion of the FM Site previously held the University's facilities management operations, which have since been relocated to an off-campus location. All previously-existing buildings at the site were demolished through UCS-NOID-0003-04, and the site is currently fenced and vacant, with asphalt and building foundations remaining. No new development is proposed at the northern portion of the FM Site, which currently holds the University's Public Safety Building. Both portions of the FM Site are designated as "Student Housing" by the certified 2010 LRDP. Existing development adjacent to the proposed project site includes the Public Safety Building to the north, Harder Stadium to the west, Parking Lot 30 and Caesar Uyesaka Baseball Stadium to the south, and the Environmental Health and Safety Building to the east.

The certified 2010 LRDP provides specific development standards for the FM Site through Policy LU-10, allowing development of the approximately 9-acre potential development envelope consistent with the following build-out provisions:

- Up to 900,000 GSF development;
- Site coverage up to 50 percent;
- Heights not to exceed 65 feet South of Mesa Road, and not to exceed 35 feet North of Mesa Road;
- Housing to accommodate a maximum of 200 faculty/staff/family housing units and maximum of 2,250 student bedspaces, and;
- A total maximum onsite population of 3,000.

Policy LU-10 also provides other site-specific development standards addressing campus-wide housing allowances, Academic and Support build-out on site, parking requirements, Sea Level Rise analysis, and development-related protections for environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) and wetlands.

The proposed amendment would modify existing policies, development standards, and figures of the certified 2010 LRDP in order to accommodate the proposed San Benito Project. Proposed modifications would:

- Concentrate all housing development in the southern portion of the FM Site (south of Mesa Road);
- Increase the maximum building height from 65 ft. to 81 ft. at the FM Site;
- Amend the LRDP ESHA map to reflect updated wetland and ESHA delineations for the FM Site;
- Allow minor development encroachments into the required 50 ft. wetland buffer at the southern portion of the FM Site;
- Modify site-related parking requirements;
- Allow for retention of treated runoff off-site at the East Storke Wetlands; and
- Revise land use designations at Main Campus.

These proposed changes, along with associated modifications to LRDP text and figures, are detailed further below.

Regarding the site-specific development standards outlined in Policy LU-10 of the certified 2010 LRDP, the Amendment proposes several modifications. These modifications would increase the maximum building height from 65 ft. to 81 ft. on the southern portion of the FM site, and would prohibit new development other than repair and maintenance of existing facilities at the northern portion of the site. The modifications would also remove the policy's cap on faculty/staff/family housing units at the FM Site, would allow a reduction in site-specific parking requirements where supported through a parking analysis as required by Policy Trans-15B, and would update the policy to reflect consistency with the University's recent adoption of its Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy and associated policy modifications approved through LRDP-4-UCS-24-0001-1. Additionally, where the policy allows a reduction of LRDP-required minimum wetland buffer from 100 ft. (Policy ESH-19) to 50 ft. for the buffer north of the wetland located along the southern portion of the southern site, the proposed amendment would allow development encroachments into the 50 ft. buffer where no more than 0.5% of the total required buffer area would be impacted. The University's proposed language is shown below with certified LRDP language shown in

straight type and language proposed by the University to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~ and language to be added in underline.

Proposed LRDP Policy LU-10 (Pages D-17-18):

Policy LU-10 – Residential ~~D~~development at the **Facilities Management Housing** site shall be located within the southern portion (south of Mesa Road) of the approximately 9-acre potential development envelope designated as Housing in Figure D.3. No new development, other than repair and maintenance of existing facilities, passive public access and recreation, and wetland/habitat restoration shall be allowed on the northern portion of the site. Existing facilities on the northern portion of the site may remain until such time as removal may be required by implementation of the Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy, or at the University's discretion. ~~and~~ Housing development shall be consistent with the following build-out provisions:

- ~~a maximum of 200 faculty/staff/family housing units;~~
- a maximum of up to 2,250 student bed spaces;
- Up to 900,000 GSF development;
- Heights shall not exceed ~~65~~ 81 feet ~~on the southern portion of the site and 35 feet on the northern portion of the site~~ as shown in Figure D.4;
- Site coverage up to 50 percent; and
- Maximum onsite population of 3,000

b. Housing unit build-out on this site shall be counted toward the housing development cap consistent with Policy LU-02.
c. Academic and support build-out on this site shall not exceed 185,000 GSF. New academic and support build-out on this site shall be counted toward the 3.6 million GSF campus-wide Academic and Support development cap consistent with Policy LU-01.
d. Bicycle parking serving the development shall be provided on the site. Vehicular parking serving the entire site shall be provided on-site to the extent feasible and in Structure/Lot 30 or consistent with the requirements of Policy TRANS-15B.
e. Development on the FM site shall be consistent with the Adopted UCSB Sea Level Rise Strategy and associated LRDP policies.~~Early in the project planning process for the FM site, a site-specific flooding/Sea Level Rise (SLR) study shall be prepared to address the current levels of flooding/SLR and anticipated future levels given the expected life of the new structures. The parameters of the study shall be carried out consistent with Policy SH-04.~~
f. Mesa Road and Stadium Roads shall not be realigned further west due to the presence of ESHA.
g. The ESHA buffer on the north side of the wetland on the FM site may be reduced to a minimum of 50 feet consistent with the allowed buffer reductions in Policy ESH-31 and where fully mitigated consistent with Policy ESH-17. De minimis encroachment into the buffer (<0.5% of total buffer area) is allowed if necessary to accommodate design constraints of a student housing project.

j. The fire reduction/fuel modification plan shall certify that no fire/fuel modification activities shall occur within the wetland or ESHA area.

In regard to proposed development within wetland buffer at the FM Site, the Amendment also proposes to modify LRDP Policy ESH-31.A.1. This policy addresses the buffer requirements established through ESH-19, and details site-specific development allowances, including those of the FM Site, that would be otherwise inconsistent with the buffer requirements of ESH-19. The University's proposed language is shown below with certified LRDP language shown in straight type and language proposed by the University to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~ and language to be added in underline.

Proposed LRDP Policy ESH-31.A.1 (Page F-23):

1. In lieu of the 100-foot buffer from freshwater marsh and oak woodland ESHA, the Facilities Management project (see Policy LU-10) on Main Campus may be constructed with a minimum 50-foot buffer from the adjacent freshwater wetland and ESHA oak woodland habitat. *De minimis encroachment into the buffer (<0.5% of total buffer area) is allowed if necessary to accommodate design constraints of a student housing project.* ~~, and a~~ A 40-foot to 70-foot buffer on a portion of the southern boundary to accommodate an existing road where there is no potential for its relocation, is allowed as approximately delineated on Figure F.5.

In regard to proposed retention of treated runoff at the East Storke Wetlands, the Amendment proposes to modify LRDP Policy ESH-38. This policy addresses the required protection and restoration of 4.68 acres of undeveloped land at the East Storke Wetlands site, located immediately West of the FM Site, dedicated as ESHA as mitigation for the authorized Recreation Center Expansion project (NOID 2-02). In order to meet Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) stormwater retention requirements, the proposed project would include the creation of an offsite stormwater retention basin located within the eastern portion of the East Storke Wetlands site. Development of the basin would include excavation and revegetation, and would utilize clean water supplied through treated runoff from Main Campus to support wetland habitat restoration while meeting RWQCB requirements. The University's proposed language is shown below with certified LRDP language shown in straight type and language proposed by the University to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~ and language to be added in underline.

Proposed LRDP Policy ESH-38 (Page F-25):

Policy ESH-38 – In order to mitigate the loss of grassland habitat and open space associated with the construction of the Multipurpose Activity Center (MAC [Rec Cen Expansion]), 4.68 acres of land on the eastern side of East Storke Wetland north of Harder Stadium (Figure F.2) is permanently dedicated as

ESHA. The 4.68 acre ESHA shall be permanently maintained and managed to ensure that it functions continuously as a restored ESHA. The mitigation site shall preserve the existing mature trees, provide for additional plantings of locally native trees to enhance the long term viability of raptor habitat, and provide for native grassland restoration, wetland protection and restoration and enhancement where feasible. Clean water runoff (filtered and treated) may be directed into the wetland area to enhance habitat features and for seasonal ponding of peak flows if supported by energy dissipation features to prevent erosion and habitat disruption.

Additionally, the Amendment proposes to further modify parking standards for the proposed development through text changes to the certified 2010 LRDP, removing the existing requirement for minimum parking target ratios established through TRANS-15A. The University's proposed language is shown below with certified LRDP language shown in straight type and language proposed by the University to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~ and language to be added in underline.

Proposed Text Change (Page D-10):

Facilities Management (*San Benito*~~Mesa Verde~~)

The 9-acre Facilities Management site would be redeveloped to provide a maximum of 550 units of largely undergraduate student housing, with the potential for some housing for faculty, staff, or families located along the property's northern edge. The site is well suited to housing since it is 20 feet below the surrounding mesa and could accommodate relatively high structures without appearing obtrusive. The first level could accommodate some maintenance facilities or even non-residential neighborhood-serving uses. ~~Parking would be provided at the target ratio of one space for every four beds for student housing and 2 spaces for each family unit, including guest parking.~~

Furthermore, the Amendment proposes changes to the certified 2010 LRDP in the following figures to update the proposed FM Site buildout and to integrate proposed policy modifications required for the San Benito Project:

- **Land Use Maps.** Amend 2010 LRDP Figure D.1 (Land Uses) and Figure D.3 (Potential Development Areas) to change the land use designation of the southern portion of the proposed Central Utility Plant site and the southern portion of the proposed Lot 17 service vehicle driveway from Recreation to Academic and Support, and to change the southwestern corner of the FM Site from Open Space to Housing, to allow for the proposed development at the project site. Amend 2010 LRDP Figure D.1 (Land Uses) and Figure D.3 (Potential Development Areas) to change the land use designation of the northern portion of the FM Site from Housing to Open Space, consistent with proposed changes to LRDP Policy LU-10.

- **Figure D.4, Height Limits.** Amend LRDP Figure D-4 to show an 81-foot height limit for the southern portion of the FM site and to remove an allowed height limit from the northern portion of the site.
- **Figures Showing ESHA Delineations.** Amend existing ESHA and ESHA buffer designations in LRDP Figure D.1 (Land Uses), Figure D.2 (Land Use Overlays), Figure F.1 (Open Space Areas), Figure F.2 (Historic and Current Biological Resources), and F.5 (ESHA Buffers) to reflect the results of most recent biological studies and wetland delineations.
- **Transportation/Access Figures.** Amend LRDP Figure E.1 (Vehicular Circulation and Parking), E.2 (Bicycle Routes), and Figure E.4 (Coastal Access Program) to reflect infrastructure changes resulting from proposed modifications to Stadium Road and the proposed Lot 17 service driveway, transit stop, and pedestrian and bicycle paths.
- ***Clean-up Amendment - Figure F.5 (ESHA Buffers).** Amend Figure F.5 (ESHA Buffers) to correct an error by changing the buffer distance on the southern boundary of the Facilities Management site from 50 feet to 40-70 feet, consistent with Policy ESH-31(A)(1). *Not required for proposed development.
- ***Clean-up Amendment - (Figure D.3 (Potential Development Areas)).** Amend Figure D.3 (Potential Development Areas) to correct an error by changing the land use designation on the Devereux South Knoll land use from Housing to "Academic and Support" potential development area, consistent with the "Academic and Support" land use designation under Figure D.1 (Land Uses). *Not required for proposed development.

The proposed amendment has been submitted in response to a related notice of impending development, NOID No. UCS-NOID-0001-25, for the construction of a student housing project and associated development, described in greater detail in the next section. As designed, this project could not be approved without the proposed amendment to the LRDP. Therefore, approval of the proposed amendment to the LRDP is necessary in order for the related NOID to be found consistent with the certified LRDP.

B. NOTICE OF IMPENDING DEVELOPMENT (UCS-NOID-0001-25) DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The proposed amendment to the University's certified 2010 LRDP is project-driven, and has been submitted in conjunction with a related Notice of Impending Development, NOID No. UCS-NOID-0001-25. Through this NOID, University proposes: the construction of seven new residential and support buildings up to 81 feet in height with 2,224 beds for students and 14 beds for staff; construction of a new Central Utility Plant and vehicle accessway; roadway changes to Stadium Road; new bicycle parking; new pedestrian and bicycle paths; tree removal and replacement; enhancement of an existing on-site wetland; and excavation and revegetation at East Storke Wetlands for treated-runoff-supported wetland habitat restoration. Student housing created by the proposed new dorms would be utilized by approximately 500 current undergraduate students who reside in existing double- and triple-rooms located elsewhere across

campus, and the remaining 1,724 student beds would be used to house an equivalent increase in the total undergraduate student population enrolled at the University, as allowed through the certified 2010 LRDP. In total, the project would provide 2,238 student and staff bed spaces.

Site Setting and Proposed Development

Development for the San Benito Project is proposed to occur both within the roughly six-acre southern portion of the nine-acre Facilities Management (FM) Site, located east of Stadium Road and south of Mesa Road, and at offsite locations within the University as well. No new development is proposed at the northern portion of the FM Site, which currently holds the University's Public Safety Building. Existing development adjacent to the proposed project site includes the Public Safety Building to the north, Harder Stadium to the west, Parking Lot 30 and Caesar Uyesaka Baseball Stadium to the south, and the Environmental Health and Safety Building to the east. The incorporated community of Isla Vista is located approximately 1,200 feet south of the project site. The Goleta Slough and Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, which are located in the City of Santa Barbara, are north of the project site. The UCSB Storke Campus is west of and adjacent to the project site. Inclusive of the proposed off-site development, the total project area covers approximately 14.6 acres.

Proposed development at the FM Site would include six new dorms, one new student support building, and a central utility plant (CUP). Proposed offsite development would include changes to existing parking at Parking Lot 30, roadway and circulation changes along Stadium Road, the creation of new pedestrian and bicycle paths between the project site and Main Campus, drainage improvements and realignments at Main Campus south of the FM Site, restoration activities and the creation of an offsite stormwater retention basin at the East Storke Wetlands site west of the FM Site, and mitigation tree plantings at the West Campus Mesa. Collectively, the majority of the proposed development would be located near the northwestern portion of the University's Main Campus, while the proposed retention basin would be located on the University's Storke Campus and the mitigation tree planting site would be located on the University's West Campus.

The East Storke Wetlands site and the West Campus Mesa site are designated as "Open Space" by the certified 2010 LRDP. The majority of the greater FM Site (both north and south of Mesa Road) is designated as "Housing" by the certified 2010 LRDP, with areas of designated Open Space located along the site's southern and northeastern bounds. The proposed CUP and service driveway would be located at the southeastern portion of the project site, within an area currently designated as "Academic and Support" (north) and "Recreation" (south). The proposed amendment would convert a portion of the existing Open Space at the southwestern corner of the project site to a Housing designation and would convert a portion of the existing Recreation designation at the southeastern end of the project site to Academic and Support in order to accommodate the proposed development as designed.

Facilities Management Site (Project Site)

The Facilities Management (FM) Site is located at the northwestern corner of the University's Main Campus, immediately east of Stadium Road and bisected into a northern and a southern portion by Mesa Road. The southern portion of the FM Site is vacant (aside from asphalt and the foundations of previously demolished structures), fenced area surrounded by slopes that are approximately 20-feet in height and have a gradient of approximately 2:1. The site was excavated to its current bowl-like configuration in the 1940's, prior to the University's acquisition of the campus. Within the depressed center of the site, the site is level and slopes gently to the north. Earthen slopes surrounding the center of the site support a variety of native and non-native trees and plants, and are fringed by a small, degraded wetland area located along the southern portion of the site (0.67 acres). An ESHA designation is applied to oak woodland areas located at both the southern and northern portions of the site (1.04 acres). The majority of campus-related maintenance and operation activities formerly conducted at the southern portion of the FM Site were relocated in Fall 2023 to an off-campus location just outside of the coastal zone. All previously-existing buildings at the site were demolished through UCS-NOID-0003-04, and the site is currently fenced and vacant, with asphalt and building foundations remaining.

No new development is proposed at the northern portion of the FM Site (north of Mesa Road), which currently holds the University's Public Safety Building. The Goleta Slough is north of and adjacent to the UCSB campus boundary north of Mesa Road and bounding the northern portion of the FM Site. The Slough consists of approximately 440 acres of wetland habitat— 396 of which are included in the Goleta Slough Ecological Reserve, managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The existing storm drain system at Main Campus drains north through an existing outfall into the Goleta Slough.

The proposed project would include the construction and operation of six new dorms, one new student support building, and a central utility plant (CUP) at the FM Site. The new dorms would provide 2,224 beds for undergraduate students and six apartment units with 14 beds for project-related staff. Student housing created by the proposed new dorms would be utilized by approximately 500 current undergraduate students who reside in existing double- and triple-rooms located elsewhere across campus, and the remaining 1,724 student beds would be used to house an equivalent increase in the total undergraduate student population enrolled at the University, as allowed through the certified 2010 LRDP. In total, the project would provide 2,238 student and staff bed spaces.

The six proposed dorm buildings would be six-to eight-stories tall, with a maximum roofline height of 81 ft., as measured from existing grade. The proposed student support building would be two-stories tall, with an approximate roofline height of 23 ft., as measured from existing grade. Construction activities at the project site would require the use of an estimated three fixed-location construction cranes, with heights of approximately 180, 213, and 246 feet above the ground surface. In total, approximately 720,000 gross square feet of floor area would provide student housing; resident-serving recreation and other services; resident-serving retail and food services; and other

Project-related service and support functions. The proposed student rooms and residential support uses – such as student lounges, bathrooms, housekeeping, trash/recycling, circulation, and utility areas – would occupy approximately 642,979 gross square feet of building area, or approximately 89% percent, of the total gross building floor area, while retail and dining, resident-serving, and building support and circulation uses would occupy the remaining 11%. Proposed wall materials would be composed primarily of white-colored serrated precast concrete panels. No more than 35% of each facade would be comprised of window glazing, with the exception of a market area proposed to be predominantly glazed but treated with bird-safe glass in accordance with the LRDP. The University states that upon completion, the proposed project would qualify for LEED gold certification, or greater.

Various site constraints were considered in the siting and design of the proposed development at the project site. The project site is constrained by fault lines to the east, by existing utilities and a roadway to the west, by an ESHA buffer to the North, and by wetland and ESHA buffers to the south. The proposed dorms are oriented east-west, separated by a fire vehicle access lane and landscaped corridors, and utilize a kinked/bent design to maximize usable area. The proposed residence buildings would have a combined footprint of 2.93 acres, equating to 38% site coverage. Installation of significant underground infrastructure required to serve the project site is also proposed, including telecom, electrical, water for heating, domestic water, water for firefighting, sanitary, sewer, and storm drainage. Routing for proposed infrastructure is constrained by site elevation (e.g. gravity lines), required separations between certain utilities such as water and sewer, available fitting angles for pressurized lines, and required duct bank and/or conduit sweeps for dry utilities. Given these constraints, the proposed utility design relies on nearly all of the available space between buildings. While the University's siting of proposed buildings and underground infrastructure would largely comply with known site constraints, a total of 448 square feet of buffer encroachment would occur at the western-most portion of buffer for wetland located along the southern portion of the project site. This encroachment area would account for less than 1% of the total ESHA/wetland buffer present at the project site, and the University proposes to address any potential impacts to ESHA/wetland habitat values from a reduced buffer through proposed habitat restoration and enhancement efforts described in greater detail below. All exterior lighting for the proposed project is proposed to comply with the requirements of the certified 2010 LRDP, with no proposed uplighting and with lighting adjacent to wetland/ESHA proposed to not exceed 3000k and to result in spillover no greater than 0.2 foot-candles within wetland/ESHA boundaries.

At the southeastern portion of the project site, an area of approximately 0.4 acres would be developed to provide a new central utility plant (CUP), with a new service driveway connecting the development pad to Parking Lot 17 located east of the project site. The CUP would contain four 2,229 BTU/hr. heat pumps that would produce hot water to be used for heating purposes within structures at the FM Site. Access to the CUP would primarily be from the proposed service vehicle driveway that would extend southward from the southern end of Parking Lot 17. Noise generated by the operation of the CUP would be attenuated by 10 ft.-high masonry walls around the perimeter of the facility, which would result in noise levels of approximately 47dBA at a distance of 50 feet.

Proposed siting of the CUP would be located outside the 100-foot buffer from the outermost edge of nearby oak woodland ESHA, as required by Policy ESH-19 of the LRDP.

Parking and circulation changes proposed with the project include reductions to existing vehicle parking, creation of new bicycle parking, new pedestrian and bicycle paths, and roadway changes to Stadium Road. Regarding roadway changes, the proposed project would divide Stadium Road into two segments. Stadium Road currently functions as a publicly-utilized roadway that connects Mesa Road (to the north) and El Colegio Road (to the south), and provides access to parking and recreation areas on Main Campus including those of Harder Stadium. The proposed project would divide the roadway into a northern segment that would be closed to public vehicle use between Mesa Road and the Southern end of the FM Site, and a southern segment that would remain open to public vehicle use between El Colegio Road and the southern end of the FM Site. The northern portion of Stadium Road would, however, remain open to emergency vehicles and campus service vehicles, and would be opened to public vehicle use during certain athletic and other University-determined events. A vehicle turn-around/passenger drop-off and pick-up area proposed at the northern end of Lot 30 would enable northbound vehicles on Stadium Road to turn around at the proposed dorms and then return southwards to El Colegio Road. Additional changes proposed along Stadium Road include a new project-serving bus stop for Metropolitan Transit District vehicles and the expansion of existing bicycle parking located near the existing Parking Lot 38 access driveway. A total of 1,924 new bicycle parking racks would be added to the northern end of Parking Lot 30 south of the FM Site, adjacent to the proposed turnaround area. With the proposed development, parking capacity at Lot 30 would be reduced by 86 stalls (360 existing; 274 proposed). The remaining parking would be available to approximately 58 non-student staff, as well as to pre-existing user groups. In order to better connect the project site to the rest of Main Campus, a new pedestrian/bicycle pathway would be constructed between the northern end of Lot 30, through an existing service vehicle driveway located between the southern edge of the FM Site and Northern edge of the baseball stadium, along an existing dirt path located adjacent to recreation fields and the UCSB Recreation Center, and connecting to an existing artery of the larger bicycle path network on Campus. Construction of the proposed bicycle path extension would require removal and relocation of two existing sand volleyball courts located at the southern end of the proposed path.

Proposed development at the project site, CUP area and driveway, and offsite retention basin includes the removal of 167 native and ornamental trees, including 37 oak trees. As required by the LRDP, the University has proposed mitigation tree plantings to offset these removals. Mitigation tree plantings are proposed to be located at on- and off-site locations and would include a total of 315 oak trees/seedlings and a total of 259 other native trees, in accordance with the requirements of the certified LRDP. Landscaping at the project site would include primarily native trees and plants, and would incorporate vegetated bioswales adjacent to the existing degraded wetland area along the southern portion of the site in order to filter and infiltrate drainage from the site while also supporting wetland function.

The University also proposes wetland and oak woodland habitat restoration on the FM site. Of the total proposed project-related grading (30,250 cy. cut; 3,950 cy. fill), grading at the proposed FM Slope Restoration area would include 890 cy. of cut and 0 cy. of fill. Grading in portions of the wetland would be along the bottom of the slope to enhance wetland function, and restoration activities would include widening and deepening the existing wetland, which is currently constrained by existing fencing and pathways that would be removed through the proposed project. Proposed restoration at the FM Slope would enhance approximately 0.67 acres of wetland, as well as approximately 1.04 acres of oak woodland ESHA located on the slope above the wetland. Restoration work includes enhancing the functionality of the wetland and oak woodland components of the area and establishing diverse flowering vegetation in the openings between the woodland areas. Proposed restoration activities would support the restoration or establishment of several plant communities at the project site, including oak woodland (21,500 sf), wetland (~12,500 sf), riparian (6,700 sf), mixed woodland (19,000 sf) and coastal sage scrub (12,800 sf) communities. Additional detail regarding proposed restoration and monitoring activities for the FM Slope Restoration area was provided in the University's application materials, listed in **Appendix 1**.

FM Site and Off-Site Locations (Project Drainage System)

The University proposes a permanent drainage system as part of the project which includes elements on the FM site as well as offsite locations nearby. Stormwater from the project site and designated adjacent areas would be managed using a combination of water retention and treatment features. Biofiltration planters and planter boxes distributed throughout the project site and along Stadium Road would manage and filter stormwater runoff prior to discharge into the University's existing storm drain system under Mesa Road. Biofiltration, bioswales, and site landscaping would provide water quality treatment at the FM Site. However, there is not adequate area onsite to provide adequate retention volume to meet RWQCB post-construction runoff regulatory requirements for retention of the 95th percentile stormwater runoff volume. To meet RWQCB stormwater retention requirements, the proposed project would reroute stormwater runoff from an approximately 22-acre upland portion of Main Campus south of the project site that currently drains towards the project site. A portion of the rerouted stormwater would then drain to storm drains or surface overflow routes downstream (north) of the project site. The University's existing storm drain network which conveys site stormwater north to the storm drain main located under Mesa Road would be replaced with a more complex network of storm drain infrastructure, including replacement of the existing storm drain pipeline extending northward from the housing project site, beneath Mesa Road and along the east side of the UCSB Public Safety building. The new pipeline would follow a similar alignment, would continue to discharge to the Goleta Slough, and would be sized to convey peak flows from a 25-year event.

Stormwater runoff from upland areas south of the project site would also be conveyed through a new pipeline installed in Stadium Road, to a proposed offsite retention basin (described in detail in the next section) to be located within the East Storke Wetland site immediately northwest of the project site. Drainage improvements proposed to direct water from Main Campus to the Offsite basin include installation of a new 12-inch storm drain connected to a new Continuous Deflective Separation (CDS) unit and an existing

storm drain within Stadium Road. The proposed CDS unit would function as a centrifugal filter device to remove solids (including fine and suspended solids) and some oil and grease from water passing through the unit. The Stadium Road drain would include a manhole with two outlets. One outlet would be designed to handle flows associated with the basin's RWQCB-required stormwater retention volume (95th percentile storm), while a second outlet pipe would be designed to ensure that stormwater in excess of the 95th percentile storm is discharged to drainage infrastructure in Mesa Road instead. Treated water directed from the CDS unit towards the offsite basin would flow through a new 18-inch pipe that would extend from the CDS unit in Stadium Road, through the northern end of Harder Stadium field, and northward to the basin. The portion of the proposed pipe between Harder Stadium and the proposed basin would be installed using boring technology (as opposed to trenching) to minimize environmental impact.

East Storke Wetlands Site (Offsite Retention Basin)

As described above, the University proposes the installation of a permanent drainage system for runoff from upland areas of Main Campus that currently drain towards the project site. A part of this system will be a retention basin constructed at the East Storke Wetland site to receive treated stormwater from Main Campus. The East Storke Wetlands site is part of the larger Storke Wetlands area on the University's Storke Campus, and is located immediately northwest of the FM Site, across Stadium Road. The East Storke Wetlands site historically existed as a southwestern extension of the Goleta Slough, but was cut off over time by the development of roads, berms, drainage ditches, and tidal gates. In total, the greater Storke Wetlands area covers approximately 37 acres and provides a variety of wetland and upland habitat types. Restoration and permanent protection of the 4.68-acre East Storke Wetlands site was previously required as mitigation for the authorized Recreation Center Expansion Project (NOID 2-02), but previous efforts by the University to restore the site as an oak woodland proved unsuccessful. Although the East Storke Wetlands site has an ESHA overlay, much of the site is currently characterized by highly degraded wetland area, largely dominated by non-native invasive vegetation. The proposed retention basin at the eastern end of the East Storke Wetlands site – as required to meet RWQCB requirements for the proposed development at the FM Site – will include excavation and revegetation for wetland habitat restoration, utilizing treated runoff directed from Main Campus.

The proposed retention basin will be approximately 1.5 acres in size, with a maximum retention volume of 70,000 cubic feet. The treated water will be conveyed through a pipe from the CDS treatment unit to the retention basin. An area of dense vegetation or small sandstone rocks would be installed at the pipe's outfall into the basin, to prevent scour and erosion within the basin. The University does not propose future routine or maintenance removal of sediment within the basin, as all water directed to the basin would originate in low-sediment areas and would be filtered through the CDS unit prior to arrival at the basin. Grading for the offsite basin would require a total of 2,360 cubic yards of cut and 450 cubic yards of fill. The proposed basin would contain an overflow drain at 10.5 feet elevation, two feet above the proposed basin bottom at 8.5 feet. The overflow drain would connect to an existing storm drain under Mesa Road that flows to an existing channel that discharges to Goleta Slough. Extremely large events or events

occurring when the basin is already full would overflow at 11 feet elevation into an existing channel north of the basin that flows under Mesa Road through a 72-inch corrugated culvert. The water retention portion of the basin would be approximately two- to three-feet deep.

The University proposes habitat restoration at the East Storke Wetlands site which would incorporate the proposed retention basin as a treated-runoff-supported wetland within a larger habitat restoration area. Degraded habitat currently present at the site would also be restored through the planting of native vegetation both in and around the basin to create a variety of habitat types at the site, including: emergent wetlands, alkali wetlands, coastal sage scrub, grassland, and oak woodland. The University has proposed to site 36 coast live oak acorns/seedlings within the restoration area adjacent to the proposed basin, as mitigation plantings required for tree removals proposed with the project. As noted above, routine maintenance including dredging and sediment clearing would not be required within the basin, and as such are not proposed. Mosquito management within the basin would be overseen by Santa Barbara County's Mosquito and Vector Management District Board (MVMDB), consistent with other areas of standing water at the University. Additional detail regarding proposed restoration and monitoring activities for the East Storke Wetland site was provided in the University's application materials, listed in **Appendix 1**.

West Campus Mesa (Offsite Mitigation Tree Planting)

The West Campus Mesa site is a 9.5-acre area located on the University's West Campus, between Slough Road (to the north and west) and West Campus Point Road (to the south and east). Prior to the Rancho Period when certain native habitat areas were removed, this site would have been characterized as oak woodland. The site is currently dominated by legacy non-natives, with volunteer native colonization by coyote brush, elderberry, California everlasting, and coast live oaks. An ESHA designation is applied to portions of the site, as depicted in LRDP Figure D.2. Mitigation oak tree plantings within this area would be located within a bowl-shaped area north of an existing riding ring, and amongst a matrix of colonizing coyote brush and volunteer oaks on the north and west sides of the site. Proposed plantings would support the transition of the site to a mixed woodland, which would provide valuable habitat for White-tailed kites and other woodland species while further buffering Devereux Slough from development on West Campus. The University has proposed to site 273 coast live oak acorns/seedlings within the West Campus Mesa area, as mitigation plantings required for tree removals proposed with the project. Additional detail regarding proposed restoration and monitoring activities for the West Campus Mesa site was provided in the University's application materials, listed in **Appendix 1**.

Construction Schedule and Staging

Project activities are proposed by the University to commence in April 2025, following Commission authorization of LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 & UCS-NOID-0001-25, and are projected to be completed in August 2027.

Proposed construction operations would generally occur between 7:00 AM and 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Construction operations would also periodically occur on weekends and until 7:00 PM on weekdays for operations including, but not limited to: extended concrete pours, testing of building mechanical systems, temporary road closures, utility work, and deliveries of items such as building furniture and equipment. Additionally, swing shifts with extended construction hours between 4:00 PM to 12:00 AM are proposed for underground mechanical, electrical, and plumbing utility works between June 2025 and February 2026, and for exterior panel work between February 2026 and May 2026. Associated impacts with proposed extended construction hours would be temporary and would be limited to the construction phase of the Project.

Throughout the project's proposed 28-month construction period, a number of staging areas would be required for the temporary siting of construction office trailers, worker parking, and construction materials. The following areas would be used by the project for temporary staging:

- Staging site located approximately 150 feet west of the Los Carneros Road/Mesa Road intersection on the UCSB Storke Campus. This site is frequently used by UCSB to store construction-related material, such as excess soil, construction equipment, and building materials. The site would be used for construction material and equipment staging.
- University-owned property in the Cabrillo Business Park. The Cabrillo Business Park property is located off campus, but less than one mile from the proposed project site. The eastern end of the site would be used for construction material staging.
- Parking Lot 30. The northern portion of Lot 30 (immediately south of the FM Site) would be used for temporary installation of construction office trailers. Lot 30 would be closed to non-project use during construction.
- Parking Lot 38. This parking lot is east of the housing project site and approximately 600 feet east of Stadium Road. The lot would be used for construction worker parking and for the siting of temporary construction office trailers. Lot 38 would be closed to non-project use during construction.

Throughout the proposed project's construction period, traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety control measures would be implemented, including the use of: temporary fencing around the construction site and staging areas, barriers, signage, flag persons, traffic control persons, and temporary roadway rerouting. Following completion of proposed construction activities, all areas within and adjacent to staging areas that were disturbed by construction-related operations would be restored to their previous condition.

C. CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

The standard of review for the proposed LRDP amendment is the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The standard of review for the related NOID is the policies of the certified 2010 LRDP. NOID No. UCS-NOID-0001-25 is not consistent with the certified LRDP unless the proposed LRDP Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 is

approved and certified. **Special Condition 1** for NOID No. UCS-NOID-0001-25, therefore, stipulates that prior to the commencement of any development, certification of the Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 by the Coastal Commission must be final and effective in accordance with the procedures identified in California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 5.5, Section 13547.

Visual Resources

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, which has been incorporated in the certified LRDP, requires that visual qualities of coastal areas be considered and protected, landform alteration shall be minimized, and where feasible, degraded areas be enhanced and restored. This policy requires that development be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and other scenic coastal areas. This policy also requires that development be sited and designed to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas. Several prominent visual features are located within and adjacent to the San Benito Student Housing project site, including the on-site wetland and vegetated slope on the southern and western portions of the site, the East Storke Wetlands west of the site, and the Goleta Slough to the north of the site.

The LRDP contains policies to ensure that the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, including building height restrictions. Policy LU-10 requires building heights on the proposed project site to be a maximum of 65 ft. Policy SCEN-01 requires new structures to be in general conformance with the scale and character of surrounding development, and clustered developments and innovative designs that would minimize impacts to visual resources are encouraged. Policy SCEN-03 requires new development to be sited and designed to minimize adverse impacts to scenic resources to the greatest extent feasible as well as requires the University to enhance primary and secondary view corridors (as shown in the LRDP) where feasible.

Generally, the LRDP directs Main Campus buildings to be developed in concentric zones consistent with 35-foot, 45-foot, 65-foot and 85-foot maximum height profiles. Higher profile buildings are designated to the core of the Main Campus with lower height buildings maintained along the perimeter, allowing views from inland buildings to the coast and providing “stepped-levels” of development which sets back the larger campus buildings from surrounding areas and reduces the impact of new structures on scenic and visual qualities. Although the subject site is along the perimeter of the Main Campus, it was given a 65-foot height limit in the certified LRDP due to the site’s existing topography. In the 1940s, a large portion of this site was carved out and the material was presumably used to fill what is now the airport, leaving an approximately 20-foot high hillside which aligns the south of the site. When the LRDP was updated in 2014, the Commission found that given the site’s topography and the natural buffers that would be maintained along the Goleta Slough, increasing the southern portion of the FM site’s (south of Mesa Road) height limit from 35 ft. to 65 ft. would not adversely impact public views, scenic resources, or the character of the area. The height limit for the northern portion of the FM site (north of Mesa Road) was retained at 35 ft.

Today, the University is proposing to further increase the maximum building height at the project site (the southern portion of the FM site). The proposed student housing site is part of what is known as the Facilities Management site, which consists of the bowl-shaped area located south of Mesa Road and east of Stadium Road as well as the existing Public Safety site located on the north side of Mesa Road. The proposed LRDP amendment would remove all building height requirements for the portion of the Facilities Management site north of Mesa Road (i.e., the northern portion of the site) and would allow a maximum height of 81 ft. for the portion of the Facilities Management site south of Mesa Road (i.e., the southern portion of the site). These changes are proposed through text edits to Policy LU-10 and edits to Figure D.4 which shows height limits for all areas of the campus.

The University is proposing to build seven new buildings at the project site. Six of the buildings would be between six and eight stories tall to house university students, and one building would be two stories tall to provide student services for the residents. The siting and design of the buildings is such that the building heights increase from north (adjacent to Mesa Road) to south (adjacent to the existing approximately 20-foot high hillside). Therefore, with the exception of Building 1, which would essentially be built into the hillside, the shortest buildings (approximately 72 and 74 ft. tall) are adjacent to Mesa Road and closest to Goleta Slough, while the tallest buildings (approximately 80 and 81 ft. tall) would be in the center of the site and adjacent to the hillside on the southern edge of the site.

The University has submitted photo simulations of the proposed development from various public viewpoints to support the proposed increase of the maximum allowable building height on the site. As the photo simulations show, due to the site's location on the northern side of Main Campus, the proposed development would not impact public views to or along the ocean. However, the site is visible from public viewpoints adjacent to and across from the Goleta Slough. These viewpoints range from approximately 0.3 miles away at the intersection of Mesa Road and Los Carneros Road to approximately 1 mile away on a public trail near Highway 217. These views of the project site are distant and located adjacent to industrial and commercial uses such as the Santa Barbara Airport. However, despite the distant views, the proposed project will be visible from the surrounding area. The University's visual analysis included photo simulations of the LRDP buildout in addition to the proposed project. The LRDP buildout photo simulations included 65 ft. tall buildings on the project site as well as a 35 ft. tall building on the northern portion of the project site and a 70 ft. tall structure on Lot 30. The submitted visual analysis shows that although the proposed buildings would be more visible from nearby public viewpoints than the 65 ft. tall buildings allowed by the LRDP, the difference would not result in a significant impact to visual resources. Further, the proposed development has been designed to fit within the previously disturbed site and would therefore not require a significant amount of grading or result in any significant alteration of natural landforms.

The University has indicated that although the proposed building heights are greater than what is allowed by the certified LRDP, the proposed project is consistent with the "stepped-levels" approach that was found by the Commission to not have adverse impacts on public views, scenic resources, or the character of the area when the

Commission certified the previous LRDP update. However, while the buildings proposed as part of the NOID are sited and designed such that the shorter buildings are in the most visible locations and step up to the highest structures, the proposed LRDPA includes a blanket maximum height of 81 ft. for the entire site. So, the LRDP, as proposed to be amended, would not ensure that buildings on the site will incorporate a stepped-level siting and design that is necessary to minimize impacts to visual resources. While the Commission agrees that the proposed project will minimize impacts to visual resources, the University's proposal to allow a maximum building height of 81 ft. for the entire site is inconsistent with protecting the visual quality of the subject area. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to specify the maximum allowable height for each proposed building, and **Suggested Modification 3** is necessary to modify the proposed changes to Figure D.4 (which include the blanket proposed height limit value of 81 ft.) to instead reference Policy LU-10.

Views of the project along the adjacent scenic route of Mesa Road are towards the development node of Main Campus, and therefore, the proposed development would not interfere with views to Goleta Slough north of the site. The northern portion of the site (the existing Public Safety site) is, however, between Mesa Road and the slough, but no development or redevelopment is proposed on this portion of the site. In fact, the proposed amendment includes the addition of language to Policy LU-10 that allows only passive public access and recreation, and wetland/habitat restoration on the area of the site north of Mesa Road in the future. The existing buildings may be repaired and maintained until they are required to be removed through implementation of the University's Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy or at the University's discretion. The University is also proposing to change the land use designation of the northern portion of the site from Housing to Open Space, which further indicates the University's intent to not propose new development in the future. Since this portion of the site is closer to Goleta Slough, not allowing an increase in the height of the existing development would help to maintain the existing scenic quality of the area. Further, although the University is proposing to add language to require no new development other than repair and maintenance to the existing facilities, it is necessary to ensure that such repair and maintenance does not increase the existing heights of the facilities. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to add text to clarify that the existing facilities may be maintained at their existing heights. Additionally, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to clarify that demolition of the existing facilities is also allowed.

While the Commission finds that the increased height of the structures from 65 ft. to a maximum of 81 ft. will not have a significant impact on visual resources, light emanating from the structures, particularly at night, as well as glare during the day, may have a significant impact on visual resources, especially for the floors above 65 ft. Therefore, **Special Condition 11** is necessary to require all windows located on building facades along the perimeter of the site and above 65 ft. on the building to be designed to minimize glare to the maximum extent feasible through window design features, such as perforated exterior window screening as well as require window design features, such as dark tinting or automated window shading, to effectively minimize nighttime light spillover to the maximum extent feasible. Further, the proposed wall materials would be composed of white-colored serrated precast concrete panels; however, Policy SCEN-05

requires natural building colors that are compatible with the surrounding landscape to be used where practical. In this case, the building exteriors will be made of concrete, the color of which can easily be adjusted. Therefore, in order to be consistent with the visual resource policies of the LRDP, **Special Condition 11** is also necessary to require all building exteriors to be limited to earth tone colors that are compatible with the surrounding environment, including shades of green, brown, and medium gray.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the LRDP, only as modified, is consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Acts. In addition, the notice of impending development, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable policies of the LRDP, as amended, with regard to visual resources.

Public Access

The University's certified LRDP incorporates by reference Coastal Act Sections 30210, 30211, 30212, 30213, and 30252 concerning coastal recreation and access. Coastal Act Sections 30210 and 30211 mandate that maximum public access and recreational opportunities be provided and that development does not interfere with the public's right to access the coast. Section 30212 of the Coastal Act, as incorporated in the LCP, requires that public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast be provided in new development projects with certain exceptions such as public safety, military security, resource protection, and where adequate access exists nearby. In addition, Section 30213 requires that lower cost visitor and recreational opportunities be protected, encouraged and, where feasible provided. Section 30252 of the Coastal Act states, in part, that the location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by facilitating the provision or extension of transit service and providing adequate parking facilities or provide substitute means of serving the development with public transportation.

Parking

Coastal access is generally viewed as an issue of physical supply and is dependent not only on the provision of lateral access (access along a beach), but also the availability and ease of transportation options, such as public parking, for visitors. In past Commission actions, the Commission has found that the availability of public parking, including on-street parking, constitutes a significant public access and recreation resource and is as important to coastal access as shoreline accessways. The proposed San Benito housing project consists of the construction of a new 2,224-student bed housing complex with dining and other student services that would employ approximately 58 non-student full time staff, which would contribute to additional demand for parking for residents, visitors, and staff on the Main Campus. The proposed project, however, would not add any additional parking on campus, and would eliminate approximately 86 existing parking spaces.

In addition to the Coastal Act policies noted above, the LRDP contains policies that require the University to accommodate coastal visitor parking as well as provide sufficient parking to meet the demands of development so as not to impact coastal visitor parking. LRDP Policy LU-10 requires the proposed development to provide

vehicular parking on site to the extent feasible or within Lot 30 which is directly adjacent to the project site. Additionally, LRDP Policy TRANS-15 requires dormitory housing to provide a ratio of 1 parking space for every 4 student bed spaces (which would equate to 556 parking spaces for the proposed project) as well as provide adequate guest parking. The LRDP includes these requirements, because inadequate on-site parking has the potential to create or exacerbate existing parking problems and discourage access to the coast by both directly using coastal access parking spaces and indirectly by raising the level of difficulty to find an available space which may lead to more traffic congestion, more car idling, and longer wait times. Although the proposed project site does not contain coastal access parking and is not located directly adjacent to any coastal access points, parking demands from the project could have a ripple effect that does ultimately impact nearby coastal access parking. For example, the nearby residential area of Isla Vista has multiple coastal access stairways to the beach. However, if the proposed project does not provide sufficient parking, residents, staff, and visitors may end up using on-street parking in Isla Vista, which would exacerbate the area's already impacted parking availability and which would make it more difficult for the general public to visit Isla Vista beaches. Therefore, the proposed LRDP Amendment and NOID requires site-specific data to show that proposed parking provisions are adequate to accommodate all parking needs of the project.

The University is proposing to amend Policy LU-10, which provides the build-out provisions of the proposed housing site, to require that parking is either provided on site and in Lot 30 or to be consistent with the requirements of Policy TRANS-15B. Policy TRANS-15B allows for a reduced number of parking spaces to be approved if a site-specific parking study shows that the actual parking need for the development is lower than the total number of spaces required. As part of the LRDP and NOID submittal, the University provided a parking study to support the proposed project, which would not provide any additional campus parking. The parking analysis asserts that the actual existing demand for parking is less than the required four to one ratio stipulated in Policy TRANS-15, because the number of permits sold to undergraduate residents in Fall 2023 and Spring 2024 actually equates to one permit per five beds. The parking study goes on to state that there is a sufficient amount of parking available in existing parking lots and structures on campus, including Lot 38, which is approximately 800 ft. west of the housing site, Structure 50, which is approximately 510 ft. southwest of the project site, and Structure 22, which is 2400 ft. south of the project site. More specifically, the parking analysis indicates there is an average availability of 272 housing-allocated parking spaces in Lot 38, an average availability of 330 housing-allocated parking spaces in Structure 50, and an average availability of 118 housing-allocated parking spaces in Structure 22. Together, the parking analysis approximates 720 housing-allocated parking spaces available in Lot 38 and Structures 50 and 22, which would be enough to accommodate the 556 spaces required by Policy TRANS-15 for the proposed project.

Although the subject LRDP amendment proposes to change the requirements of Policy LU-10 to allow for a reduction of the parking ratio required by Policy TRANS-15, the submitted NOID, however, does not propose to reduce the required parking ratio for the proposed project. Rather, the University is proposing to accommodate student

residential parking generated by the project in existing parking lots on campus. This approach is consistent with Policy TRANS-18, which allows for residential parking to be assigned to existing parking locations with available capacity. Therefore, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to delete the proposed reference to Policy TRANS-15B in Policy LU-10 since the project, as proposed, would be consistent with all of the requirements of Policy TRANS-15. Additionally, Policy TRANS-18 requires residential parking for each campus housing development to be assigned to a particular parking location(s), and the University has indicated Lot 38 and Structures 50 and 22 would be the parking areas assigned to serve the residential parking for the new development. However, Policy LU-10 only requires parking for the development to be provided on-site or in Lot 30. In order for the proposed amendment to be consistent with Policy TRANS-18, **Suggested Modification 2** is necessary to modify Policy LU-10 to require parking to be provided in Lot 38 and Structures 50 and 22, in addition to the site itself and Lot 30.

In addition to the residential parking demand, the project would also generate commuter parking demand as approximately 58 full-time equivalent staff (not including student workers) would be employed at the project site. According to the submitted parking analysis, approximately 50% of the new staff would drive alone to work and approximately 11% would carpool or vanpool, which would result in a parking demand of 32 spaces. Parking Lot 30, which is adjacent to and south of the housing project site, is designated for commuter (i.e., faculty and staff) and visitor parking. Because the project would eliminate 86 existing parking spaces from Lot 30, this lot would be reduced to 274 parking spaces. Parking surveys of Lot 30 in Fall 2023 and Winter 2024 resulted in an average peak weekday demand of 48 spaces resulting in approximately 226 spaces available for additional commuters, which would easily accommodate the estimated commuter demand of the project. Additionally, Lot 30 also allows for visitor parking. After accounting for the employee parking demand of 32 spaces, Lot 30 would have approximately 194 spaces available for visitors at peak demand.

Alternative Transportation Options

Consistent with Policy TRANS-02, the proposed project includes the extension of an existing bus line and a new bus stop approximately 500 ft. southwest of the project site across Stadium Road adjacent to Harder Stadium. This bus line would serve the student residents and employees at the project site. Each University student receives unlimited bus use (paid for through student fees) on all Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) bus lines, which serve the University as well as the region from the City of Goleta to the City of Carpinteria. Employees can choose to partake in the University's transportation alternative program (TAP), which offers discounted bus passes, a limited number of complimentary parking days per quarter, and discounted carpool permits among other benefits. MTD buses connect to other regional buses that serve Ventura County and northern Santa Barbara County, as well as Amtrak train service, the Santa Barbara Airport, and Greyhound. Other vehicle transportation options include Zipcars, which are rental cars parked on campus that can be rented by the day or by the hour, and taxicab or other rideshare services. Extension of MTD bus service to the project site, along with the other vehicle transportation options, will help to offset increased

demand for parking which will ultimately protect existing coastal access parking on campus and coastal access on-street parking in Isla Vista. To ensure bus service to the project site is implemented, the Commission finds **Special Condition 12** is necessary to require the University to submit a transit plan, prepared in consultation with MTD, with the location of stops and the hours and frequency of service, as well as evidence that bus service is in place prior to occupancy of the student housing development.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Amenities

As noted above, the proposed project would remove 86 existing parking spaces in Lot 30, which is necessary to accommodate a bicycle parking area that would provide approximately 1,924 bicycle parking racks. A second bicycle parking area for approximately 300 bicycles would be located adjacent to the existing tennis courts southwest of the project site. These two bicycle parking areas would provide a total of 2,224 bike spaces or one bike space per student bed, which is consistent with LRDP Policy TRANS-06, which requires additional bicycle parking facilities as part of all campus building projects.

The proposed project also includes new pedestrian and bicycle paths to connect the proposed housing development to other areas on campus. A proposed sidewalk and bicycle path would follow an existing service vehicle driveway located along the southern edge of the housing project site. At the eastern end of the service driveway, the proposed path would turn south past an electrical substation, then follow an existing dirt path that is adjacent to sports fields and the UCSB Recreation Center. The southern end of the new sidewalk and bicycle path would connect to an existing east-west path near the Arnhold Tennis Center. A new bicycle roundabout would be constructed at this new intersection, and the existing pathways would be realigned slightly to intersect with the roundabout. Additionally, the project proposes to reconfigure the portion of Stadium Road directly adjacent to the project site in order to facilitate project-related pedestrian circulation. This portion of Stadium Road would be generally closed to through traffic between the housing site's main entrance located on the south side of the proposed buildings and Mesa Road. A new vehicle turn-around/passenger drop-off and pick-up area would also be located adjacent to the site's main entrance. The proposed bicycle and pedestrian amenities will help to facilitate public access by connecting the project site to the existing bike and pedestrian path network that includes several miles of pathways and trails that connect to the coast.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the LRDP, only as modified, is consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act with regards to public access. In addition, the notice of impending development, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable policies of the LRDP, as amended, with regards to public access.

Biological Resources and Water Quality

Coastal Act Section 30230, which has been included in the certified LRDP, states that marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced and where feasible restored and that special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological significance.

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act, which has also been included in the certified LRDP, states, in part, that the quality of coastal waters, streams, and wetlands shall be maintained and where feasible restored. Section 30233 of the Coastal Act, included in the certified LRDP, states, in part, that the diking, filling, or dredging of wetland areas shall not be allowed with the exception of development for incidental public services, restoration purposes, and nature study or aquaculture. Section 30240 of the Coastal Act, which has been included as part of the University's certified LRDP, states that environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs) shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values and that development in areas adjacent to ESHA shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that would significantly degrade such areas. ESHAs are defined as areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. Further, Section 30240 states that only uses dependent upon ESHA resources shall be allowed in such areas.

Additionally, the LRDP contains several policies that address sensitive resources. For instance, LRDP Policy ESH-17 requires ESHA on campus to be protected and, where feasible, enhanced and restored, and Policy ESH-25 requires the biological productivity and quality of campus wetlands to be maintained, and where feasible, restored. Policy ESH-19 requires native vegetation buffers between new development and freshwater wetlands and ESHA, and Policy ESH-20 requires that where development is sited adjacent to buffers, the new development shall enhance the buffer with native vegetation.

<u>On-Site ESHA/Wetland</u>
The subject site (FM site) has a unique bowl-like shape where the interior of the site is relatively flat and has been previously graded and developed and the perimeter of the site is a vegetated hillside that contains coast live oaks, eucalyptus, and other native and non-native vegetation. A wetland exists between the developed interior of the site and the eastern and southern portions of the hillside. To confirm the biological resources and boundary of the wetland on the site, two ESHA and wetland assessments were conducted for the proposed project, dated May 2024 and September 2024.

The vegetated area on the site's west side contains eucalyptus, oaks, and other landscape trees, including coast live oaks that were voluntarily planted by the University in 2018. The northern boundary of the site consists of landscape shrubs and trees as well as a mowed roadside turf area. The eastern and southern portions of the vegetated hillside contain oak woodland, stands of poison oak, and non-native vegetation. A seep exists along the bottom of the eastern and southern portions of the hillside that has allowed for wetland associated species, such as sandbar willow and rabbit's-foot grass, to grow. The LRDP designates the wetland and oak woodland on the FM site as ESHA.

Other areas that were surveyed by the University's biologist include the site of the proposed Central Utility Plant as well as areas north of Mesa Road which are designated in the LRDP as ESHA. The Central Utility Plant site contains eucalyptus trees, annual brome grassland, coyote brush scrub, and landscaping trees and shrubs.

A small manmade drainage channel is also located within this area, which supports a few wetland-related species including arroyo willow, rabbit's-foot grass, tall flat sedge, and western bent grass. The area northeast of the project site between Mesa Road and the UCSB boundary that is designated as ESHA in the LRDP contains turf that is regularly mowed and one non-native palm tree. Coast live oaks exist on the other side of a fence that demarcates the boundary between the University and the Santa Barbara Airport property. Canopies of some of the coast live oaks have grown over and onto the UCSB side of the fence.

The 2024 biological assessments revised the boundaries of the onsite wetland and oak woodland to accurately depict the resources as they currently exist. The designated ESHA on the north side of Mesa Road was also revised to only include the existing oak tree canopy as the remainder of the area consists of disturbed non-native roadside turf and other non-native plants. Commission ecologist Dr. Jonna Engel has reviewed the submitted biological resources surveys and visited the surveyed locations. Dr. Engel agrees with the ESHA and wetland boundary determinations as shown and described in the Assessment Report, dated September 2024, prepared by Padre Associates, Inc.

In addition to designating ESHA on the UCSB campus, the LRDP also includes policies that require buffers to protect ESHA and wetland resources from the direct effects of nearby disturbance (both acute and chronic). The Commission notes that unless adequate buffer areas are provided between development and habitat areas, new development will result in adverse effects from contaminated and increased runoff, increased erosion, displacement of habitat, and disturbance to wildlife that are dependent upon such resources. Applications for proposed development that have come before the Commission have typically provided for a 100 ft. open-space buffer between new development and ESHA and wetland areas, and when not proposed by the applicant, such buffer areas have been required by the Commission to protect those resources.

Although the Commission, as well as the certified LRDP, typically require a 100 ft. buffer for new development, the LRDP notes that in light of the significant benefits of clustering development in specific locations on Main Campus, the University may construct some development with an ESHA or wetland buffer that is less than 100 ft. In 2014, the Commission certified Policy ESH-31 as part of the most recent LRDP comprehensive update and found that on balance it was more protective of all significant coastal resources, including sensitive habitat and public access, to allow some encroachment within identified ESHA and wetland buffers in order to obtain substantial resource benefits from clustering development in a manner that would result in permanently protecting the most valuable habitat and retaining the scenic character of coastal areas on campus. Specifically, Policy ESH-31 allows for development on the subject site to be constructed with a minimum 50 ft. buffer from the adjacent on-site wetland and oak woodland habitat as well as maintain a 40 to 70 foot buffer along the southern boundary of the onsite wetland/ESHA to accommodate an existing road that cannot be relocated.

As previously noted, the University's biological consultant prepared two ESHA and wetland assessments for the subject project, dated May 2024 and September 2024. The proposed project was initially designed according to the May 2024 wetland

delineation. This delineation was submitted to Commission staff in June 2024 during pre-submittal coordination on the project. Commission ecologist Dr. Jonna Engel reviewed the wetland delineation and vegetation mapping in the report and observed discrepancies between the vegetation map, which depicted all of the existing vegetation on site, including wetland indicator species, and the wetland delineation, which did not include in the boundary of the wetland certain areas of wetland indicator species that were shown on the vegetation map. Subsequently, Dr. Engel requested a site visit, which was conducted on August 6, 2024. Dr. Engel and the University's biologist reviewed the portions of the site that had not been delineated as wetland but that contained wetland-related vegetation, and the University's biologist agreed to conduct another wetland delineation in that area to determine the full extent of the wetland. Despite being notified of the discrepancies in the May 2024 report, the University continued to move forward with completing the proposed building plans. In September 2024, the University submitted the revised wetland delineation to Commission staff, and, as a result of the wetland delineation revision, portions of the proposed structures encroached into the required 50 ft. wetland buffer. At this point, the University had already completed the proposed plans and was unable to move the structures or redesign the proposed structures in order to meet the 50 ft. buffer across the entire site.

The encroachment into the buffer would occur in three different areas on the south side of the site. Building 1 would encroach a maximum of 9 ft. into the 50 ft. buffer and Building 7 would encroach a maximum of 8 ft. into the 50 ft. buffer. The proposed project would result in a reduction of approximately 448 sq. ft., or less than 1 percent, of the total buffer area. Although the proposed project would result in a further reduction of the ESHA/wetland buffer on site, the extent and reach into the buffer is generally minimal and would not result in a significant disruption to habitat values of the adjacent wetland and oak woodland. In fact, as a result of pre-Coastal Act development of the site, the onsite wetland has persisted for over 40 years with essentially zero buffer. Additionally, a majority of the wetland would be protected by a 50 ft. buffer and the University proposes to restore the buffer area through the removal of existing hardscape and the planting of native vegetation. In order for the proposed project to be consistent with the LRDP however, the University is proposing to add language to Policy LU-10 and Policy ESH-31 to allow for de minimis encroachments <u>(those that are less than 0.5% of total buffer area)</u> into the buffer.

In addition to restoration of the wetland/ESHA buffer, the University proposes to restore the wetland and ESHA itself to enhance the functionality of the onsite wetland and oak woodland and to establish diverse flowering shrubs to support nectar feeding insects and birds. Non-native species within the ESHA/wetland and associated buffer would be removed through various removal methods, including hand-weeding, solarization, and herbicides. Restorative grading would be conducted to widen and slightly deepen the wetland. Grading would consist of approximately 890 cu. yds. of cut. Native plants would be installed to either establish or enhance five plant communities: oak woodland, wetland, riparian, mixed woodland, and coastal sage scrub. **Special Condition 2** is necessary to ensure that the proposed restoration is implemented according to the proposed restoration plan as well as require certain restoration and monitoring methods that were not provided for in the proposed plan, such as the use of local genetic stock for all native seeds and plants and to require a final comprehensive report at the end of

the five-year monitoring period. Additionally, **Special Condition 4** is necessary to require certain specifications for herbicide use, including the use of herbicides that are safe to use in aquatic environments, as well as to require all project activities to be conducted during daytime hours to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize impacts to birds and other species within the adjacent sensitive habitat areas, including the onsite ESHA and the Goleta Slough. Further, the University has submitted evidence from the fire department that the proposed project will not require fuel modification. Therefore, **Special Condition 4** is also necessary to prohibit mowing or disking for fuel modification as well as any other use in wetland and other environmentally sensitive habitat, except as necessary for maintenance of stormwater management systems and bioswales. Further, **Special Condition 6** is necessary to require the use of protective fencing around all ESHA, wetlands, and their associated buffers, except where development within such areas is explicitly authorized by the subject NOID, and to prohibit the placement or storage of construction equipment and materials within such areas to avoid impacts to ESHA, wetlands, and their buffers. Finally, **Special Condition 5** is necessary to require a biological monitor to be present during all site preparation and grading activities within ESHA, wetland, and their buffers to ensure sensitive species on and near the project site are protected to the maximum extent possible during construction activities.

The proposed project also includes landscaping of the residential project area. The Commission recognizes that the use of non-native and invasive plant species within new development can cause adverse on-site and off-site impacts upon natural habitat areas. Non-native and invasive plant species can directly colonize adjacent natural habitat areas. In addition, the seeds from non-native and invasive plant species can be spread from the developed area into natural habitat areas via natural dispersal mechanisms such as wind or water runoff and animal consumption and dispersal. These non-native and invasive plants can displace native plant species and the wildlife which depends upon the native plants. Non-native and invasive plants often can also reduce the biodiversity of natural areas because, absent the natural controls which may have existed in the plant's native habitat, non-native plants can spread quickly and create a monoculture in place of a diverse collection of plant species.

For the above reasons, the placement of any non-native invasive plant species within the development (which could potentially spread to the natural habitat areas) is a threat to the biological productivity of adjacent natural habitat and would not be compatible with the continuance of those habitat areas. Therefore, to minimize adverse effects to the native plant communities within the project area that are not directly and immediately affected by the proposed development, the Commission has typically required that all landscaping consist primarily of native plant species and that invasive plant species shall not be used. Thus, to ensure permanent protection of the adjacent wetland, ESHA, and other significant habitat areas, and to ensure that non-native and invasive plant species cannot directly colonize adjacent natural habitat areas, the Commission finds that **Special Condition 9** is necessary to prohibit the use of any plant species listed as problematic or invasive by expert authorities such as the California Native Plant Society. In addition, to ensure that adverse impacts to raptors and other wildlife are minimized, **Special Condition 9** prohibits the use of rodenticides containing

any anticoagulant compounds (including, but not limited to, Warfarin, Brodifacoum, Bromadiolone or Diphacinone).

Tree Removal and Mitigation

Construction of the subject housing project, including the Central Utility Plant and associated service driveway, the new bike path, and the East Storke Wetland restoration, would result in the removal of 167 trees. Several different species of trees would be removed, but in general 37 coast live oaks, 11 other native trees, and 119 non-native trees would be removed.

LRDP Policy ESH-28 requires trees associated with new development that are either native or have the potential to provide habitat for raptors or other sensitive species, to be preserved to the maximum extent feasible, and where native or otherwise biologically significant trees are retained, new development shall be sited a minimum of five feet from the outer edge of the tree's canopy drip-line. Consistent with the requirements of Policy ESH-28, the University submitted the results of raptor wintering and breeding surveys and a monarch butterfly habitat assessment for the project site. The assessment determined the project site is not likely to support winter roosting by monarch butterflies and no monarch butterflies were observed during surveys. Two species of raptors were documented during the most recent raptor surveys. One Cooper's hawk was observed flying and perching in the survey area on one occasion. The raptor assessment concluded that this one-time observation suggests this species does not rely heavily on the survey area for foraging in winter. Additionally, Cooper's hawks have not been observed nesting in the survey area during previous breeding surveys. Red-tailed hawks were also observed during the most recent wintering surveys, including at a known nest site within what is currently the Associated Students Recycling Grove. This nest is in a tree that is adjacent to the proposed Central Utility Plant site but outside of the project site boundary and will therefore not be directly impacted by the proposed development. There are no other known or recently active nest sites within the project vicinity.

Although recent surveys have not documented raptor nesting within the project site, it is still necessary to ensure that potential impacts to nesting bird species are avoided during tree removal activities. Additionally, given the project site's proximity to adjacent habitat areas, including known nest sites, there is further potential for breeding birds to be impacted by construction. Thus, to avoid any potential adverse impacts to raptor or sensitive bird species, **Special Condition 5** requires a qualified environmental resource specialist to conduct pre-construction bird surveys to determine whether nesting or breeding behavior is occurring within 500 feet of the project site. If a sensitive bird species is exhibiting nesting behavior, the University must contact all appropriate agencies to determine the proper course of action to protect the species. The nest may not be disturbed or removed and a biological monitor must be present during all significant construction activities to monitor the potential impacts to nesting birds, and any indirect impacts from noise must be attenuated. Where no bird breeding behavior is initially observed, the environmental resource specialist shall conduct monthly follow-up surveys during the bird breeding/nesting season. Further, **Special Condition 5** requires that a qualified environmental resource specialist be present during all tree and vegetation removal activities. Where the survey identifies active nests in the survey

area, a construction monitor shall be present during all further construction activities until the chicks have fledged. If significant impacts or damage occur to sensitive habitats or to wildlife species, the applicants shall be required to submit a revised or supplemental program to adequately mitigate such impacts.

The LRDP also requires specific mitigation ratios for trees that are removed for new development. A replacement ratio of 10:1 is required for the removal of any oak tree. A replacement ratio of 3:1 is required for the removal of any native tree or breeding/nesting tree, and a replacement ratio of 1:1 is required for any ornamental/non-native tree. The University is proposing to replace all of the trees proposed for removal at the required ratios, except for eight of the coast live oaks that were voluntarily planted by the University in 2018. The University is proposing to replace these eight oaks at a mitigation ratio of 1:1, which is inconsistent with the requirements of Policy ESH-28 and the LRDP Campus Tree Trimming and Removal Program which do not provide for a reduced replacement ratio to be approved in the case of oak trees planted voluntarily (i.e., not as mitigation for oak tree impacts). However, in this case, the eight voluntarily planted oak trees are small and do not provide significant habitat value as nesting within these trees by raptors or other sensitive species has not been observed. As such, it is appropriate to allow 1:1 replacement of these oaks on the FM site, although the University did not propose such a change as part of the LRDPA. **Suggested Modification 2** is suggested to include language in Policy LU-10 to allow for the eight voluntarily planted oak trees on site to be replaced at a 1:1 mitigation ratio.

A total of 34 oak trees and 9 other native trees will be removed from the housing site. Additionally, all 119 non-native trees proposed for removal are located at the housing project site. At the East Storke Wetland, three oak trees and two other native trees are proposed to be removed as they are located either within the area of the proposed wetland restoration or within the area where the storm drain that will convey clean stormwater runoff to the wetland is proposed. In total, the University proposes to remove 167 trees. The mitigation ratios outlined in the LRDP, including through **Suggested Modification 2**, would require 450 replacement trees to be planted. The University is proposing to plant a total of 572 trees/large shrubs to mitigate for the proposed tree removals.

The University proposes to plant 263 trees/large shrubs on the housing project site and 309 oak trees offsite. The 263 trees planted on site would consist of a mixture of oak trees, other native trees/large shrubs, such as sycamores, and two non-native species. While the LRDP allows for ornamental trees to be planted on campus, Policy ESH-11 prohibits the use of any noxious or invasive plants species. Therefore, **Special Condition 9** is necessary to require a final landscaping plan that does not include any plant species listed as problematic or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Invasive Plant Council, or by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government. The offsite replacement trees would consist of 36 oak trees planted at the East Storke Wetland restoration site and 273 oak trees planted at the West Campus Mesa. The oak trees planted at the East Storke Wetland would be planted on a slope south of the proposed wetland restoration area. This site is suitable for oak tree plantings as it is upland from the East Storke Wetland and adjacent to an existing coast

live oak woodland as well as Monterey cypress that have served as raptor nesting habitat. The trees planted at the West Campus Mesa would be established between two areas that total almost four acres. One of the areas (approximately 2.3 acres) is a south-facing slope that surrounds an existing horse corral. This area is currently dominated by annual non-native grasses with scattered iceplant, non-native herbaceous species, and senescing coyote bush. The other area (approximately 1.68 acres) is on the northwest side of West Campus Mesa and includes several scattered tall oaks within patches of colonizing coyote bush, stands of non-native herbaceous species, iceplant, and non-native grasses. The success of the existing oaks in this area suggests that the West Campus Mesa is a suitable site for oak establishment. Although the University has provided an oak mitigation restoration plan for the proposed project, some details, such as specific planting locations at the East Storke Wetland and detailed monitoring and management information, was not provided. Therefore, **Special Condition 3** is necessary to require the University to submit final tree mitigation and monitoring programs that include all of the necessary information prior to authorization of the NOID. Additionally, **Special Condition 3** is necessary to require the mitigation ratios, as specified in the LRDP, for each type of tree removed, since mitigation for the proposed project will occur at three different sites and proper tracking of the replacement trees is necessary to ensure proper mitigation.

East Storke Wetland Restoration

Current water quality regulations require new construction to retain stormwater on site from a storm in the 95th percentile. The proposed project site (FM site), however, does not contain enough area to incorporate a retention basin that is large enough to hold the required amount of stormwater runoff. Onsite alternatives, such as the use of cisterns to capture and retain water, were analyzed but were determined to be infeasible since the captured stormwater would have to be treated for use indoors and the quantity of the stored water would be in excess of the site's irrigation needs. Therefore, after studying onsite alternatives, an offsite location was pursued that would act as a mitigation site to collect the same amount of water from the housing project watershed that would otherwise be required to be retained onsite the FM site.

Three offsite alternative locations were explored, including the East Storke Wetland, the adjacent Public Safety site, and Parking Lot 30. The use of large pipes that capture stormwater underground and allow for slow infiltration into the groundwater were evaluated for use under Parking Lot 30. This alternative was determined to be infeasible as it would likely overflow based on the site's low soil infiltration rates. Stormwater detention basins were evaluated at the East Storke Wetland and the Public Safety site. The Public Safety site was determined to not be a feasible location since the routing of the storm drain would require crossing under existing telecom infrastructure, and other existing utilities, such as sewer and propane, are located at the site. The East Storke Wetland, which is adjacent to and west of the housing project site, was determined to be the most suitable location for the required stormwater retention as it did not have any infrastructure constraints and would provide an opportunity to restore an environmentally sensitive habitat area that has become degraded and invaded by non-native species. Historic aerials and topographic sheets from as far back as the 1870's show how the eastern portion of the East Storke Wetland has been converted from an intact salt marsh to a drained wetland to a partially filled wetland as a result of

agricultural operations and later military/airport construction. The construction of berms, roads, drainage channels, and fill within this area has resulted in a lack of tidal connections and reduced biodiversity and ecological function.

In 1987, a botanical, hydrological, and vertebrate assessment of the East Storke Wetland was conducted, and the assessment's authors recommended creating several depressional wetlands at the site to retain water and add habitat heterogeneity to the site. However, the area proposed for restoration as part of the subject project was designated in the 1990 LRDP as a potential building site. As part of an LRDP amendment in 2002 for the expansion of the Recreation Center on the Main Campus, a new LRDP policy was created to mitigate for the loss of grassland habitat and open space associated with the Recreation Center expansion. This policy was then superseded in the most recent LRDP update by Policy ESH-38, which required 4.68 acres of land on the eastern side of the East Storke Wetland to be restored and permanently maintained as ESHA. In 2003, a restoration plan was prepared to restore the site to an oak woodland by removing two fill mounds and non-native species across the site and planting 234 oak seedlings. A survey of those trees was conducted in 2010, which found only 74 trees were still alive and only seven of the trees were over three feet tall. This demonstrated that the site was unsuitable for growing healthy oaks. In 2021, soil samples were collected as part of the design effort for creating a stormwater detention basin to capture the required stormwater runoff for the housing site, which documented dense clay and historic wetland soils in the eastern portion of the East Storke Wetland site. In April 2022 and August 2024, a biological survey and wetland assessment for the site was conducted, which showed the site as being dominated by non-native annual grasses and other ruderal plants including rabbit's-foot grass, which is a wetland indicator species. The assessment also documented coyote bush scrub, iceplant, degraded landscaping, and scattered, stunted oaks bordering the proposed stormwater detention basin site. Additionally, the survey documented a few individual native plants, including honeysuckle, southern tarplant, and foothill needle grass. The assessment also noted that the planted oak trees further upslope of the wetland soils showed less stunted growth than those within the low lying area that contains wetland soils.

Initially, UCSB was considering constructing a rock-lined detention basin at the East Storke Wetland site. However, coordination with Commission staff resulted in a change to the basin design that would be more compatible with the habitat values at the site as the proposed design would not include placement of large amounts of rock. Rather, the proposed basin would be earthen-based and would provide native habitats to support wildlife. The site would be graded to follow existing contours and ensure slopes to the restored basin bottom are gradual and variable in steepness to allow for a range of microsites relative to flooding frequency while ensuring there are deep enough portions to retain open water and capacity within the system. Approximately 2,660 cu. yds. of cut would be excavated, 30 cu. yds. of fill would be used for habitat berms and slopes, and the excess soil will be removed from the site. Because the proposed project would result in excess fill material, **Special Condition 13** is necessary to require the University to provide evidence of the location of the disposal site for all debris material including excavated soils.

The restoration project proposes to create or enhance six different habitat types over approximately 1.5 acres: emergent vegetation, intermittent flooded habitat, transitional habitat tolerant of dense clay soils, upland habitats with flowering plants, adjacent oak woodland habitat, and seasonally open water. As previously discussed, the LRDP designates the proposed restoration site, as well as the surrounding area, as ESHA and requires the site to be permanently maintained and managed to ensure it functions continuously as restored ESHA. However, as noted above, the prior oak woodland restoration was not successful, and the restoration site has become degraded and invaded with non-native species. Therefore, the proposed project, which would restore habitat that is compatible with the existing soils and topography of the site, is consistent with Policy ESH-38 which also requires the site to provide wetland protection and restoration and enhancement where feasible. LRDP Policy ESH-17 requires ESHA on campus to be protected, and where feasible, enhanced and restored, specifically where ESHA has been degraded through habitat fragmentation, colonization by invasive species, or other damage. Additionally, Policy ESH-25 states that the biological productivity and the quality of campus wetlands, including Storke Wetlands, shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored. Therefore, not only is habitat restoration within ESHA allowed by the LRDP, but it is also encouraged as well as required where feasible.

Although the University has submitted a restoration plan for the proposed wetland restoration site, some details and required mitigation are missing from the plan. For example, mitigation is not provided for impacts to southern tarplant, which will be removed through grading of the site. Therefore, **Special Condition 2** is necessary to require a final habitat restoration, monitoring and management program to be submitted that is in substantial conformance with the submitted Seasonal Pond Restoration Plan, dated January 2025, but that also includes a complete set of final project plans, including grading plans with cross sections, site plans, and revegetation and restoration plans. Additionally, the proposed restoration plan notes that the project will require several weed control cycles. Therefore, **Special Condition 4** is necessary to require herbicide use to be restricted to the use of aquatic safe herbicides and other requirements to ensure the use of best management practices for herbicide application. Finally, **Special Condition 5** is necessary to require the University to retain the services of a qualified biologist or environmental resource specialist to conduct sensitive species surveys prior to construction as well as monitor the site and project vicinity to ensure protected species are protected.

Water Quality

The Commission recognizes that new development has the potential to adversely impact coastal water quality through the removal of vegetation, increase of impervious surfaces, increase of runoff, erosion, and sedimentation, and introduction of pollutants such as petroleum, cleaning products, pesticides, and other chemicals. The University's certified LRDP incorporates Coastal Act Sections 30230 and 30231, which mandate that marine resources and coastal water quality be maintained and where feasible restored. Coastal Act Section 30253, also incorporated into the certified LRDP, requires among other things that erosion be minimized and site stability ensured. In addition, Policy WQ-01 states, in part, that projects shall be sited, designed, and managed to prevent adverse impacts from stormwater to coastal waters and ESHA. Policy WQ-02

provides, in part, that drainage and runoff shall not adversely affect the Campus wetlands and that pollutants shall not be allowed to enter the area through drainage systems.

The proposed amendment and its related notice of impending development consists of the construction of seven new structures that would occupy approximately 642,979 sq. ft. Total project-related grading would include 32,400 cu. yds. (30,250 cu. yds. of cut and 3,950 cu. yds. of fill). Sources of pollutants associated with new development as well as accumulated pollutants from rooftops and other impervious surfaces have the potential to result in adverse effects to the water quality of coastal waters. Such cumulative impacts can be minimized through the implementation of drainage and polluted runoff control measures. In addition to ensuring that runoff is conveyed from the site in a non-erosive manner, such measures should also include opportunities for runoff to infiltrate into the ground. Methods such as bioswales, biofiltration planters, and other impervious surfaces allow for infiltration.

The housing project site is predominately covered with asphalt and other impermeable surfaces. However, the proposed project would add an additional 1.83 acres of new impervious area to campus. The proposed increase in impervious surface decreases the infiltrative function and capacity of existing permeable land on site. This leads to an increase in the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff that can be expected to leave the site. Further, pollutants commonly found in runoff associated with the proposed development include petroleum hydrocarbons, including oil and grease from vehicles; heavy metals; synthetic organic chemicals; dirt and vegetation; litter; fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. The discharge of these pollutants to coastal waters can cause cumulative impacts such as: eutrophication and anoxic conditions resulting in fish kills and diseases and the alteration of aquatic habitat, including adverse changes to species composition and size; excess nutrients, which cause algae blooms, and sedimentation, which increases turbidity, both of which reduce the penetration of sunlight needed by aquatic vegetation that provides food and cover for aquatic species; disruptions to the reproductive cycle of aquatic species; and acute and sublethal toxicity in marine organisms leading to adverse changes in reproduction and feeding behavior. These impacts reduce the biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, and estuaries, and reduce optimal populations of marine organisms and have adverse impacts on human health. To address water quality issues, the University is proposing to direct runoff from the project site to biofiltration planters and landscaping on site as well as large bioswales within the onsite wetland buffer. Currently, the site's storm drain system drains directly to Goleta Slough. The existing storm drain system would be upgraded, and the biofiltration planters, bioswales, and landscaping areas would be connected to the new storm drain system that would continue to discharge to the Goleta Slough.

Although these filtration methods provide water quality treatment, they would not provide adequate retention to meet post construction runoff requirements. Therefore, the project proposes to mitigate for the lack of retaining the necessary amount of stormwater runoff on site by directing stormwater from the same watershed, namely approximately 22 acres of the Main Campus upslope of the San Benito housing site to a

restored retention pond area at the East Storke Wetland. Stormwater would be conveyed through a new pipeline installed in Stadium Road. A continuous deflective separation (CDS) unit would be installed along the new storm drain pipe, which would remove solids, such as trash, debris, vegetation, and fine and suspended solids, as well as some oil and grease. The treated water would then flow from the CDS unit through the new storm drain pipe to the East Storke Wetland restoration site. The wetland restoration site is proposed to retain up to 70,000 cu. ft. of water and would not be required to be dredged or cleared of sediment since the source of runoff would be primarily from turf sports fields, parking lots, and roadways which are not sediment laden areas. An overflow drain is proposed to be installed above the proposed basin bottom that will connect to an existing storm drain under Mesa Road which flows to an existing channel that connects to Goleta Slough.

To find the proposed development consistent with the water and marine resource policies of the LRDP, the Commission finds it necessary to require the incorporation of Best Management Practices designed to control the volume, velocity and pollutant load of stormwater leaving the developed site. The Commission finds that sizing post-construction structural BMPs to accommodate (infiltrate, filter or treat) the amount of stormwater produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24 hour storm event, in this case, is equivalent to sizing BMPs based on the point of diminishing returns (i.e. the BMP capacity beyond which, insignificant increases in pollutants removal (and hence water quality protection) will occur, relative to the additional costs. Therefore, the Commission requires the selected post-construction structural BMPs be sized based on design criteria specified in **Special Condition 8** and finds this will ensure the proposed development will be designed to minimize adverse impacts to coastal resources, in a manner consistent with the water and marine policies of the LRDP.

Furthermore, interim erosion control measures implemented during construction will serve to minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water quality resulting from drainage runoff during construction and in the post-development stage. To ensure that proposed erosion control measures are properly implemented and in order to ensure that adverse effects to coastal water quality do not result from the proposed project, the Commission finds it necessary to require the University, as required by **Special Condition 7**, to implement the erosion control measures and construction best management practices contained in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the housing project, dated February 2025. Erosion on site can be further minimized by landscaping all disturbed and graded areas with native plants compatible with the surrounding environment. Thus, **Special Condition 9** requires all disturbed areas on the project site to be planted no later than 60 days after construction is completed.

Additionally, the Commission finds that grading operations and stockpiled materials and debris have the potential to contribute to increased erosion, sedimentation, and pollution. Policy WQ-10 requires grading to be scheduled during the dry months of the year and may only be extended into the rainy season based on site-specific conditions, including application of appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures. Policy WQ-11 prohibits the storage or deposition of excavated materials on campus where

such material will be subject to storm runoff in order to minimize soil erosion and sedimentation of coastal waters. Therefore, to ensure that landform alteration and stockpiling of excavated material will not result in adverse impacts to water quality, **Special Condition 4** requires the University to conduct grading and vegetation removal activities during the dry season, which may be extended if the situation warrants a limited extension, and **Special Condition 13** requires the University to remove all excavated material, including construction debris, from the site to an appropriate location permitted to receive such material. Should the disposal site be located in the Coastal Zone a separate coastal development permit or notice of impending development may be required. Thus, the Commission finds that the project, as conditioned, is designed in a manner that will ensure adverse impacts to coastal resources are minimized, in a manner consistent with the water and marine policies of the LRDP.

Lighting and Bird Safe Building Design

In past actions, the Commission has found that night lighting may alter or disrupt feeding, nesting, and roosting activities of native wildlife species. In this case, the subject site is adjacent to identified ESHA and wetlands. Although the majority of the project site is currently developed with existing night lighting, the proposed project would still result in some increase in new artificial lighting to the project area due to the increase in the scale and massing of development on site. This impact can be minimized by directing lighting away from sensitive habitat areas and requiring the best available technology to minimize trespass, glare, and sky glow. To address the impact of night lighting on the neighboring wetland sensitive habitat areas, the Commission requires exterior night lighting to be minimized, shielded and directed away from the adjacent wetland and open space areas wherever lighting associated with development adjacent to these resources cannot be avoided. Pursuant to **Special Condition 10**, the Commission requires that exterior night lighting installed on the project site to be of low intensity, low glare design, and be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject site to prevent spill-over onto adjacent environmentally sensitive habitat areas, wetlands and wildlife habitat. Additionally, **Special Condition 11** requires use of interior or exterior design features, such as dark tinting and window shading, to minimize nighttime light spillover to the maximum extent feasible.

Bird populations, which have declined from loss of habitat, are seriously threatened by the growing presence of man-made structures within their transit and migratory flight space. The UCSB campus is characterized by several of the factors that contribute to buildings being collision hazards for birds. The campus encompasses significant habitat for birds such as the Campus Lagoon, Devereux Slough, and Storke wetlands and is also adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and Goleta Slough which support numerous bird species. In addition, the campus is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a primary migratory route for birds, and is prone to fog during summers. In recognition of these factors and to avoid where feasible, and minimize the impact of new buildings on birds, the LRDP requires bird safe building and window treatments to be incorporated into new building designs. Therefore, **Special Condition 11** is necessary to require all windows located along the perimeter facades of the proposed buildings, as well as the windows for the proposed market, to be comprised of bird-safe, non-glare glass that have an

exterior reflectance coefficient of not more than 13%. Additionally, any window located on perimeter facades over 65 ft. in height or within 50 ft. of wetlands or other ESHA shall use bird-safe, non-glare glass or exterior design features to effectively screen window glare.

Finally, given the possibility of impacts to sensitive species that may be regulated by other agencies as well as the projects water quality requirements, **Special Condition 17** requires the University to submit evidence that all final required approvals from federal, state, and local agencies have been obtained or that no approval is needed.

Therefore, for all of the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the LRDP, only as modified, is consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act with regard to the protection of environmentally sensitive resources and water quality. In addition, the notice of impending development, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable policies of the LRDP, as amended, with regard to environmentally sensitive habitat area protection and water quality.

Development and Hazards

Coastal Act Section 30250, which has been included in the certified LRDP, states that the construction of new residential, commercial, or industrial development shall be located in close proximity to existing development areas able to accommodate it and where such development will not have a significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. The certified 2010 LRDP was approved with several policies to prevent cumulative impacts of new development, including LRDP Policy LU-10, which provides site-specific development standards for buildout of the approximately 9-acre potential development envelope at the FM Site (which includes the portions both north and south of Mesa Road). The LRDP also contains several policies to ensure that new development minimize risks to life and property and to ensure structural stability and integrity consistent with Section 30253 of the Coastal Act, which has been included in the certified LRDP. Regarding potential geologic hazards, LRDP Policy GEO-01 requires geotechnical and soil studies to ensure structural and geologic stability, and LRDP Policy GEO-02 requires that new buildings shall not be located on or near any faults. Regarding potential flooding hazards, LRDP Policy GEO-11 requires that new development comply with FEMA requirements for all development proposed within a flood hazard zone. Additionally, LRDP Policy LU-10 requires the preparation of a site-specific flooding/Sea Level Rise (SLR) study consistent with the requirements of LRDP Policy SH-04.

The University is proposing an amendment to the certified LRDP and the related notice of impending development for the construction of seven new residential and support buildings up to 81 feet in height with 2,224 beds for students and 14 beds for staff; construction of a new Central Utility Plant (CUP) and vehicle accessway; roadway changes to Stadium Road; new bicycle parking; new pedestrian and bicycle paths; tree removal and replacement; enhancement of an existing on-site wetland; and excavation and revegetation at East Storke Wetlands for treated-runoff-supported wetland habitat restoration. The East Storke Wetlands site and the West Campus Mesa site are designated as “Open Space” by the certified 2010 LRDP. The majority of the greater FM

Site (both north and south of Mesa Road) is designated as “Housing” by the certified 2010 LRDP, with areas of designated Open Space located along the site’s southern and northeastern bounds. The proposed CUP and service driveway would be located at the southeastern portion of the project site, within an area currently designated as “Academic and Support” (north) and “Recreation” (south). Development proposed along the southern extent of the project site that is inconsistent with existing land use designations of the LRDP would include a proposed vehicle turnaround area, bicycle parking area, entry walk, and the proposed CUP and associated service driveway. To address these inconsistencies, the proposed LRDP amendment would convert a portion of the existing Open Space at the southwestern corner of the project site to a Housing designation and would convert a portion of the existing Recreation designation at the southeastern end of the project site to Academic and Support in order to accommodate all proposed development in a manner consistent with the allowed uses described in the certified 2010 LRDP. Existing and proposed LRDP figures describing land use designations at the University are included in the exhibits for this staff report.

Additionally, the proposed LRDP amendment would amend the LRDP ESHA map to reflect updated wetland and ESHA delineations, modify existing site-specific policy language in LRDP Policy LU-10 to allow a <0.5% encroachment into wetland buffer for proposed development at the project site, and revise LRDP Policy ESH-38 to allow the use of clean (filtered and treated) runoff to support ESHA restoration at the East Storke Wetlands site, in order to accommodate all proposed development in a manner consistent with these site-specific policies.

As described previously in this report, proposed new development at the project site would be consolidated within the southern portion of the FM Site. LRDP Policy LU-10 provides site-specific development standards for the FM Site, including a maximum height of 65 ft. The proposed project would include a height increase to 81 ft at the southern portion of the FM Site, which is located closer to the core of Main Campus, and thus would enable the University to abandon potential for future buildout of the northern portion of the site while still meeting University housing goals for the project. As such, the Commission finds that the proposed consolidation of new development and increase in maximum height allowed at the southern portion of the FM Site would reduce potential adverse impacts upon on coastal resources to the maximum extent feasible pursuant to Section 30250 of the Coastal Act. With the proposed amendment, development of the proposed project both at the project site and at all offsite areas would be consistent with the land use designations of the certified 2010 LRDP. However, the project proposed pursuant to the subject NOID is only consistent with the certified LRDP if the proposed amendment to the LRDP is approved. Therefore, the Commission finds that **Special Condition 1** is necessary to ensure that the proposed amendment to the LRDP is deemed legally adequate prior to authorization of the impending development. Further, the Commission finds that **Suggested Modifications 1-3** are necessary to provide further clarification on allowed structure heights across the FM Site and to allow for demolition of existing facilities the northern portion of the site.

Regarding potential geological hazards associated with the proposed development, the University has submitted a geotechnical design report, as required by GEO-01 of the

LRDP, which includes geotechnical and soil studies to ensure the structural and geologic stability of the proposed development. The geotechnical design report was prepared by Tetra Tech (dated October 2024) and incorporated findings and recommendations from a previous seismic study performed at the site (Tetra Tech, May 2022). The report assessed current geologic, soil, and seismic conditions at the project site. Several historic faults and two active faults were identified within the vicinity of the project site. Both active faults were associated with the larger More Ranch Fault and are located north and east of the project site, with no surface exposure. The report addressed these findings and included a number of geotechnical recommendations – addressing site preparation, grading, and stabilization; and addressing building foundation design and setbacks – to increase the stability and geotechnical safety of the site for the proposed development. In accordance with the recommendations of the report and the requirements of GEO-02, the University has sited all new buildings a minimum of 50 feet from identified fault lines. However, to ensure that all recommendations of the geotechnical consultants are incorporated into the project plans, the Commission finds it necessary to require the University, as required by **Special Condition 15,** to submit project plans certified by the consulting geologic and geotechnical engineering consultant as conforming to their recommendations. Additionally, **Special Condition 7** requires the University to submit interim erosion control plans which provide for the stabilization of all temporary stockpiled fill and disturbed areas on site and to utilize all best management practices including, but not limited to, the installation of temporary sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins or silt traps), temporary drains and swales, sand bag barriers, and silt fencing during construction activity to minimize erosion on the project site.

The proposed project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. However, a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain (Zone AE) extends to the edge of the project site, and does cover the area of the proposed offsite retention basin, which is currently subject to flooding during a 100-year storm. According to the University's Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy (SLRAS), the project site is identified in the Lower Mesa Road sub-area, within Area 5. Even with a projected two meters of sea level rise, the SLRAS finds that there would not be a significant flooding risk to the housing project site during a 100-year storm. Additionally, with a projected two meters of sea level rise, groundwater conditions at the project site would not be substantially different from existing groundwater depths. Existing flooding risks in the area of the basin, however, would be increased slightly under the same scenario. Additionally, as the proposed project would concentrate all new development within the southern portion of the FM Site (south of Mesa Road), the University has proposed amendments to LRDP Policy LU-10 to prohibit all future development at the northern portion of the FM Site (north of Mesa Road) outside of repair and maintenance of existing facilities, until such facilities are removed at the discretion of the University or as required by implementation of the University's adopted Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy (approved through LRDP-4-UCS-24-0001-1). Although proposed new development at and adjacent to the project site – including proposed drainage improvements – have been sited and designed to minimize risks associated with flooding and sea level rise, the Commission finds that **Special Conditions 7 and 8** are necessary to minimize risk of erosion, and other impacts to coastal resources, both

during construction and following project completion and **Suggested Modifications 1-3** are necessary to prohibit height increases and allow for future demolition of existing facilities at the northern portion of the FM Site, as may be necessary for adaptive management of the site.

The Commission also finds that, because the proposed project would be located adjacent to known faults and located in an area of the Coastal Zone which may also be subject to the impacts of potential hazards including flooding, sea level rise, erosion, and various geologic risks, **Special Condition 16** is necessary to require that the University shall assume these risks as a condition of project approval. **Special Condition 16** requires the University to waive any claim of liability against the Commission for damage to life or property which may occur as a result of the proposed development. The University's assumption of risk shows that the applicant is aware of and appreciates the nature of the hazards which exist on the site and which may adversely affect the stability or safety of the proposed development.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment to the LRDP, only as modified, is consistent with Section 30250 of the Coastal Act. In addition, the notice of impending development, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable policies of the LRDP, as amended, with regard to hazards and with regard to cumulative impacts of new development related to the proposed project.

Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

The certified 2010 LRDP was approved with several policies to minimize impacts upon archaeological and tribal cultural resources. Coastal Action Section 30244, which has been incorporated in the certified LRDP, requires that where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required. LRDP Policy ARC-01 requires archaeological studies for all new development that would require ground disturbance. For proposed development that could adversely impact archaeological resources, LRDP Policy ARC-03 requires preparation of a mitigation plan, and LRDP Policy ARC-04 requires that both a Registered Professional Archaeological consultant and a Native American representative shall both be present during all operations that could impact such resources.

Archaeological and tribal cultural resources are significant to an understanding of cultural, environmental, biological, and geological history. The LRDP requires the protection of such resources and the need to reduce potential adverse impacts to such resources through the use of reasonable mitigation measures. Degradation of archaeological resources can occur if a project is not properly monitored and managed during earth moving activities and construction. Site preparation can disturb and/or damage archaeological and/or tribal cultural materials to such an extent that the information that could have been derived would be permanently lost or the significance of the resource destroyed. In the past, numerous archaeological sites have been destroyed or damaged as a result of development. As a result, the remaining sites, even

if they are less rich in materials, have become increasingly rare and valuable as a resource. Further, because archaeological sites studied collectively may provide information on subsistence and settlement patterns, the loss of individual sites can reduce the scientific value of the other sites which remain intact.

Archaeological and tribal cultural resources are known to exist at several locations on the UCSB campus. Previous archaeological surveys covering all areas of proposed grading and ground disturbance for the proposed project were performed in June 2022 by Applied Earthworks (project site, offsite basin) and in February 2001 by Conejo Archaeological Consultants (bike path extension between FM Site and Main Campus bikeways). The studies identified several previously-recorded archaeological resource sites within the proposed project area. However, the results of the archaeological surveys, review of maps, and previous investigations confirmed that these sites had been largely removed during previous development activities, and suggest a low likelihood of encountering intact buried archaeological deposits during the proposed ground disturbance activities. In light of survey findings and given the extent of proposed grading, the project still has the potential to adversely impact archaeological resources. The University initiated AB 52 tribal consultation with local tribal representatives from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians, and Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation on August 21, 2024, via email and certified mail. The correspondence included a draft description of the proposed project, along with proposed context, site, demolition, and grading plans. Subsequent correspondence with the same contacts was initiated on October 10, 2024, which included a site plan and description for proposed mitigation tree plantings at the West Campus Mesa area. The University's tribal consultation process elicited requests from Gabriel Frausto (Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation) and Wendy Teeter (Santa Ynez Band of the Chumash Indians) that tribal cultural resource monitoring be conducted during proposed earth moving and ground disturbance activities, and that local tribes be involved in proposed mitigation tree siting and planting activities. The University has proposed to have an archaeological monitor and tribal representative onsite during ground disturbance activities that would occur within 100 ft. of identified archaeological sites, to provide a short training session for construction crews in the identification of archaeological remains and awareness of Native American concerns, and to halt work immediately if a suspected human bone is discovered, regardless of context, until a qualified archaeologist can examine the find. Per the Commission's Tribal Consultation Policy, Commission staff has contacted representatives from Native American Tribes understood to have current and/or historic connections to the project area. At the time of publication of this staff report, no responses had been received and no questions or concerns had been brought to the attention of Commission staff by representatives of the Tribes that were contacted.

Because the Commission finds that there is still potential for adverse effects to archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources to occur due to inadvertent disturbance during grading and ground-disturbing activities, **Special Condition 14** is necessary to require that a qualified archeological and tribal cultural resource specialist shall be invited and shall be present on site during all proposed ground-disturbing activities, and that if an area of archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources is discovered during the

course of the project, project activities with the potential to impact such resources shall cease. Such activities shall not recommence until a qualified archaeological and tribal cultural resource specialist, in consultation with Native American Tribes listed on an updated Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) contact list, analyzes the significance of the find. If necessary, the specialist(s) will prepare a supplementary archaeological plan for the review and approval of the Commission's Executive Director. If human remains are encountered, the University shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws.

Therefore, as conditioned through **Special Condition 14**, the Commission finds that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable policies of the certified UCSB Long Range Development Plan related to archaeological and cultural resources.

California Environmental Quality Act

Pursuant to Section 21080.9 of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the Coastal Commission is the lead agency responsible for reviewing Long Range Development Plans and Notices of Impending Development for compliance with CEQA. In addition, Section 13096 of the Commission's administrative regulations requires Commission approval of Notices of Impending Development to be supported by a finding showing the application, as modified by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Secretary of Resources Agency has determined that the Commission's program of reviewing and certifying LRDPs qualifies for certification under Section 21080.5 of CEQA. Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. Section 21080.5(d)(I) of CEQA and Section 13540(f) of the California Code of Regulations require that the Commission not approve or adopt a LRDP, "…if there are feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the activity may have on the environment."

For the reasons discussed in this report, the LRDP amendment, as submitted is inconsistent with the intent of the applicable policies of the Coastal Act and feasible alternatives are available which would lessen any significant adverse effect which the approval would have on the environment. The Commission has, therefore, modified the proposed LRDP amendment to include such feasible measures adequate to ensure that such environmental impacts of new development are minimized. As discussed in the preceding sections, the Commission's suggested modifications bring the proposed amendment into conformity with the Coastal Act. Therefore, the Commission finds that the LRDP amendment, as modified, is consistent with CEQA.

The Commission has also imposed conditions upon the Notice of Impending Development to include such feasible measures as will reduce environmental impacts of new development. The Commission incorporates its findings on Coastal Act and LRDP consistency at this point as if set forth in full. These findings address and respond to all

public comments regarding potential significant adverse environmental effects of the project that were received prior to preparation of the staff report. As discussed above, the proposed development approved by this NOID, as conditioned, is consistent with both the policies of the certified LRDP and Coastal Act. Feasible mitigation measures which will minimize all adverse environmental impacts have been required as special conditions. As conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available, beyond those required, which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact that the activity may have on the environment. Therefore, the Commission finds that the Notice of Impending Development, as conditioned herein, is consistent with CEQA, the Coastal Act, and the applicable provisions of the Long Range Development Plan.

APPENDIX 1: SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

University of California Santa Barbara 2010 Long Range Development Plan; Final Environmental Impact Report for San Benito Student Housing Project (Addendum No. 5 to the 2010 Long Range Development Plan) dated October 2024; Submittal materials for LRDP-4-UCS-25-0001-1 (San Benito) and UCS-NOID-0001-25 (San Benito); UCSB NOID 2-02 (Recreation Center Expansion Project) staff report; UCSB NOID No. UCS-NOID-0003-04 (FM Site Demolition) staff report.