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PROJECT APPLICANT: Santa Barbara City College

PROJECT LOCATION: East and West Campus, 721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara, Ca. 93109-9990 (Figure 1)

SITE ACREAGE: 2.3 Acres

PROPOSED PROJECT: Construction of 510 additional parking spaces on campus.

On the West Campus, construct a partial 3 story parking structure northeast of the existing West Campus parking lots and immediately west of the Arroyo Hondo ravine and habitat. The structure would contain 436 additional student parking spaces. The building footprint will be approximately 49,822 sq. ft., with total building area of approximately 145,088 sq. ft. These square footages are within those specified by the College’s adopted Long Range Development Plan: 68,000 square foot footprint and 168,000 gross square feet. The parking structure will be accessed from a new perimeter access road that will also serve as fire and service vehicle access to the Learning Resource Center and the Interdisciplinary Center buildings (Figure 2).

The entrance road for the West Campus Parking Structure will be expanded to four lanes with an east-bound de-acceleration lane on Cliff Drive to facilitate right-hand turns onto the new West Campus entrance road. A traffic control kiosk will be constructed in a turn out pocket along the west side of the entrance road. A left-hand turn pocket just south of the kiosk will provide for access towards the new Parking Structure (Figure 3).

On East Campus the parking addition will be a 101 space parking lot (Lot 1D) directly to the east of the existing kiosk. Construction of parking lot 1D will require the removal of 27 existing spaces and several small temporary classroom and administrative bungalows. The net gain of additional spaces on the East campus will be 74.

East Campus traffic improvements will include a new entrance configuration (Figure 4). The existing kiosk will be moved approximately 120 feet south along the East Campus entrance road to allow for a greater stacking distance for entering cars, and construction of an additional entrance from Cliff Drive, and turnaround for parking lot 1D.

INTRODUCTION

Santa Barbara City College has prepared this Negative Declaration (ND) for construction of the development set forth in the project description. This ND has been prepared pursuant to Section 15070-15075 of the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. Upon approval of the ND, the College will submit the project proposal to the Coastal Commission for review and approval. The Coastal Commission will review the proposal for conformance with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.
FIGURE 1  CAMPUS LOCATION
This document also meets the Coastal Commission’s environmental information requirements set forth in section 13353 of the California Administrative Code.

A Negative Declaration document describes the potential adverse impacts of a proposed project and explains why the anticipated impacts will not have significant impacts on the physical environment.

**PROJECT HISTORY**

On August 25, 1988 City College received certification from the California Coastal Commission for amendments to its 1985 Long Range Development Plan. The amendments included the addition of a multi-level student parking structure, parking lot 1D, campus entrance improvements to mitigate parking impacts on the beach parking lots and adjacent community street parking.

**PROJECT LOCATION**

Santa Barbara City College is located on the bluffs overlooking the ocean within the City of Santa Barbara, California. The main entrances are from Cliff Drive on the north boundary, Loma Alta Drive divides the college site into East and West Campuses, which are connected physically by a bicycle/pedestrian bridge which spans Loma Alta. A coastal bluff inland of Shoreline Drive forms the southern boundary of the Campus with Pershing Park forming the eastern boundary. To the west and north of the Campus is a residential area of homes and apartment complexes.

**PARKING**

**Issue**

Though the City College Campus is located inland of public beach parking lots and public access roads, its student parking demand has the potential of competing with public beach parking. Student parking along adjacent residential streets has created historic and ongoing conflicts within these neighborhoods. The proposed additional parking is intended to provide additional on-campus parking facilities for existing student demand, and to provide adequate parking for students and staff at the College as required in Section 30252 (4) and 30212.5 of the Coastal Act.
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In expanding its on-campus parking supply, the college is anticipating future increases in over-all public parking demands at the beach and harbor area where students presently park, and a reduction of available on-street parking demands on residential streets surrounding the college.

The reduction in the on-street parking supply will result from a Residential Permit Parking Program (RPP) which the City intends to implement on residential streets surrounding the college. Students have historically parked on the street when on-campus spaces were full. The RPP will eliminate the on-street spaces from the student parking resource.

The increases in public beach and harbor parking will occur from both the increased beach demands of a larger population, and the future intensification of commercial uses within the west harbor area. The college and the city presently have a Joint Use Agreement for the shared use of the Leadbetter and La Playa parking lots. Under the agreement, the college has exclusive use of the La Playa lots (except week-ends and holidays), and non-exclusive use of the Leadbetter lots for student parking from September to June 15th each year. The premise of the agreement is that the parking demands of students and beach-goers do not coincide, and are compatible. To the present time the premise appears valid: little or no conflict is apparent. However, as commercial uses with the west harbor area intensify, the public parking demands are likely to expand into the season and hours historically utilized primarily by students. As this occurs, student parking will be displaced by public parking.

**Existing Conditions**

City College currently has 1,982 off-street automobile parking spaces available (including Leadbetter East, see Table I), for 8,540 day students. Surveys indicate that student demand for on-street spaces in the surrounding residential area is estimated at 416 spaces approximately 3 weeks into each semester. The on-street supply in areas adjacent to the campus is estimated at 774 spaces, though this supply is open ended, as it is determined mainly by how far students are willing to walk from their cars to campus.

SBCC presently provides for off-street student and faculty parking in a number of lots located on east and west campus, including lots 1B, 2B, 2C, 3, 4A, 4B, 4C and the Leadbetter and Pershing Park parking lots (Figure 5). **SBCCs present off-street parking supply represents an 18% increase relative to the 1,674 spaces available when its LRDP was first approved by the Coastal Commission in 1985.**

For a complete discussion of existing parking supplies see Section 2.2 in the 1988 Amended LRDP and July 1990, ATE Parking and Traffic Analysis (Appendix C).

The estimate of average peak week-day student parking demand (10 to 11:00 am), is based on parking surveys conducted by the College during the third week of the Spring semester on February 20 and 21, 1990. This demand is approximately 2,197

---

1 Personal communication, Don Trent, 3/26/90. From 1985 use pattern data, it is estimated that a maximum of 77% of the students arrive in automobiles, 11% ride bikes, motorbikes or mopeds, 3% ride the bus, 2% are drop-offs at the Campus, and 7% walk in from nearby residences or drop-off points.
spaces (plus or minus 78 spaces), and exceeds the existing off-street supply (including Leadbetter East) by approximately 11%. Results of this survey are presented in Figure 6 and Appendix A. The previous studies were conducted later in the semester than the 1990 surveys and do not provide as accurate indication of peak parking demand at the college.

Peak student parking demands at the beginning of the semester are higher than the average daily demand. To obtain the peak semester parking demand, the difference in student enrollment at the beginning of the semester relative to the time of the surveys is calculated. From semester to semester, enrollment follows a distinct pattern: from the first two weeks of class to midterms, enrollment drops by 10% and from midterms to the end of the semester, enrollment drops an additional 4% points to a total of 14%. Therefore, the peak parking demand at the beginning of the Spring 1990 semester would have been 2441 spaces (plus or minus 78 spaces), 10% greater than the peak demand surveyed in February, 1990. The peak demand after midterms would drop to 2099, 4% less than the peak demand surveyed in February, 1990.

When the total on/off-street supply of 2756 spaces (1982 existing off-street + 774 on-street) is compared to the "worst case" demand of 2519 spaces (2441 + 78), the supply is 237 spaces in excess of demand.

Therefore, the off-street parking demand at the beginning of each semester presently exceeds the off-street supply by 23% to 27% (+78 spaces); the demand not met off-street is met at the curb within the surrounding residential area (Figure 7). The availability of a large supply of free off-street spaces encourages auto use and creates adverse impacts. Residents of these areas generally object to chaotic traffic conditions when students hunt for spaces closest to the campus.

Enrollment

To adequately plan for future parking demand, changes in enrollment must be considered. If College enrollment is to significantly increase, the College may have difficulty meeting student parking demand with the proposed parking supplies set forth in Table I.
### TABLE I

**SBCC PARKING LOT RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Lots</th>
<th>West Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1B</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated</td>
<td>Curb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -257</td>
<td>Total - 362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot 2A**

| Regular  | 68 |
| Handicapped | 2 |
| Total -70 |

**Lot 2B**

| Regular | 83 |
| Staff   | 10 |
| Handicapped | 2 |
| Total -95 |

**Lot 2C**

| Regular | 336 |
| Handicapped | 4 |
| Total -340 |

**Lot 3**

| Regular | 165 |
| Handicapped | 5 |
| Total - 170 |

*The Leadbetter West and East are City lots are used on a cooperative agreement basis between the City and the College as set forth in a 52 year joint use agreement (Started 1982/83).*
PARKING LOT LEGEND

Main Upper Lots
1A ......... Staff Permit required, 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.
1B ......... Staff Permit required, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.; car pool vehicles with Student Permit (non-reserved areas only), after 3 p.m.
1MC ......... Staff and student motorcycle and moped parking, 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.
V ......... Visitors (valid permit required), 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.; reserved for staff, after 5 p.m.

Loma Alta Lots
2A ......... Staff Permit required, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Student Day or Evening Permit, 3 to 10 p.m.
2B, 2C, 3 ....... Student Day Permit required, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Day or Evening Permit, 3 to 10 p.m. (Note: Staff parking only in front of PE/Sports Pavilion complex.)

West Campus Lots
4A, 4B, 4C .... Student Day Permit required, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Day or Evening Permit, 3 to 10 p.m. (Note: No permit required on West Campus for special events, after 3 p.m.)
4D ......... Staff and Student Medical Permit required, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. (No permit required after 3 p.m.)
4E ......... Staff Permit parking, 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.
4MC ......... Staff and student motorcycle and moped parking, 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.
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However, based on demographic and population/age distribution data, Department of Finance figures project a future stabilization of enrollment at a level lower or equal to enrollment of Fall 1990 (Figure 8). According to these projections, enrollment in the next decade will not reach the enrollment level peak of 1981-1982. Figure 9 presents average daily enrollment calculated by the College for the past 10 years. The daily enrollment figures show a similar leveling-off to Department of Finance data. Therefore, the College believes that the proposed parking supplies will meet future parking demand based on existing parking demand data.

Figure 10 provides the hourly enrollment for May of 1988. In comparison to April 1985 hourly enrollment data, student enrollment has shifted significantly towards the morning hours. The ten o'clock morning period shows the greatest increase at 20%. Though the one o'clock afternoon period shows a 26% increase, the two o'clock period drops by 64% relative to 1985 figures. In conjunction with hourly enrollment, the parking studies consistently show a pattern of heavy morning use, peaking between ten and eleven a.m. and lesser afternoon use.

Parking data for 1990 shows a morning peak and afternoon drop in parking demand which matches previous survey patterns. The daily peak in parking demand is still from ten to eleven o'clock in 1990 and demand for parking at two o'clock dropped by 17% to 23% from peak demand (See Figure 6). In the 2-21-90 survey total parking dropped to 184 cars from a peak of 278 for the beach front Leadbetter Lot, becoming a surplus of 96 spaces (Figure 11). This condition reinforces the conclusion that no conflicts exist between the demand for student and beach parking. Overall the 1990 survey has higher parking levels because this survey was made earlier in the semester than previous surveys (1985,1988) in order to more accurately determine the peak semester parking demand.

**Future Parking Supplies**

*The total future parking supply of 2492 spaces is sufficient to meet the projected peak demand of 2441 spaces*\(^1\) (plus or minus 78 spaces) throughout the school year (Figure 12).

Considering that demographic statistics indicate no significant increase in student enrollment, minor additions to parking supply will assist in increasing the supply to a more comfortable level. For example, by restriping West Campus Lots additional parking spaces could be gained. The college should also continue to rigorously pursue avenues for reducing the parking demand, such as improved bus services, increased bus lines and a preferential parking program.

---

\(^1\) Since enrollment is not expected to increase, the existing estimated peak demand (i.e. at the beginning of the semester) can be used for the future demand projections. This demand is for 2441 spaces (plus or minus 78 spaces).
Impact of New Parking Facilities Overall

The additions of the student parking structure and Lot 1D, in concert with the city’s RPP will increase the college’s offstreet parking supply by 26% to 2,492 spaces (1982 + 510), and decrease the total on and off-street supply by 10% (2756 - 774 + 510)(Figure 13).

The effect of these projects will be:

* the elimination of free on-street parking, which encourages auto use;

* a reduction in the total parking supply, thereby eliminating surplus capacity, which also encourages auto use; and

* the absorption of virtually all the college’s parking demand into lots with controlled entry, thereby enabling the college to better manage student parking overall, and to effectively apply incentive programs intended to increase student use of alternative transportation modes. The LRDP requires such a program with Policy 4.1. Additionally, Policy 4.1 through 4.3 of the LRDP set forth specific actions to accomplish reductions in campus vehicle trips.

The project will increase the total offstreet supply to an amount which is approximate to the existing peak demand for student parking (supply = 2492, demand = 2363 to 2519). If actual demand is the higher of the demand range (2519), the peak demand for student parking, during the first weeks of each semester, would exceed the off-street supply by 51 spaces. These students would park on-street outside the RPP area if the convenience level were acceptable, or they would seek another mode of transport to the campus..

Impact of SBCC Parking on Public Beach Parking Lots

At times when the kiosk at the beach parking lots is not manned to enforce parking by permit only, students without permits who are displaced from the on-street resource will seek free parking at the beach lots. This will increase beach lot parking.

When the beach lot kiosks are manned, these students will not find parking on, or near the campus, this will provide them an incentive to purchase a permit or change modes of transit. For students with parking permits, the parking on campus is most preferable as the climb to the campus from the beach lots is time consuming and physically demanding. When the beach lot kiosks are manned, student parking at the beach will diminish in favor of the on-campus lots.
If the City of Santa Barbara implements the RPP in December of 1990 as planned, the displaced student parking will utilize the Leadbetter lots until the new on-campus parking addition is completed. At present, the use of beach lots by the public and the use of the lots by students does not significantly conflict. If the City determines that a conflict could occur, a delay of the implementation of the RPP until the 1991 fall semester, or the phasing of the program, to soften its initial impact, would eliminate the conflict.

Impact of SBCC Parking on Harbor Expansion

As with the beach parking lots above, the proposed project would not adversely impact the public’s use of beach or harbor parking lots. It would actually reduce student demand significantly for those spaces. A brief discussion of this issue is included in the 1988 Amended LRDP.

Considering that demographic statistics indicate no increase in student enrollment, and that limited Harbor expansions by the City will provide for additional parking resources, the existing and future parking conditions at the waterfront will not be adversely affected by the proposed projects.

Mitigations

The construction of additional parking spaces on the west and east campus will satisfy existing student parking demands which now occur at beach parking lots and residential neighborhoods where they do, or have the potential to, conflict with other uses. The additional spaces will not cause an increase in enrollments at the college and will not induce additional vehicle trips to the campus. As part of its analysis of the parking and traffic impacts of the proposed project, ATE has designed additional measures to assist the college in implementing policy 4.1 of the LRDP by maximizing benefits of its student bus pass program and additional parking resources (Appendix B and C). Since no adverse impacts to parking resources are evident, mitigations are unnecessary.

Consistency with LRDP

SBCC is required by policy 4.1 of the 1988 Amended LRDP to provide a comprehensive parking program reducing parking impacts to residential and harbor areas. If parking conflicts are identified by the student parking surveys, any of the following policies may be used by the College to eliminate the parking conflicts identified.

The College has taken yearly surveys of student parking patterns since the 1986-1987 academic year. The specific measures the College has undertaken to reduce parking impacts are provided below in *italics* after each policy.
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SBCC Hourly Enrollment 1988 vs 1985

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 AM</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 AM</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 AM</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AM</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 PM</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Daily Attendance
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Ledbetter West
1989 vs. 1990 Hourly Parking Demand

Lot Capacity: 280 Spaces Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3/16/89</th>
<th>2/20/90</th>
<th>2/21/90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>2:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th Week of Semester 3rd Week of Semester 3rd Week of Semester

FIGURE 11
Future SBCC Parking Supply and Demand

Supplied includes only offstreet spaces
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SBCC Parking Comparison of Present & Future Supply
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Policies:

4.1(a) An expanded incentive program for greater use of bicycles, mopeds/motorcycles and mass transit (initial program to be initiated within one year of LRDP certification). This program should also consider preferential carpool parking, ridesharing program participation discount bus passes, and information programs.

The College has instituted incentive programs recommended in policy 4.1(a) for the use of bicycles, mopeds/motorcycles and buses. Additional bike racks have been installed and moped/motorcycle parking areas have been enlarged. Bus schedules are provided in several racks around campus to encourage bus use. Most recently, the student body voted to finance a subsidized bus pass system with MTD. In the spring of 1991, enrolled students will be able to ride MTD free of charge during each semester.

4.1(b) Encourage use of Campus parking lots outside of the Leadbetter lots.

4.1(c) Provide for an ongoing parking space construction program to eliminate the parking deficit identified.

Use of lots away from the harbor (policy 4.1(b)) has been encouraged by increasing on-campus and Pershing Lot parking by 7%. With construction of the West Campus parking structure and lot 1D an additional 510 parking spaces (26% increase) will be provided, which will be sufficient to meet existing peak student parking demand. This on-campus parking should draw students out of the Leadbetter lots avoiding any potential parking conflicts with recreational users. This is also satisfies policy 4.1(c), which requires the College to reduce the parking deficit.

4.1(d) If the monitoring program demonstrates that College related parking at La Playa and Leadbetter Beach Lots is significantly impacting parking opportunity for beach recreational and harbor related coastal dependent uses, and non-structural mitigations fail to effectively reduce the impacts to insignificant levels, then additional student parking facilities adequate to meet demand shall be constructed on or off-campus prior to or concurrent with the construction of the Interdisciplinary Building or subsequent developments noted in the LRDP.

For Policy 4.1(d) improvements to the survey methodology, namely surveying closer to the peak in semester parking demand, will allow better monitoring of the student parking impacts to harbor lots; So far the survey has not detected any major parking impacts.

In order to fulfill the requirements of Policy 4, an maximize the benefits of the additional off-street parking, the following measures identified in the
September 22, 1985 Traffic Safety Study (ATE) should be implemented immediately:

4.1(e) A sign indicating the status of the East Campus lots shall be installed at the entrance to East Campus, in full view of approaching drivers.

4.1(f) Institute a parking education program which clearly informs College drivers where, when and for what reason they can park. The objective of the program will be to minimize unnecessary congestion on the East Campus and other lots.

4.1(g) Improve the procedure for admitting vehicles into the East Campus parking area by using pre-printed passes with time stamps for authorized visitors and training of kiosk personnel.

The College has already fulfilled policies 4.1(e) to (g). A sign is now posted to notify approaching drivers of parking status in East Campus lots (policy 4.1(e)). The College educates students on where to park (policy 4.1(f)) by including detailed instructions with class enrollment information. Also, the College has improved the procedure for admitting vehicles into the East Campus parking area by using pre-printed passes for authorized visitors and training of kiosk personnel.

4.2 Move the entrance for the moped/motorcycle parking area at the East Campus entrance so that it connects with Lot 2A.

The improved entrance to East Campus will now use the motorcycle lot as an additional entrance from Cliff Drive in order to significantly improve student and faculty traffic safety conditions.

4.3 The College will construct approximately 510 (net) additional off-street student parking spaces according to locations and dates shown in Table V. This construction program will be undertaken unilaterally for lots on College property and in cooperation with the City for construction on City-owned lots which are subject to joint use agreements.

The West Campus parking structure is part of the additional off-street student parking which the College is constructing to satisfy Policy 4.3 of the 1988 LRDP. The College intends to have Lot 1D, also part of the additional parking supply mentioned in Policy 4.3, completed by March 1991. With completion of this structure and Lot 1D the College will have constructed 571 net spaces which exceeds the 513 net spaces set forth in the LCP.

Policy 7.1(b) states that the College will modify parking restriction signs to clearly state that public parking on campus owned lots is not restricted on weekends and school holidays. The College has not complied with this requirement but does not "police" any lots on weekends.
TRAFFIC

Because the new on-campus parking resources will not significantly increase the overall parking supply available to the college, these vehicles will not generate additional vehicle trips within the vicinity of the campus. See attached July, 1990 Parking and Traffic Analysis.

The additional parking resources on the campus will reduce the number of vehicle miles travelled within the area adjacent to the college. Under current conditions, students frequently drive through the adjacent residential neighborhoods as they search for parking spaces. With the new facilities in place, students would divert from the neighborhoods to the lots. Student vehicles would be removed from these satellite areas and the overall vehicle miles traveled in the region would decline.

The new parking facilities would shift travel patterns in and around the campus slightly. It is expected that traffic volumes would incrementally increase on the section of Cliff Drive between Loma Alta and the West Campus entrance. Conversely, traffic volumes would decrease on Castillo Street, Shoreline Drive and in the neighborhoods north and west of the College. These shifts in travel patterns would not significantly impact the roadway segments and intersections adjacent to the College. In fact, the shift in travel patterns may actually improve conditions at the Castillo Street/Montecito Street intersection, which is the most critical location in the study area in terms of level of service. It should also be noted that traffic related to the College is heaviest during the mid-morning periods when traffic on the adjacent street network is lighter. The shift in student travel patterns during these off-peak periods would have insignificant impacts as it would occur outside the morning and evening street peak hours.

With the construction of the West Campus parking structure, there will be a shift in traffic from East to West campus. To determine if this traffic shift would negatively affect existing circulation patterns, the College employed Associated Transportation Engineers to conduct a traffic safety study in September of 1986. The study concluded that "the traffic volumes that exist and the forecasted growth will not be sufficient to warrant the installation of traffic signals at either campus entrance, "the West Campus entrance will adequately handle the increased traffic due to the construction of the parking structure if the change of location and widening of the entrance and the addition of a right-turn lane on Cliff Drive." The recommendations of the ATE study will be completely implemented with the construction of the project improvements addressed by this ND. A complete discussion of traffic impacts is included in the 1988 Amended LRDP and ATE's 1990 Traffic and Parking Analysis (Appendix C).
The West Campus parking structure is designed to meet existing parking demand which exceeds offstreet supply and overflows into residential neighborhoods. Student traffic which presently enters residential and beach parking areas is expected to relocate to the new on-campus parking provided. The parking structure would only affect traffic patterns along Cliff and Loma Alta Drives and this impact would be insignificant (Robert Ferris ATE, Personal Communication 3/20/90). The parking structure would not significantly impact traffic at Cliff Drive intersections.

With construction of these projects the College will have implemented the majority of the recommended 1986 ATE traffic improvements which will result in insignificant parking structure traffic impacts.

Consistency with LRDP Policies

LRDP policies state as follows:

5.1 New development will maintain public access through mitigation measures assisting the City in the maintenance of an LOS of "C" for waterfront area intersections.

The new parking structure and parking lot 1D will not result in a significant impact to City waterfront area intersections.

5.2 Upon final approval by Caltrans, provide for the following traffic safety improvements, The College will request the assistance of the City of Santa Barbara and Caltrans in making these improvements:

1) Widen Cliff Drive between the existing bus pocket and the East Campus entrance to provide additional space for right-turn traffic.

See response below

2) Widen Cliff Drive east of the East Campus entrance to provide for passenger drop-off and pick-up.

The design for the East Campus Entrance will include an additional entrance off of Cliff Drive just east of the Loma Alta intersection, for allowing drop off and pick up traffic. This design is superior to that recommended above.

3) Increase the storage capacity of the westbound Cliff Drive left-turn pocket for Loma Alta Drive. Request Caltrans to check the Cliff/Loma Alta Drive signal timing for maximum movement during the peak periods.

The College will be increasing the capacity of this turn lane in 1991.
4) Provide for a right-hand turn pocket for eastbound Cliff Drive traffic entering West Campus.

This improvement will be constructed as part of the West Campus entrance relocation.

5.3 The following traffic safety improvements will be provided by the College and implemented upon completion of the West Campus parking structure:

1) Move the West Campus entrance as far to the east as is possible without impacting the Arroyo Honda Natural Area. Provide for two entrance and exit lanes. Allow right and left turning traffic to merge at a distance from the Campus entrance that will not result in traffic conflicts inside the Campus.

This improvement will be completed with construction of the West Campus parking structure.

2) Provide for a second lane through the East Campus entrance that is reserved for permit holders only.

a) If traffic conditions at the East Campus entrance have not improved within two years after the installation of the second lane, then the College shall consider other measures such as the relocation of the East Campus Kiosk further back into the Campus in order to increase entrance storage capacity.

Prior to the construction of improvements at both the East and West Campus entrances, all necessary approvals from government agencies will be obtained.

With construction of the East Campus entrance improvements addressed in this ND, the College will have met the requirements above. By moving the East Campus Kiosk back further into Campus the College will be fulfilling Policy 5.3(2a) requirement to improve traffic conditions on the East Campus.

3) Implement a information program to educate students and faculty using the bus, of the traffic safety problems associated with jaywalking.

The College has an ongoing program to inform students and faculty availability of bus routes. As of 1991, the College will install fencing along the center divided of Cliff Drive to prevent jaywalking.
As required in Policy 5.3 the College will move the West Campus entrance to the east when the parking structure is constructed. This will improve traffic safety along Cliff Drive.

AESTHETICS: VISUAL RESOURCES

Issue

Will the proposed parking structure interfere with public views along the coast, and will it be architecturally compatible with the surroundings.

The parking structure has been designed to minimize obstruction of scenic vistas and open public views. The project parking structure will not be visible to the public from either Leadbetter Beach or the Harbor area. However, the structure has the potential to impact views of adjacent residential neighborhoods at Oceano Street to the west and from apartments across the Arroyo to the east.

For the residential structures located on Oceano Street between Del Sol and Del Mar Streets, the proposed parking structure will be located directly within their viewshed. However, the multi-level parking structure will be partially below ground level with a effective above ground height of 6 ft. when viewed from across campus to the west. The visual impact would be further reduced because the elevation of the residences in this area are approximately 10 to 15 ft. higher in elevation than the campus grounds. Accordingly the visual impact of the structure as seen from the west will be minimal.

The parking structure will not be incompatible with the apartment units located on the elevated terrace at the southwest corner of Cliff Drive and Loma Alta because of their physical and visual separation from the structure by the vegetated 300 to 400 foot wide Arroyo Honda ravine. The ravine is naturally heavily treed, thereby obstructing views to the west across campus from the apartments.

In order to obtain coastal views from these apartment structures, the owner of these apartments removed a large number of Eucalyptus trees from the Arroyo Honda Habitat area in 1988 without a Coastal Permit or City permit or permission from the College. This removal of major vegetation has eliminated a significant portion of the visual screening that existed when the 1985 LRDP visual analysis was conducted. However, the trees within the ravine are protected as sensitive habitat, and under normal conditions, effectively screen views to the west across the campus from the apartments.

The College is required by its LRDP to restore the Arroyo Hondo woodland environment. Restoration of the tree growth and protection of the Eucalyptus grove on the eastern side of the Arroyo as Monarch Butterfly habitat renders the issue of viewshed from the apartments to the east moot. The project will not have a significant visual impact.
Consistency with LRDP

SBCC LRDP policies require the following actions by the college:

1 a) Prior to the preparation of a site plan for bluff top development, a visual analysis of the bluff top as it is seen from the beach area (Leadbetter Beach and parking lots) will be undertaken. The objective of the analysis would be to determine where on the bluff top, and at what scale, buildings could be placed to avoid or minimize their visibility from the beach area.

* Site Plans will incorporate the determinations of the visual analysis.
* Maximum height will be two stories, except that three story buildings are permitted along the slope of the Arroyo Honda when the ground floor is wholly or partially subterranean and the maximum building height does not exceed 40 feet above average finished grade.

_Since the parking structure will be set back from the bluff by approximately 1000 feet, it will be difficult to see from the adjacent beach areas. Additionally, the structure is within the height limits specified by the LCP._

b) Alternative design concepts including the following, will be considered:

* individual unattached structures placed apart from each other at varying distances from the bluff top with open areas between them.

_This policy section is not applicable to the Parking Structure._

c) The College will provide the City’s Architectural Board of Review with the opportunity for non-binding review and comment on new buildings planned for the West Campus. The opportunity will be provided when the Plans are at the conceptual stage.

_The parking structure was taken to the Architectural Board of Review in March 1989 (See April 3, 1989 Minutes of ABR). The Board indicated that the project was acceptable._
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Issue

The proposed parking structure is located atop the north facing slope, and just south, of Arroyo Hondo. The Arroyo contains a remnant Oak Woodland which is designated as an environmentally sensitive habitat within The Long Range Development Plan for the SBCC West Campus.

Existing Conditions

Arroyo Hondo extends approximately 1.25 miles in length, beginning at Carrillo Street near Miramonte Drive and extending seaward to the intersection of Shoreline Drive and Loma Alta at West Beach. Where its length passes through the west campus, there are approximately 4 acres of oak and eucalyptus woodland habitat.

Relative to the adjacent developed areas, the campus portion of the Arroyo woodland provides a considerable amount of local wildlife value. However, it is a degraded remnant of its former condition, heavily disturbed by a combination of human activities and introduced species (mainly Eucalyptus). There is a considerable amount of trash scattered throughout the site as well as numerous trails criss-crossing the north-facing slope.

Seasonal water occurs in the drainage of the Arroyo, which is a major conductor of winter storm flows. The flows pass through a large culvert on the east campus just above the Del Playa East parking lot. A single soil type of Conception sandy loam characterizes the Arroyo; it has a highly erosive potential.

Flora

Of the two woodland habitats, within the Arroyo, the Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia) habitat provides the greater biological value. This is because the eucalyptus (Eucalyptus globulus) exudes a chemical which alters the soil in a manner which discourages competitors. As a result, unlike the viable understory of the oaks, within the area of Eucalyptus there is only debris of branches, bark and leaf litter.

The oak woodland is predominantly on the north facing slope of the Arroyo, were there are some scattered Eucalyptus among the Oak. The north facing slope has and understory of Pittisporum (Pittosporum undulatum), Redberry (Rhamus crocea) and Poison Oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum). Groundcover consists of scattered, introduced grasses and exotic perennials such as Periwinkle (Vinca major) and Nasturtium (Tropaeolum majus). Appendix D contains a complete list of plant species which are found in the Arroyo.
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No state or federally listed plant species (or candidate for listing) has been identified within the Arroyo and project site. No species identified by the CNPS as being rare, or endangered, or in a position of becoming so in the foreseeable future, has been identified.

Fauna

The Arroyo on campus supports a depauperate vertebrate fauna. It is unlikely, given the degree of disturbance to the site and the adjacent areas that less mobile species, including most of the amphibian and reptile species formerly present could recolonize the site even following revegetation efforts.

However, the presence of permanent or semi-permanent water on the site, in combination with the open grassy areas atop the slopes, do provide a habitat for the depauperate population of predators and foragers i.e., red tailed hawk and squirrel. Several bird species were observed. Evidence of numerous species of small mammals can be found. Appendix D contains a complete list of species which were either directly observed or identified by sign, or may potentially occur on the site because of their occurrence on similar habitats in the area.

No listed or candidate wildlife species, are known or are likely to occur with regularity within the Arroyo and on the project site.

Requirements of the Long Range Development Plan

Policy 1.1 of the College’s Long Range Development Plans states in part:

Environmentally sensitive habitats will be protected against significant disruption of habitat values through all of the following:

a. No development will occur within:
   1) the Arroyo Hondo Oak and Riparian Woodland habitat;
   2) the Pershing Park Oak Woodland habitat; or
   3) The remnant habitat on the West and East Campus bluff faces.

b. Development will be located no closer than 50 feet to the Arroyo Hondo Oak and Riparian Habitat. The 50 foot buffer shall be planted with drought tolerant groundcover that is best suited for and controlling erosion of the West Campus soils.

c. Provision of setbacks appropriate to minimize habitat impacts to the coastal bluff scrub community as determined by a qualified biologist. With the
assistance of a qualified botanist a native revegetation program for the bluff area will be developed and executed upon completion of the bluff development.

If no feasible alternative exists, a road/firelane may be allowed within the 50 foot buffer adjacent to parking lot 4 A, provided that it is located no closer than the dripline of the habitat and its impacts are mitigated. A qualified biologist will be consulted on the road siting and mitigations.

d. Diversion of run-off from structures into drainage systems designed to eliminate sheet or gully erosion on the terrace bluff or the Arroyo Hondo areas. design drainage systems to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the established vegetated areas of these two areas.

e. A program to restore the native habitats on the East and West Campus will be undertaken by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Campus biology department. Creative measures of accomplishing the restoration including incorporation into the biological sciences and horticultural academic programs of the college will be considered. The program will be initiated before the construction of the planned developments on the respective sides (East or West). The College may seek eligibility for Coastal Conservancy grant funds for such improvements.

**Biological Impacts of The Project**

The remnant Oak woodland, as a vegetative type, is the primary resource within the Arroyo. The Arroyo also supports a limited biota. In addition, the Eucalyptus grove on the south facing slope appears to be a potential habitat for the Monarch Butterfly according to a draft County of Santa Barbara Report of Monarch Butterfly roosting sites. The report concluded that the Arroyo area appears to be a temporary bivouac for the Monarch Butterfly, with no permanent roosting activity observed at this time. The proposed development will not affect the south facing slope of the Arroyo, which consists of property not owned by the college. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact upon the Monarch Butterfly habitat.

Project plans indicate that the parking structure and access road will be close to the minimum required setbacks from the drip-lines of oaks along the upper portion of the north facing slope. Grading, soil compaction and alteration of drainage patterns within the driplines of the oaks would damage the trees and potentially cause the loss of this remnant grove.

In addition, disturbed areas left unattended after project completion will be colonized by introduced species which would diminish wildlife values. Proliferation of Eucalyptus on the north facing slope would negatively affect the Oak woodland as the Eucalyptus is more prolific than the Oak and is toxic to other plants.

---

2 Calvert, William H. *Description of Monarch Butterfly Locations in Santa Barbara County* Santa Barbara County RMD, 1990.
Damage to, or loss of oak trees within the oak woodland is considered a significant environmental impact because the Oak woodland within the Arroyo represents one the last remaining stands of a once common coastal habitat, and because degradation of the woodland will further diminish the Arroyo as a wildlife habitat.

The Arroyo habitat could potentially serve as nesting areas for raptors such as the Red Tailed Hawk and Screech Owls. Raptors typically nest from January through May. Though no raptor nesting activity has been officially observed in the Arroyo, the College should survey the Arroyo for nesting activity during the months of January to May and undertake necessary measures to eliminate potential disturbances.

Mitigations

LRDP Policy 1.1 requires that development be no closer than 50 feet to the Arroyo Honda Oak habitat. The policy allows a road/firelane within the 50 foot buffer, "provided there is no feasible alternative, that its impacts are mitigated, " and that the road is no closer to the woodland than its dripline."

The mitigations below will insure that the project plans accurately indicate the required setbacks and that the construction phase of the project adheres to the setbacks and includes measures which will protect the habitats both in the short and long term, consistent with LRDP policy 1.1.

1. Accomplish the following prior to the beginning of on-site work for the project:
   - At the site and on the final grading plans, stake and delineate the locations of the woodland dripline, parking structure and road to show:
     - that the parking structure is outside the 50 foot buffer,
     - that the road and all grading, compacting and other project related activities is outside the dripline of the Oak woodland and


3. During the grading phase of the project provide an on-site monitor to insure that no fill or graded material be deposited or stored within the dripline of oak trees and that the soil surface within the dripline of all oak trees remain undisturbed throughout the construction phase.

4. Disturbed areas upslope of the oak woodland be protected and prevented from causing erosion or other instabilities within and adjacent to the dripline.

5. Consistent with, and as required by LRDP policy 1.1 e. prior to or concurrent with the construction of the project, accomplished the following:
- Remove all trash from the slopes of the Arroyo and its channel.
- Selectively remove Eucalyptus from the north face of the Arroyo and replace with planted acorns collected from the oak woodland.
- Prepare and implement a revegetation plan for the Arroyo and the adjacent grassland open areas. The plan would provide for periodic removal of Eucalyptus and improvement of the oak understory by planting native species selected to improve the wildlife habitat of the Arroyo.
- Maintain the Eucalyptus Woodland on the south facing slope of the Arroyo as roosting sites for raptors and Monarch Butterflies, which presently utilize the trees.

6. The college biologist shall survey the Arroyo habitat from January to May 1991 (i.e. during construction) on a monthly basis to determine if any raptor nesting is occurring. If nesting is occurring, the College shall confer with a local ornithologist to determine if any measures are necessary to reduce possible disturbance to the nesting birds.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative Project Locations

During the preparation of the College’s LRDP for the main campuses, numerous alternative locations for a parking structure were considered. The proposed location was selected as the least environmentally damaging alternative. The alternative locations considered are described below.

1) Pershing Park:

Placement of a parking structure at Pershing Park was considered as a means of providing student parking during the school year and an augmentation of beach and harbor parking during the summer season. This alternative was rejected by the city, which owns Pershing Park. Reasons for rejection were: vehicular access would move primarily through the intersections of Haley/Castillo and Castillo/Montecito Streets, both intersections with severe capacity constraints; pershing Park facilities are complete and the construction of a parking structure would displace other recreational facilities; the City’s Landmarks Committee was opposed.

2) SBCC east campus, of Loma Alta just north of the Dive-Tech building:

This site is too small for the planned number of parking spaces. The space available for turning movements is not sufficient to meet standard requirements; Loma Alta roadway is too narrow, traffic congestion on Loma Alta between Cliff and Shoreline Drive would occur.
3) La Playa East parking lot just below the bluff:

This location would also increase traffic congestion on Loma Alta between Shoreline Drive and Cliff Drive; the visual impact would be significant as the structure would be seen from Leadbetter beach; the sensitive habitat (LRDP designation) of coastal sage scrub habitat on the bluff would be eliminated; recent evidence indicates that an archaeological site exists along the bluff (personal communication, Pandora Snethcamp).

In contrast to the above alternative locations, the proposed project site is preferred because of the following conditions:

- the visual impact is insignificant as the site is within the west campus in a location not visible from the beach or any public use area.

- impacts to environmental resources are insignificant as the project is adjacent to but not within an environmentally sensitive habitat, mitigations to protect the adjacent habitat will be effective.

- ingress and egress to the west campus can be handled more efficiently from Cliff Drive than from Loma Alta e.g., Cliff Drive has the capacity. The west campus location will cause fewer vehicle trips to be generated through the intersections of Castillo/Haley and Castillo/Montecito than would the Pershing Park alternative. The Castillo/Montecito intersection is of critical concern relative to maintaining an acceptable Level of Service.

- archaeological resources are not an issue on the proposed site.

- the proposed location is closer to the main campus facilities than any of the alternatives considered. As a result, the project will attract more of the existing off-campus student parking demand on to the campus where it will not conflict with off-campus uses.

Alternative Projects

Requirements of LRDP

LRDP policy .4.1 requires the College to manage student parking activity in a manner which 1) provides sufficient off-street parking resources to avoid a parking supply deficit; 2) prevents student parking demands from conflicting with beach activity for recreational purposes, harbor related coastal dependent uses and with residential activities in surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, policy 5.1 requires that new campus development maintain public access through mitigation measures assisting the city in maintaining a Level of Service (LOS) of "C" for waterfront intersections.

There are three project alternatives:
1) no project,

The no project alternative would preserve the status quo relative to number of spaces and student parking demand i.e., with the open ended on-street parking and the beach lots there is an interminable supply of spaces for unrestricted student parking. The college would have to implement the parking disincentives and transportation demand reductions identified within the LRDP if student parking demands were to significantly conflict with beach user parking/harbor related uses. However, it is doubtful that efforts to reduce student parking demands through disincentives could be successful with an open ended parking supply always providing an option.

With the implementation of the city's Residential Parking Program in late 1990, up to 774 on-street parking spaces available to students will be eliminated. The removal of this parking resource, without the provision of a replacement, will shift student parking demands to the Leadbetter beach lots, and when these lots are full, to the more distant on-street spaces not restricted by the RPP.

Under the no project alternative, with city implementation of the RPP, some students, those who are unable to pay the parking fee, and unwilling to walk the longer distance to the campus from remote on-street spaces, will seek other modes of transportation to SBCC. Most however, are likely to pay the parking fee and use Leadbetter and La Playa lots.

Such a massive shift of student parking to the beach lots will have the potential for conflicts between beach users and students. These conflicts must be considered an adverse impact since LRDP 4.1 requires that the college not displace beach recreational parking, which has priority under the Coastal Act.

2) Reliance on TDM alone to reduce student parking demands overall and to a degree where parking conflicts at the beach lots do not occur.

Under the conditions which will be created by implementation of the RPP, the use of transportation demand measures (TDMs) alone to reduce student parking demands sufficiently to accommodate the displaced on-street parking and prevent potential parking conflicts between students and beach/harbor users in the Leadbetter lots, would not be successful. The elimination of 774 on-street spaces by the RPP will create a parking supply deficit too large to be eliminated by the TDMs alone. A major shift of the demand to the beach lots would occur, with on-street spaces on the periphery of the RPP area satisfying demand unmet at the beach lots.

Alternative #2 will not prevent student parking demands from potential conflicts with beach parkers at the beach lots; this alternative would not be able to eliminate the parking supply deficit which will be created by the RPP.

3) The proposed project
The proposed project will replace, on campus, 510 of the 774 on-street spaces displaced by the RPP. This is a sufficient number to avoid increased student parking demands in beach lots as a result of the RPP. While the result would be a reduction of 264 spaces in the total on/offstreet supply presently available, the total supply would be roughly equivalent to the peak demands of the college. This would be the desired situation, i.e., all spaces off-street in lots which can be managed with supply equal to demand. In addition, while not creating a parking deficit, the reduction in spaces will tighten the supply and exert pressure on students to use other transportation options such as MTD. Recently, the SBCC students voted to accept subsidized MTD service. Beginning in the Spring of 1991, enrolled students will ride MTD free of charge during each semester.

Additionally, by concentrating the total SBCC parking supply in locations either on-campus or immediately adjacent to it, the project, in concert with the RPP, will eliminate the historical pattern of students cruising on campus lots for spaces and then, finding none, returning to the adjacent residential streets in search of a close on-street space. This will result in fewer vehicle miles travelled, less auto air emissions, and less intersection traffic on Cliff, Shoreline and Loma Alta Drives.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Issue

The presence of archaeological resources on coastal properties in the central coast region is always a possibility. Archaeological resources must be protected from degradation. A survey of possible archaeological resources was undertaken by Dames & Moore, a copy of which is provided in Appendix E.

Existing Conditions

The proposed project sites are located within 0.25 miles of sites SBa-30 and SBa-31, both of which occupy portions of the campus. However, the results of a Phase 1 Survey and Phase 2 testing (trenching) program at three separate locations on the East and West Campuses indicates that neither Sba-30 or 31 extend into the site.

Each of the project sites were surveyed and trenched to verify whether discrete archaeological sites which are separate from Sba-30 and 31 existed. On east Campus, at the location of proposed lot 1D, eight backhoe trenches were excavated. A layer of midden was found, however it was determined that the layer was recently "redeposited" on top of other soils. It is not known where the redeposited materials originally came from. No other cultural materials were found (Lauren Michals, Staff Archaeologist, Dames & Moore, July 27, 1990).

On the west campus proposed project site five backhoe trenches were excavated. No cultural material was found or recovered from any of the trenches. An intact historical site was found on west campus, it is a low sandstone wall located just west
of the proposed parking structure site. The curvature of the wall and its placement along the edge of the Arroyo suggest that it may have been placed to prevent erosion (Lauren Michals July 27, 1990).

Archaeological Impacts of The Proposed Project

No intact prehistoric or historic remains greater than 50 years of age as defined by the criteria set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Appendix K, were identified on the project parcel on the east campus. No adverse impacts the cultural resources would occur as a result of the construction of lot 1D.

One intact, but insignificant, historic site (sandstone wall) was identified just west of the project site on west campus. No adverse environmental impacts to cultural resources on the west campus would occur as a result of the proposed parking structure and associated fire/access road.

Mitigations

Notwithstanding the lack of evidence of existing cultural resources upon the proposed project site, the following action should be taken:

1. During construction, if in situ prehistoric or historical archaeological materials or features greater than 50 years in age are encountered, the remains should be recorded in the field by a qualified archaeologist and procedures set forth in the Cultural Resources Section of the City's Master Environmental Assessment implemented.
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Construction of a student parking structure on the West Campus, northeast of the existing parking lot, creating an estimated 450 parking spaces. The building footprint will be approximately 84,000 square feet, with total building area amounting to approximately 168,000 square feet. The parking structure will be accessed from a new perimeter access road that will also serve as fire and service vehicle access to the Learning Resource Center and the Interdisciplinary Center buildings.

The entrance road for the West Campus Parking Structure will be expanded to four lanes with an east-bound de-acceleration lane on Cliff Drive to facilitate right-hand turns onto the new West Campus entrance road. A traffic control kiosk will be constructed in the center divider of the entrance road. A left-hand turn pocket just south of the kiosk will provide for access towards the parking control structure.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DISCUSSION

1b. & 1c. Soil Disruption, Displacement, Compaction, or Overcovering and Substantial Change in Topography. The proposed 3 story parking structure will have one story partially underground requiring some excavation. Soil compaction is needed for the road and building foundations. The finished project will restore and landscape the landform. These impacts will be confined to the project site. Erosion protection measures will be in place. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified.

3b. Substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or surface runoff. The parking structure will cause some additional surface runoff. However, the volume is not significant and the additional runoff will drain to the south of the parking structure into an existing campus sewer system. Therefore, the additional runoff will not cause any erosion problems, significantly alter drainage or surface runoff patterns.

13b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking, and Recreation. Impacts upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities. The proposed parking structure on West Campus will add 436 on-campus parking spaces. An additional 84 spaces (net gain) will be constructed on East Campus. Combined there will be 510 additional spaces. Concurrently, the City will be implementing a permit parking program around the campus which will reduce on-street parking presently available to students by 774 spaces. Consequently, there will be a net decrease of 264 spaces even though the on-campus parking supply will increase by 510 spaces.
The proposed project will increase the number of on campus spaces for students who now park at the beach and in residential areas. With minor changes to its existing parking management program, the new on campus spaces will attract some students who presently use beach lots. A reduction in student parking demands at the beach lots will provide more parking for recreational users.

13 d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods. Student parking will shift from on-street parking to on-campus parking when the parking structure and City permit program are completed (see 13b above). This shift will create a positive change in circulation patterns since traffic and safety conditions will improve along residential streets currently impacted by student parking. The projects will not result in additional vehicle trips and will reduce both vehicle miles travelled and auto emissions below current levels. Recommendations of a 1986 Traffic Safety Study by ATE have been incorporated into the proposed project and will mitigate any potential circulation or traffic safety impacts of the proposed parking structure (See Recommendation A5).

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

d The project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

RECOMMENDATION

A. It is recommended that the following amendments and / or mitigations be incorporated into the project description:

1. Prior to construction, the College shall meet with the contractor to schedule construction-related truck trips during non-peak hours and to establish haul routes to help reduce truck traffic on adjacent streets. Measures shall be undertaken to minimize the dust generated during the transport of all materials.

2. During grading and construction, the site shall be watered to minimize dust.

3. All new lighting on West Campus shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts to the adjacent Oceano and Loma Alta neighborhoods.
4. The amended LRDP includes the recommended parking mitigations for improving the operation and efficiency of the overall parking system, substantially as set forth in the September 22, 1986 Traffic Safety Analysis prepared by ATE.

5. The LRDP includes the recommended traffic mitigations for both the east and West Campus entrances and Cliff Drive, substantially as set forth in the September 22, 1986 Traffic Safety Analysis prepared by ATE.

6. In order to minimize the visual impact of the parking structure on the adjacent Loma Alta apartment units, the College will restore the removed Arroyo Honda vegetation on their property with appropriate species and landscape the proposed parking structure with screening vegetation.

7. Appropriate runoff collection will be incorporated into parking structure design to reduce potential for erosion.

8. During construction of the West Campus Parking Structure, a Cultural Resources expert will be available and if resources are found, work will cease until further investigation is completed.

B. It is recommended that the Santa Barbara College Board make the mandatory findings of significance outlined in # 21 above and direct the preparation of a Negative Declaration.
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ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
(To Be Completed By Lead Agency)

I. Background

1. Name of Proponent  
   Santa Barbara City College

2. Address and Phone Number of Proponent  
   721 Cliff Drive  
   Santa Barbara CA 93109  
   Contact: Dr. Charles Hanson  
   (805) 965-0581

3. Date of Checklist Submitted  
   July 9, 1990

4. Agency Requiring Checklist  
   SBCC

5. Name of Proposal, if applicable  
   West Campus Parking Structure

II. Environmental Impacts
(Explanations of all "yes" and "maybe" answers are required on attached sheets.)

1. Earth. Will the proposal result in:

   a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No  

   b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No  

   c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No  

   d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No  

   e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No  

   f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?  
      Yes  
      Maybe  
      No
2. Air. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?
   b. The creation of objectionable odors?
   c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

3. Water. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?
   b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?
   c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?
   d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?
   e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?
   f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?
   g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?
   h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?
   i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?
4. **Plant Life.** Will the proposal result in:
   
a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

5. **Animal Life.** Will the proposal result in:
   
a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

6. **Noise.** Will the proposal result in:
   
a. Increases in existing noise levels?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

7. **Light and Glare.** Will the proposal produce new light or glare?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

8. **Land Use.** Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X

9. **Natural Resources.** Will the proposal result in:
   
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?
   
   ![Yes] ![Maybe] ![No] X
b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?

10. Risk of Upset. Will the proposal involve:

a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

11. Population. Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?

12. Housing. Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

13. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?

b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?

14. Public Services. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire protection?

b. Police protection?

c. Schools?
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?  
   [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?  
   [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

f. Other governmental services?  
   [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

15. Energy. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

16. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:
   a. Power or natural gas?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   b. Communications systems?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   c. Water?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   d. Sewer or septic tanks?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   e. Storm water drainage?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   f. Solid waste and disposal?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

17. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
   b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

18. Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?  
   [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No

19. Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?  
   [x] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [ ] No

20. Cultural Resources.
   a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?  
      [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [x] No
b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?

Yes  Maybe  No

X

c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

Yes  Maybe  No

X

d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

Yes  Maybe  No

X


a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Yes  Maybe  No

X

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Yes  Maybe  No

X

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)

Yes  Maybe  No

X

d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Yes  Maybe  No

X

III. Discussion of Environmental Evaluation

IV. Determination
   (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.

☐ I find that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. With additional information (studies) relating to certain impacts, it may be possible to find that there will not be significant impact in this case because mitigation measures can be added to the project. Without said information (studies) and mitigation measures, the project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact report will be required.

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Date: 7-30-90

Signature: [Signature]

Title: Business Manager, San Le Bane, City College
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PARKING METHODOLOGY AND DATA

The parking counts were completed in 15 to 20 minutes of the stated count time.

The error for all parking lot counts was 1% to 2%. The capacity of each lot was known so when the lots were near capacity the empty spaces were counted and subtracted from the total known spaces.

For curb parking spaces the error was 10% due to the uncertainty involved with identifying SBCC from residential parking. Student use of residential streets surrounding the College was established through observation. These areas are presented in Figure 7.

The error adjustment for parking lots (+36 spaces) and onstreet parking areas (+42 spaces) gives the total error adjustment of ±78 parking spaces.

To provide for the most conservative count of the number of SBCC students using the residential roads identified in Figure 7, all parked cars were considered to be those of SBCC students during daylight hours. In addition, the peak hour count for the on-street parking was added to the peak hour off-street count to obtain the maximum SBCC parking demand.

All cars within the multiple use Leadbetter West lot were considered to belong to SBCC students. This is an unlikely scenario, especially in the early morning and in the later afternoon as beach users arrive. Therefore this approach ensures the most conservative offstreet parking count possible. Since completion of the 1985 parking study (LRDP), the existing Leadbetter snack bar has been expanded to a 120 to 180 seat restaurant. This has resulted in an increase in non-student use of the parking lot during the morning and lunch hours. However, the Leadbetter count did not attempt to subtract this increased use from the total count.

Given this conservative approach in counting on and off-street cars, it is felt that the tabulated peak SBCC demand is above that of the actual SBCC use of the identified parking resources.

The actual counts for all of the 1985 and 1988 parking surveys are attached, including additional graphs depicting student parking levels in more detail than presented in the LRDP text.
APPENDIX A

TABLE II

1985 SBCC Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th># of spaces</th>
<th>4/18 4:00p</th>
<th>4/19/85(Cool)</th>
<th>4/22/85(Warm)</th>
<th>% of Capacity at Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30a 10:30a</td>
<td>2:30p 8:30a 10:30a 2:30p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A Visitor,</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Campus</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Dirt Lot</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (-222 spaces washed out by 1983 winter storms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total lot park.</strong></td>
<td><strong>631</strong></td>
<td><strong>982</strong></td>
<td><strong>1404</strong></td>
<td><strong>573</strong></td>
<td><strong>1081</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Bikes</th>
<th>Mopeds &amp; Motorcys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castillo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Alta</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isletta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronel</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancheria</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceano &amp; side streets</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cars</strong></td>
<td><strong>631</strong></td>
<td><strong>1142</strong></td>
<td><strong>1600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikes</th>
<th>411</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mopeds &amp; Motorcys</td>
<td>33 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PARK** | 231 | 1142 | 1778 | 657 | 1409 | 2017 | 832 | 81% |
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### TABLE III

**1990 SBCC Parking Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th># of spaces 8:00a</th>
<th>2/20/90 10:00a 2:00p</th>
<th>2/21/90 8:00a 10:00a 2:00p</th>
<th>% of Capacity at Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Visitor</td>
<td>27 16</td>
<td>25 25</td>
<td>3 25 23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>2 8 6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B 1C</td>
<td>195 142 195 192</td>
<td>129 195 191</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A 2B</td>
<td>70 68 69 68</td>
<td>62 69 64</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C 3</td>
<td>95 90 94 88</td>
<td>91 94 93</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Campus</td>
<td>340 336 337 290</td>
<td>277 336 304</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>170 165 167 131</td>
<td>161 165 142</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (-222 spaces washed out by 1983 winter storms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>280 78 280 128</td>
<td>189 278 184</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total lot</strong></td>
<td><strong>1793 1344 1770 1403</strong></td>
<td><strong>1275 1753 1534</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Curb:         |                   |                       |                            |
| Castillo      | 47 29             | 50 26                 | 26 51 30                   | N/A                   |
| Loma Alta     | 23 18             | 22 17                 | 19 23 17                   | N/A                   |
| Miramonte     | 23 12             | 24 18                 | 13 21 15                   | N/A                   |
| Weldon        | 53 38             | 52 42                 | 25 53 41                   | N/A                   |
| Isleta        | 84 30             | 90 51                 | 23 67 32                   | N/A                   |
| Coronel       | 24 17             | 21 16                 | 16 21 13                   | N/A                   |
| Montecito     | 38 32             | 42 29                 | 29 42 28                   | N/A                   |
| Rancheria     | 26 23             | 25 20                 | 20 27 14                   | N/A                   |
| Oceano & side streets | 98 75 | 101 80 | 69 94 74 | N/A |
| **Total**     | **2209 1618 2197 1702** | **1515 2152 1798** | **99%**                    |

| Cars          |                   |                       |                            |
| Bikes~        | >242 84           | 157 119               | 84 190 93                  | <79%                  |
| Mopeds & Motorcys~ | 100 32 | 71 41 | 37 61 51 | 71%  |
| **TOTAL PARK**| **>2551 1734 2425 1862 1636 2403 1942** | **<95%** | **<95%** |
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ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION MEASURES

The shift of student and staff vehicles from the on-street parking areas to the on-campus parking lots will give the college a much greater degree of control over the implementation of alternative transportation modes.

In addition to the parking measures listed under policy 4.1 of the LRDP, additional Transportation Demand Management measures should be considered by the College if the Parking Monitoring Program demonstrates that College parking supplies are not adequate to meet demand and/or conflicts with beach recreational users are occurring. These recommended TDM measures are as follows:

1) Upon installation and staffing of the West Campus Kiosk, the College should initiate a preferential parking program as necessary to reduce the identified parking deficit and/or beach recreational user conflict (e.g. provide for reduced fees for cars that car-pool, set aside a minimum number of preferential parking spaces). Portions of lot 1D could be reserved for staff car-pool or vanpool vehicles. This lot is ideal for such a use because of its close proximity to the campus administrative facilities. The most attractive parking areas in the west campus parking garage could be reserved for student car-pool participants.

In addition other incentives should be instituted which will encourage use of alternative means of transportation by students and faculty. The alternate mode of transportation may be by mass transit, car pooling, bicycling and must be used regularly by the employee.

2) Employees and students shall be made aware of the Ride-Sharing Program, or similar successor programs, administered by the Area Planning Council or successor agency. The College should request all employees and students registered semi-annually in the Ride-Sharing Program and should make every effort to encourage participation in the program.

3) All deliveries to the Campus should be scheduled for times outside of the morning and evening peak traffic hours.

*The major truck delivery times for the College occur before 8:00 a.m. (Food Service), with no delivery occurring after 4:00 p.m.*

4) The College should designate a person as the Alternative Transportation Coordinator (ATC), who shall work with the City’s Transportation Management Program Coordinator while administering the vehicle use disincentives described here within. The Comprehensive Parking Program shall monitor the progress of the TDM measures and report annually to the City of Santa Barbara.

5) During each registration period or orientation sessions for new students, students should be informed about, and encouraged to use alternative transportation.
Appendix B

6) As required by the LRDP, the College should modify parking restriction signs to clearly state that public parking on campus owned lots is not restricted on weekends and school holidays.
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PARKING AND TRAFFIC ANALYSIS
July 11, 1990

Mr. Stephen Stanley
SPECTRA
3081 Calle Mariposa
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE WEST CAMPUS PARKING STRUCTURE AND PARKING LOT 1D
PROJECT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The following letter is a review of the traffic and parking information contained in the Negative Declaration prepared for the Santa Barbara City College West Campus parking structure and Parking Lot 1D. Also addressed are the comments submitted by the Environmental Defense Center on the Negative Declaration.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As discussed on Page 1 of the Negative Declaration (ND), Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) is proposing to construct a 436-space parking structure on West Campus, to be located east of the existing West Campus parking lots. The College is also proposing to construct a new 101-space surface parking lot (Lot 1D) on East Campus, to be located directly east of the existing kiosk. Parking Lot 1D will require the removal of 27 existing spaces and several temporary classroom and administrative buildings.

The proposed parking facilities are intended to provide additional off-street parking supplies for existing student parking demands at SBCC. Student parking in adjacent residential neighborhoods has created continued conflicts in these areas, and student parking in the beach parking lots competes with public use of these facilities. SBCC has therefore proposed the increases in on-campus parking supplies to reduce potential parking conflicts between SBCC students, local residents and beach users.
PARKING ANALYSIS

Existing Conditions

Based on information contained on pages 7 through 11 of the Negative Declaration, Santa Barbara City College currently provides 1294 off-street parking spaces in various parking lots located in the East Campus and West Campus areas. In addition to these spaces, 688 off-street spaces are currently available to students in the Pershing Park and Leadbetter West parking lots, as well as the recently completed Leadbetter East parking lot. These spaces are made available to the College via a joint use agreement between the City and SBCC. It should be noted that the number of spaces listed in Table 1 of the ND for these three lots are outdated, as the City has modified the striping in these facilities thus changing the number of spaces currently available. The most current parking space inventory information for these lots is displayed in Table 1, contained on the following page. Given the updated parking lot inventories, the total existing off-street parking supply available to faculty and staff at SBCC is 1,982 spaces.

As noted previously, SBCC students also park on-street in the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Campus. Inventories of the street segments located within the residential neighborhoods closest to the campus showed that approximately 416 spaces are available in these areas. The actual number of on-street spaces used by SBCC students may be higher, as students may park in areas outside of those inventoried. Figure 1, attached to this letter, illustrates the street segments included in the on-street inventories. Table 1 summarizes the number of spaces currently available in the various off-street parking lots and on-street areas used by students and staff at SBCC.

As discussed on page 7 of the ND, the existing peak parking demand generated by students and staff at SBCC was measured on two days during the third week of the 1990 Spring semester (February 20 and 21, 1990). These studies showed that the peak parking demand for SBCC is approximately 2,197 spaces, occurring at 10:00 A.M. The ND further indicated that the peak parking demand experienced during the first two weeks of the semester may be approximately 10% greater than this number, as enrollment is typically highest during this period. This would increase the peak demand experienced at SBCC to 2,441 spaces. Based on this demand figure, the existing on- and off-street supply at SBCC (2,398 spaces) would be deficient by 43 spaces. This excess demand would most likely be satisfied in on-street areas outside of those inventoried and in the Harbor parking lots.
Table 1
Santa Barbara City College
Existing On- and Off-Street Parking Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Park</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter West</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter East</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Areas</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the peak parking demand estimates attributed to the College may be somewhat inflated for several reasons. First, the parking demand studies completed in the Leadbetter West parking lot assumed that all vehicles were related to City College. Some of these vehicles may have been owned by beach users or patrons of the Sea Cove Restaurant. Second, the on-street parking demand studies assumed that all vehicles parked on-street were owned by City College students. A portion of these vehicles were probably owned by the occupants of or visitors to the adjacent residences. Finally, the use on the 10% factor applied to the parking demand generated in the third week of the semester may by somewhat of an overstatement, as the 10% drop in enrollment relates to the period between the first week of the semester and the mid-point in the semester. The actual drop in student enrollment between the first week and the third week may not be as high as the 10% figure used for the parking analysis. The demand figures discussed in the ND and in this analysis should therefore be viewed as conservatively high.
Future Conditions

Completion of the proposed West Campus parking structure and the Parking Lot 1D would increase the off-street supply available to SBCC from 1,982 spaces to 2,492 spaces. The City of Santa Barbara is also preparing to institute an on-street residential parking permit program in the neighborhoods adjacent to the Campus. This program would effectively prohibit students from parking in these areas unless they are residents of or visitors to the adjacent housing developments. The total future parking supply available to the College would therefore remain at 2,492 spaces. Table 2 summarizes the future spaces which would be available in the various off-street parking lots and on-street areas used by students and staff at SBCC. Again, the number of spaces listed in this table for the Leadbetter and Pershing parking lots are different than those shown in the NO due to striping changes implemented by the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing Park</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter West</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbetter East</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Areas</td>
<td>(Prohibited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,492</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The future supply of off-street parking spaces would satisfy the existing peak student and staff parking demands generated by SBCC. Based on the existing peak demand figure of 2,441 spaces, the future supply at SBCC (2,492 spaces) would exceed the peak demand by 51 spaces.
The ND indicated that the parking demand estimates for the off-street facilities may be off by one to two percent due to possible errors in the data collection process. It was also estimated that the demand measured in the on-street areas may be off by 10% due to the uncertainty in identifying all student vehicles. These possible fluctuations in the demand calculations would equate to + or — 78 spaces, which would yield a demand range of 2,363 to 2,519 spaces. The high end of the demand range would exceed the future off-street supply available to SBCC by 27 spaces. The potential excess demands would be satisfied in on-street parking areas outside of the residential permit program boundaries or in the Harbor parking lots. This deficit situation would presumably exist during the first week or two of the semester. During other periods, parking demands would be satisfied by the off-street supplies. It should be noted that because the parking demand estimates for the College are conservatively high for various reasons, it is unlikely that this deficit situation would materialize in the future.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

As discussed in the ND and above, construction of the West Campus parking garage and Parking Lot 1D will essentially offset the loss of on-street parking spaces adjacent to SBCC which will be subject to the City’s proposed residential permit parking program. The new parking facilities will not, therefore, result in the addition of significant amounts of new parking demand and associated traffic at SBCC.

Because the new on-campus parking resources will not significantly increase the overall parking supply available to SBCC, these facilities would not generate additional vehicle trips within the vicinity of the campus. In fact, the additional parking resources may actually reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled within the area adjacent to SBCC. Under current conditions, students frequently drive through the adjacent residential neighborhoods as they search for parking spaces. With the new facilities in place, students would divert from the neighborhoods to the lots. Student vehicles would be removed from these satellite areas and the overall vehicle miles traveled in the region would decline.

As noted on page 20 of the ND, the new parking facilities would shift travel patterns in and around the campus slightly. It is expected that traffic volumes would incrementally increase on the section of Cliff Drive between Loma Alta and the West Campus entrance. Conversely, traffic volumes would decrease on Castillo Street, Shoreline Drive, Loma Alta Drive and in the neighborhoods north and west of SBCC. These shifts in travel patterns would not significantly impact the roadway segments and intersections adjacent to SBCC. In fact, the shift in travel patterns may actually improve conditions at the Castillo Street/Montecito Street intersection, which is the most
critical location in the study area in terms of operational level of service. It should also be noted that traffic related to SBCC is heaviest during the mid-morning periods when traffic on the adjacent street network is lighter. The shift in student travel patterns during these off-peak periods would have insignificant impacts as it would occur outside the critical morning and evening street peak hours.

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Page 16 of the ND states that "SBCC is required by policy 4.1 of the 1988 Amended LRDP to provide a comprehensive parking program reducing parking impacts to residential and harbor areas." The proposed parking structure and Lot 1D would assist in accomplishing this policy by removing student vehicles from the adjacent neighborhoods and the beachfront parking areas.

The ND also indicates that LRDP Policy 4.1(a) requires "an expanded incentive program for greater use of bicycles, mopeds/motorcycles and mass transit" at the College. It is not anticipated that construction of the proposed on-campus parking facilities would deter the use of these alternative transportation modes by students and staff at SBCC due to increases in overall parking resources. As noted previously, the City of Santa Barbara is planning to implement a residential permit parking program in the neighborhoods adjacent to SBCC during the same period in which the additional on-campus spaces are constructed.

The loss in on-street spaces will be offset by the new on-campus parking facilities. In fact, the City’s parking program could eventually encompass 774 on-street spaces, while the two new parking facilities would add 510 spaces. Thus the net number of spaces available to students in the area adjacent to the Campus could potentially decrease even with the construction of the on-campus facilities.

Construction of the new on-campus parking lots in conjunction with implementation of the City’s residential permit program could also allow SBCC to strengthen its transportation management program. Portions of Parking Lot 1D could be reserved for staff carpool or vanpool vehicles. This lot would be ideal for such a use due to its close proximity to the campus administrative facilities. Likewise, the most attractive parking areas in the West Campus parking garage could be reserved for student carpool participants. The shift of student vehicles from the on-street parking areas to the on-campus parking lots will give SBCC a much greater degree of control over the implementation of alternative transportation modes. A series of potential transportation and parking demand management strategies which could be added to the ND are outlined in the following section.
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING DEMAND MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

The following text discusses various Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures which could be added to those listed in the Mitigation section of the ND (page 19). These measures could be instituted by SBCC in the event that future parking supplies are not adequate to meet demands. The transportation and parking management strategies will be discussed separately for staff and students at SBCC.

SBCC Staff Transportation and Parking Management Strategies

The alternative travel strategies discussed below are aimed at reducing the number of staff vehicles traveling to and from the SBCC campus on a daily basis.

1. Staff Transportation and Parking Survey: The first step in instituting a successful TDM plan for SBCC employees would be involve completing a transportation survey of all staff members. The survey would identify the various alternatives travel methods (carpooling, vanpooling, transit, etc.) which are most attractive to SBCC employees. The survey would also identify appropriate incentives that could be used by SBCC to promote participation in the programs, such as subsidized transit, preferential parking for carpoolers, vanpool assistance, etc. Once this information is ascertained, the College could formulate a transportation demand management plan tailored to meet the needs of its employees.

2. Employee Transportation Coordinator: The implementation of an effective TDM plan could be further facilitated through the appointment of an Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC). The ETC would be responsible for the planning, development, and implementation of the employee TDM plan. The ETC would generally be responsible for compiling the transportation survey data, encouraging and implementing policies that support commute alternatives, disseminating information relative to carpooling and commute alternatives, providing information pertaining to bus routes and schedules in the area, and monitoring the on-site TDM program and reporting to City staff.

3. Carpooling: In comparison to other alternative travel modes, carpooling is one of the more attractive options for SBCC. The average carpool occupancy in the south coast area is 2.5 persons, so peak parking demands would be reduced by 1.5 spaces for every new carpool formed. The data collected in the employee survey could be used to determine those employees who would be willing to carpool. The survey data could also be used to determine employee schedule information and residence locations in order to promote the formation of carpools. This option could be promoted by a preferential parking system that would allow carpooling employees to
park in reserved, convenient spaces near the entrances to campus buildings, thus providing additional incentive for carpooling. Other services which could be provided on-site to promote carpooling include registration of SBCC employees with the County regional ridesharing agency, encoding of all employee addresses in a computer data base, and provision of lists and/or maps outlining those employees who live in close proximity to one another.

4. **Vanpooling**: Vanpooling is particularly attractive for the long distance commuters (30 minutes or longer) to the Campus. The employee survey data could be used to determine the number of staff members living in outlying areas (Ventura, North County, etc.) who would be willing to vanpool. Vanpools could then be administered in a variety of ways including College sponsored vanpools, employee-owned vanpools, or government subsidized vanpools. Design concepts that would facilitate vanpooling include passenger pick-up and drop-off areas, preferential vanpool parking areas, and wider parking spaces (9.5 feet) for the larger vehicle sizes.

5. **Public Transit**: Existing Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) bus stops are located at several locations around the campus. The use of transit facilities could be encouraged by implementing bus fare subsidy packages for College employees. The College could also advertise to its employees the various bus subsidy packages and bus routes available in the area.

6. **Bicycling**: Because the Campus site is located near several residential areas, biking could become an important component in the TDM plan. The existing bike lanes on roadways in the area surrounding the project site would also aid in promoting cycling. Secure bicycle parking devices should be installed in areas convenient to employees. Ideally, shower and changing facilities would also be made available on-campus.

7. **Emergency Transportation Services**: In the event that an emergency or work requirement interferes with an employee’s normal alternative transportation arrangement, SBCC could assist in providing an alternative means to guarantee a free ride home. These services would include subsidized taxi rides, provision of a College vehicle, or provision of a shuttle service.

**SBCC Student Transportation and Parking Management Strategies**

The alternative travel strategies discussed below are aimed at reducing the number of student vehicles traveling to and from the Campus on a daily basis.
1. **Public Transit**: The expanded use of public transit by SBCC students would be one of the most effective transportation management strategies available to the College. Students at SBCC have recently voted to institute a subsidized bus pass program to be funded through student registration fees. This program, scheduled to begin in the Spring 1991 semester, will allow SBCC students to ride the MTD services free of charge during each semester they are enrolled. It is expected that student ridership should increase significantly with the subsidized bus pass system in place.

The use of transit services by SBCC students could also be promoted through the formation and implementation of an enhanced transit program for the College. This program would be devised jointly in a cooperative effort between SBCC and MTD staff. The program would be designed to match the bus services provided in the area to the needs of the students. Ideally, the program would be designed to provide bus services during heavy periods of class activities, centering around the main beginning and ending times of the busy mid-morning classes. The program could also include a shuttle bus system between the campus and the main transit hub in downtown Santa Barbara. The transit plan could also include an analysis of the existing bus stop locations in the vicinity of the campus to determine if modifications are required to improve efficiency. It is ATE's understanding that such a program is currently being studied by MTD staff.

2. **Carpooling**: Student carpooling could be promoted by a preferential parking system that would allow carpooling students to park in reserved, convenient spaces near campus entrances points. The College could also offer reduced parking fees to carpool participants, thus providing additional incentives for carpooling.

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE CENTER COMMENTS**

The Environmental Defense Center (EDC) has submitted a letter to SBCC regarding the adequacy of the Negative Declaration prepared for the West Campus parking structure. On page 3 of the letter, the EDC states "It is well established that parking garages can constitute indirect sources of air pollution by attracting traffic that would go elsewhere or not exist at all" and that "the increased availability of parking can act as a disincentive for students, staff, and faculty to employ alternative methods of transportation ... in direct violation of LRDP policy 4.1(a)".
As discussed in the ND, SBCC is required by policy 4.1 of the 1988 Amended LRDP to provide a comprehensive parking program reducing parking impacts to residential and harbor areas. The proposed parking structure and Lot 1D would assist in accomplishing this policy by removing student vehicles from the adjacent neighborhoods and the harbor parking areas, and is therefore consistent with the section 4.1 of the LRDP.

Construction of the proposed on-campus parking facilities would not generate additional traffic volumes, nor would it deter the use of alternative transportation measures outlined in policy 4.1(a). As discussed previously in this letter, the City of Santa Barbara is planning to implement a residential permit parking program in the neighborhoods adjacent to SBCC during the same period in which the additional on-campus spaces are to be constructed. The new on-campus parking facilities would simply replace the on-street spaces lost as a result of the City's program, and thus would not generate new traffic or act as a disincentive to alternative vehicle use.

Construction of the new on-campus parking lots in conjunction with implementation of the City's residential permit program may actually allow SBCC to strengthen its transportation management program. The shift of student vehicles from the on-street parking areas to the on-campus parking lots will give SBCC a much greater degree of control over the implementation of alternative transportation measures (preferential parking assignment, reduced parking cost incentives, etc.) for its students.

The EDC letter (page 5) also states that "As a component of the Long Range Development Plan, the City College was required to establish an expanded incentive program apparently to encourage the use of non-automotive transportation to the campus. The measures identified in the negative declaration at page 17 fall woefully short of satisfying this requirement."

The conditions listed under LRDP policy 4.1(a) are only required in the event that parking conflicts between SBCC and residential, beach area, and harbor uses are identified through parking survey information. Completion of the parking structure would reduce these conflicts, thus reducing the need for implementation of the measures outlined in policy 4.1(a).

Page 20 of the ND also outlines several measures in addition to those listed under policy 4.1(a) which could be implemented by SBCC if the parking monitoring program indicates that parking conflicts are occurring. These measures, combined with those discussed in the above text, would provide adequate incentives for the use of alternative transportation modes among both students and faculty at the College.
This concludes our letter regarding the Negative Declaration for the Santa Barbara City College West Campus parking structure and Parking Lot 1D. Please call me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Scott A. Schell
Transportation Planner
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1.0 Introduction

Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) proposes to construct a 3-story student parking structure and access roads on the West Campus. The building footprint will be approximately 49,822 feet. A Draft Negative Declaration (Santa Barbara City College, West Campus Student Parking Structure, Parking Lot 1D & Improvements to East & West Campus Entrances) was issued for the project on March 26, 1990. The Environmental Defense Center, after review of the document, found the Negative Declaration to be deficient in identification of biological resources and impacts associated with the project, as well as in developing appropriate mitigation measures (Chytlo, 1990).

The purpose of this report is to address the biological concerns outlined by the Environmental Defense Center and to augment the information set forth in the Negative Declaration for the Proposed West Campus Parking Structure. This biological resource study focuses on the Arroyo Honda, located adjacent to the proposed Parking Structure. The footprint of the parking structure and access roads lie within an area which has already been modified (i.e. paved, graded or landscaped). Therefore it has very low importance for botanical resources, and very reduced value to wildlife.

The objectives of this study are the following:

- Describe the existing biological setting of the Arroyo Honda.
- Identify any rare or otherwise sensitive plant and animal species located within and around the Arroyo Honda.
- Determine the potential impacts associated with the construction and use of a proposed 3-story parking structure located adjacent to the Arroyo Honda.
- Suggest mitigation measures to avoid or lessen all impacts to biological resources associated with the construction and use of the parking structure.

2.0 Biological Setting

2.1 Methods

The site was visited on June 18 and again on June 22, 1990. Observations on vertebrate species and wildlife value of existing habitats were made by Larry Hunt, Ph.D. Rachel Tierney conducted investigations of botanical resources.

A complete walk-over of the site was executed, extending from the Arroyo crossing at Loma Alta Drive,
west to the crossing at Cliff Drive (State Highway 225) on the SBCC campus. Additionally, a survey was made of the level, grassy areas immediately south of Arroyo Honda. The Arroyo Honda was also examined for vertebrates upstream, between Cliff Drive and Miramonte Road.

2.2 Existing Setting

Site plans for the West Campus Parking Structure (Architects West, November 30, 1989) locate the proposed building and access roads just south of the wooded Arroyo Honda. The Arroyo runs for approximately 1.25 miles through the diminutive Honda Valley, beginning at Carrillo Street near Miramonte Drive and traveling east to the intersection of Loma Alta and Shoreline Drives at West Beach. At this point the flow is carried under the roadways and emptied onto West Beach. The Arroyo encompasses over 4 acres of Mixed Oak and Eucalyptus Woodland within the City College West Campus.

The woodland is heavily disturbed by a combination of human activities and introduced plant species (mainly Eucalyptus). There is a considerable amount of trash scattered throughout the site as well as numerous trails crisscrossing the north-facing slope.

The Arroyo channel was dry upstream of the Miramonte Road undercrossing, and between Cliff Drive to Loma Alta Drive (an arca covering most of the study site), during the late spring reconnaissance. However, the drainage apparently experiences heavy flows during storms, as evidenced by large amounts of compacted water-borne debris and the size of the culvert pipes. There is currently a small amount of standing water in the Arroyo east of the Cliff Drive undercrossing on the SBCC campus, as well as flowing water upstream from this point to the Miramonte Road undercrossing. The source of this water could not be determined during the survey, but may be man-made.

The Soil Conservation Service identifies a single soil type on-site, classified as Concepcion Sandy Loam (United States Department of Agriculture, 1981). It is characterized as light-grey, sandy/silty soil with a high erosive potential. This soil is classified as hydric within the County.
WEST CAMPUS PARKING STRUCTURE
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

P = Proposed
I = Point of Potential Impact to Oak Woodland

FIGURE 1
2.3 Botanical Resources

The south side of the arroyo (the north-facing slope) supports a moderately developed woodland of Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) with scattered Australian Blue Gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*). Understory shrubs consist of Pittosporum (*Pittosporum undulatum*); Redberry (*Rhamnus crocea*) and Poison Oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*). Ground cover consists of scattered, introduced grasses and exotic perennials such as Periwinkle (*Vinca major*) and Nasturtium (*Tropacolum majus*).

The north slope of the arroyo is vegetated entirely by Eucalyptus Woodland with a deep (6" to 2') ground cover of leaf litter, branches and bark.

Plant species observed during the field reconnaissance are listed in Table 1.

Extensive grading has occurred in places south of the Arroyo, and common, introduced grasses and ruderal species, such as Castor Bean (*Ricinus communis*), Cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*) and Western Ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya* var. *californica*) have established.

2.4 Wildlife Resources

2.4.1 Wildlife Value of Habitats

The Oak Woodland appears to provide greater value to wildlife than areas covered by Eucalyptus. This is attributable to the large amounts of downed wood (trunks, branches and bark) which provide microhabitats for many small vertebrates, and by the structural heterogeneity afforded by the oaks and associated understory shrubs.

Eucalyptus woodlands have less value to wildlife because of the chemical alteration of the soils beneath the trees, the corresponding lack of understory shrubs, and the overall loss of structural heterogeneity of this habitat.

The site provides a considerable amount of local wildlife value, relative to the adjacent developed areas. However, the site is a degraded remnant of its former condition, and supports a depauperate vertebrate fauna. It is unlikely given the degree of disturbance to the site and the adjacent areas that less mobile species, including most of the amphibian and reptile species formerly present, could recolonize the site even following revegetation efforts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>STATUS (a)</th>
<th>HABIT (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambrosia psilostachya var. californica</td>
<td>Western Ragweed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anagallis arensis</td>
<td>Pimpernel</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemisia californica</td>
<td>Coastal Sagebrush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex lentiformis</td>
<td>Quailbrush</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex semibaccata</td>
<td>Australian Saltbush</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena fatua</td>
<td>Wild Oats</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena barbata</td>
<td>Slender Oats</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis pilularis ssp. consanguinea</td>
<td>Coyote Bush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassica nigra</td>
<td>Black Mustard</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus diandrus</td>
<td>Ripgut Brome</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus mollis</td>
<td>Soft Chess</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus rubens</td>
<td>Red Brome</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurca melitensis</td>
<td>Tocalote</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conyza canadensis</td>
<td>Horseweed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erodium cicutarium</td>
<td>Redstem Filaree</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus globulus</td>
<td>Blue Gum</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foeniculum vulgare</td>
<td>Sweet Fennel</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haplopappus venetus ssp. vernoniioides</td>
<td>Coast Goldenbush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedera helix</td>
<td>English Ivy</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemizonia ramosissima</td>
<td>Tarweed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteromeles arbutifolia</td>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum glaucum</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobularia maritimum</td>
<td>Sweet Alyssum</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malva parviflora</td>
<td>Cheeseweed</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrubium vulgare</td>
<td>Horehound</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melilotus albus</td>
<td>White Sweet Clover</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotiana glauca</td>
<td>Tree Tobacco</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporum undulatum</td>
<td>Pittosporum</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbago sp.</td>
<td>Plumbago</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphanus sativum</td>
<td>Wild Radish</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus crocea</td>
<td>Redberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus integrifolia</td>
<td>Lemonade Berry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

---

\(^1\) This list represents those species found during a June field reconnaissance, during a very dry year. Undoubtedly, many other ephemeral species are present at more favorable times.
### TABLE 1 (Continued)

**ARROYO HONDA**

**Plant Species List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>STATUS(^a)</th>
<th>HABIT(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ribes speciosum</td>
<td>Fuchsia-flowered Gooseberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricinus communis</td>
<td>Castor Bean</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus ursinus</td>
<td>Wild Blackberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus mexicana</td>
<td>Elderberry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrophularia californica</td>
<td>Figwort</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonchus oleraceus</td>
<td>Sow Thistle</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stachys bullata</td>
<td>Hedge Nettle</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicodendron diversilobum</td>
<td>Poison Oak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropaeolum majus</td>
<td>Garden Nasturtium</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia Sp.</td>
<td>Vetch</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca major</td>
<td>Periwinkle</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthium spinosum</td>
<td>Spiny Cocklebur</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Status: N = native; I = introduced; C = cultivated

\(^b\) Habit: T = tree; S = shrub; Su = subshrub; PH = perennial herb; A = annual; AG = annual grass; PG = perennial grass; V = vine
Of considerable importance is the potential for crow and raptor roosting sites provided by both Oak and Eucalyptus Woodlands. Several roosting sites (as evidenced by whitewash) were found throughout the Arroyo on the SBCC campus. The remains of a gull (no positive identification) was found at one such site. Great-horned owls, Red-tailed hawks and Sharp-shinned hawks have been seen roosting in this area. The Eucalyptus Woodland also provides temporary roosting sites for Monarch butterflies (Danaus plexippus) (Calvert, 1990).

The presence of permanent or semi-permanent water in the channel also improves the wildlife value of the site. At least two pairs of Black Phoebes (Sayornis nigricans) were seen foraging in the watered areas of the arroyo, feeding nearby fledglings.

The open, grassy areas, including the heavily-disturbed proposed building site, afford foraging space for several bird species as well as habitat for several species of mammals including Beechey Ground Squirrels (Otospermophilus beecheyi), Botta Pocket Gophers (Thomomys bottae) and Brush Rabbits (Sylvilagus bachmani).

2.4.2 Known or Expected Vertebrate Species

The following list contains species that were either directly observed or identified by sign (scat, tracks, burrows, carcasses), or may potentially occur on-site because of their occurrence in similar habitats on the Mesa, More Mesa and west of the UCSB campus. No sensitive species were directly or indirectly observed during the survey although the edaphic and floristic conditions on-site may potentially provide habitat for certain sensitive species. These are discussed in Section 2.5. Explanation of symbols: (o) = direct observation; (f) = feathers or carcass; (s) = scat; (t) = tracks; (b) = burrows.

**AMPHIBIANS**
- Black-bellied Slender Salamander
- Ensatina
- Arboreal Salamander
- Western Toad
- Pacific Treefrog

**REPTILES**
- Western Fence Lizard (o)
- Side-blotched Lizard
- Coast Horned Lizard
- Western Skink
- California Legless Lizard
- Southern Alligator Lizard
- Gopher Snake
- California Kingsnake
- Ring-necked Snake
- Blue Racer
- Striped Racer
- Night Snake
- Western Rattlesnake
BIRDS

Great Blue Heron
Turkey Vulture
Black-shouldered Kite
Cooper's Hawk
Red-tailed Hawk (f)
American Kestrel
California Quail
Killdeer
Western Gull
California Gull (o)
Ring-billed Gull
Band-tailed Pigeon
Rock Dove (o)
Mourning Dove (o)
Barn Owl
Screech Owl
Great Horned Owl
White-throated Swift
Black-chinned Hummingbird
Anna's Hummingbird (o)
Allen's Hummingbird
Common Flicker
Acorn Woodpecker (o)
Hairy Woodpecker (o)
Downy Woodpecker
Nuttall's Woodpecker
Western Kingbird
Black Phoebe (o)
Say's Phoebe
Horned Lark
Violet-Green Swallow
Barn Swallow
Cliff Swallow
Tree Swallow
Scrub Jay (o)
Common Crow (f)

Plain Titmouse
Bush Tit (o)
White-breasted Nuthatch
Wrentit
House Wren
Bewick’s Wren
Mockingbird (o)
California Thrasher
American Robin
Hermit Thrush
Swainson's Thrush
Ruby-crowned Kinglet
Cedar Waxwing
Loggerhead Shrike
European Starling (o)
Hutton's Vireo
Orange-crowned Warbler
Yellow-rumped Warbler
Black-throated Gray Warbler
Townsend's Warbler
Hermit Warbler
House Sparrow (o)
Western Meadowlark
Red-winged Blackbird
Hooded Oriole
Northern Oriole
Brewer's Blackbird
Western Tanager
House Finch (o)
American Goldfinch
Lesser Goldfinch
Rufous-sided Towhee
Brown Towhee (o)
Dark-eyed Junco
White-crowned Sparrow (o)
Golden-crowned Sparrow
Fox Sparrow
Song Sparrow (o)

MAMMALS  The presence of the starred (*) taxa in or near the arroyo is conditional upon the maintenance of the open grassy areas south of the arroyo.

Virginia Opossum
Trowbridge Shrew
Ornate Shrew
Broad-handed Mole (b) *
Hoary Bat
Big Brown Bat

Western Pipistrelle
Brazilian Free-tailed Bat
California Myotis
Small-footed Myotis
Yuma Myotis
Brush Rabbit*
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MAMMALS (Continued) The presence of the starred (*) taxa in or near the arroyo is conditional upon the maintenance of the open grassy areas south of the arroyo.

Beechey Ground Squirrel (o) *
Botta’s Pocket Gopher (b) *
Western Harvest Mouse
Dusky-footed Woodrat
House Mouse
Black Rat

Gray Fox (s)
Domestic Dog (s)
Coyote (s)
Raccoon (t)
Long-tailed Weasel *
Striped Skunk
House Cat

2.5 Sensitive Biological Resources - Regulatory Setting

A "sensitive biological resource" refers to any rare, threatened or endangered plant or animal species. Habitats are also considered sensitive if they exhibit a limited distribution, have high wildlife value, contain sensitive species, or are particularly susceptible to disturbance.

Rare, or otherwise sensitive plant and animal species and habitats, are protected by federal and state legislation. The federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 and the published list of endangered and threatened species provide legal protection for threatened and endangered taxa nationwide. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has jurisdiction over the federal program.

California has a similar mandate embodied in the California Endangered Species Act of 1970 and its corollary laws: the California Species Preservation Act of 1980 and the California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), along with recommendations from the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), has jurisdiction over the California Species Protection Laws.

Candidate species (taxa that are under review for state or federal listing) can gain fully-protected status at any time. State candidate species are also protected from removal or disturbance.

Many species qualify for formal protection under the California Environmental Quality Assurance Act (CEQA, State of California, 1986), even if these plants are not registered under state or federal programs. These include the majority of plants on the CNPS Lists 1 and 2, as well as species that are identified as rare, endangered or threatened regardless of recognition by the USFWS, CDFG or the CNPS.
2.5.1 Sensitive Flora

No state or federally-listed plant species (or candidate for listing) has been identified within the project site. No species identified by the CNPS as being rare, endangered, or in a position of becoming so in the foreseeable future, has been found in or near the project vicinity.

2.5.2 Sensitive Wildlife

No listed or candidate wildlife species, are known or are likely to occur with regularity on the project site. "Sensitive wildlife" or "species of special concern" are those that have shown a significant decline in numbers and/or distribution in recent years. The following sensitive taxa may potentially occur on-site:

**California Legless Lizard** (*Anniella pulchra*). This subspecies is listed by the CDFG as a species of "special concern". Legless lizards are common in stabilized coastal dunes and are geographically widespread in California. However, populations become increasingly fragmented inland from the coast. This is due to a combination of quite specific microhabitat requirements. They require loose, sandy soils in which to burrow. The soils present on-site appear suitable for this species and they have the greatest potential of occurring on the south slopes (Oak Woodland) of the arroyo. Specimens are known from Goleta Point, Hope Ranch and at a few sites on the Mesa.

**Blue Racer** (*Coluber constrictor*). This diurnal chaparral/grassland snake is also listed as a CDFG "special concern" species. It appears to be quite uncommon in Southern California, and locally has been found in mixed chaparral/grassland situations on the Mesa and at Lake Los Carneros.

**Trowbridge Shrew** (*Sorex trowbridgii*). This species is represented by a single museum record from Hope Ranch, and by skeletal remains found in Black-shouldered Kite pellets from More Mesa.

**Black-shouldered Kite** (*Elanus leucurus*). Once listed as "threatened" by state wildlife authorities, this species is now protected by federal legislation regarding all native migratory birds. This species is an uncommon resident in Santa Barbara County and typically inhabits open grassland and marshes (Lehman, 1982).

**Sharp-shined Hawk** (*Accipiter striatus*) This winter raptor is considered a "species of special concern" by the CDFG (Remsen, 1978) and the Audobon Society (Tate, 1986). This species may have been observed in the Arroyo (Flink, 1990).
2.5.3 Sensitive Habitats

The Oak Woodland in the Arroyo represents one of the last remaining stands of a formerly common coastal habitat. Oaks are protected in the Santa Barbara City College Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) (Spectra, 1988). Policy 1.1 of the LRDP states that no development will occur within 50 feet of the Arroyo Honda Oak and Riparian Habitat. In addition, this document requires that the 50 foot buffer will be planted with drought tolerant species, best suited for controlling erosion of the West Campus soils. The Plan allows for a road or firelane within this 50 foot buffer adjacent to parking lot 4A if no feasible alternative exists, provided that it is no closer than the dripline of the habitat.

Monarch butterfly roosting areas are considered "environmentally sensitive habitats" by the County's Local Coastal Plan (Santa Barbara County, 1982). Initial results from a study conducted for the County of Santa Barbara identify the Honda Arroyo as a potential roosting site or temporary bivouac (Calvert, 1990).

3.0 Impacts Associated with Project Development

3.1 Impacts to Oaks

The site and grading plans for the project show the access road and delineation of work-limit skirting close to, but outside of, the dripline of the woodland in the western section of the project. However, a preliminary visit to the site, and estimations of building and road locations, fail to clearly identify avoidance of the woodland.

3.2 Further Degradation of the Arroyo

Along with direct damage to oak trees associates with grading and construction activities, further degradation of the woodland may occur through soil disturbance via bank erosion or construction-related talus deposits. Soil compaction or deposition around trees has shown to be deleterious over time, by reducing the amount of air incorporated into the soil and available to roots.

In addition, any disturbance to the soil could potentially be followed by the establishment of introduced species, limiting the wildlife value of the site. The proliferation of Eucalyptus on the south side of the Arroyo would be especially undesirable, and a likely occurrence following disturbance and/or removal of oak trees.
4.0 Mitigation Measures

The following recommendations are proposed to protect the biological value of the existing on-site habitats.

1) Consider alternatives to the present design, that would eliminate the need to infringe upon the required 50-foot Oak Woodland buffer area. Relocation of access roads for the proposed building to the south side of the structure, away from the Arroyo, would decrease disturbance to this habitat.

2) If no feasible alternatives are identified, the access road and "limit of work" should be staked so that a more accurate appraisal of potential impacts can be made. A walk-over by the site engineer and a biologist, after initial staking, would provide a forum to consider the particular construction techniques and grading schemes, and how they may affect the oak trees.

3) Comply with all "Oak Tree Notes," listed on the Grading and Drainage Plan (G. Garvin Associates, November 30, 1989, revised May 14, 1990). Add the following conditions:

   No fill or graded material shall be deposited within the dripline of oak trees. Any soil or debris accumulated under trees shall be removed without disruption to the original soil surface.

   Any disturbed area shall be adequately replanted and stabilized to prevent erosion of soils into the Arroyo.

4) An on-site monitor should be present during the initial grading phase and final construction activities, to confirm that the above conditions are met and to assure the best possible outcome. Recent state legislation (AB3180), effective January, 1989, requires that the lead agency must adopt a monitoring or reporting program to "ensure compliance during project implementation".

The following recommendations are proposed to maintain and improve the biological value of the existing on-site habitats.

4) Remove all trash from the slopes of the Arroyo and the Arroyo channel. Construct small barriers in the channel to slow the water flow and retain water in the channel for longer periods.

5) Selectively remove eucalyptus from the channel borders and the south side of the Arroyo (the
north-facing slope) where it occurs within the Oak Woodland and replace with planted acorns collected from the site. Details for planting and maintenance should be developed specifically for this location. Any revegetation plan should provide for the periodic removal of Eucalyptus in the Oak Woodland. With a recovery and revegetation program, the site has the potential to increase in wildlife value for the more mobile vertebrate species, such as birds and certain mammals. The Oak Woodland understory could be substantially improved by further plantings of existing native species. Open areas should be maintained and a buffer zone should be created to allow small populations of these types of mammals to persist.

6) Maintain the Eucalyptus Woodlands on the north side of the Arroyo (the south-facing slope) as roosting sites for raptors and Monarch butterflies.
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APPENDIX E

ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDY
July 31, 1990

Dr. Charles Hanson
Business Administrator
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, California 93109

Re: Phase 1 Archaeological Survey
    Phase 2 Testing Report
    Santa Barbara City College
    Proposed Parking Lot 1D, Parking Structure, and
    New Maintenance Building
    Santa Barbara, California

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to summarize results of a Phase 1 prehistoric and historic archaeological survey and a Phase 2 testing program. The cultural resources evaluation was completed at three separate locations on the East and West Campuses of the Santa Barbara City College located at 721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara, California (Figures 1 and 2). These three separate parcels covered a total of approximately 61,000 square feet and are located within an area of possible prehistoric and historic archaeological sensitivity as defined by maps prepared as part of the "Cultural Resources Element, City of Santa Barbara’s Master Environmental Assessment." 

The Phase 1 study of the proposed project areas documented the presence of surface cultural remains in three locations. Two areas were identified on the West Campus in the vicinity of the proposed access road to the student parking structure and one area was identified on East Campus in the location of the proposed parking lot 1D. It was not possible to adequately assess the importance of the archaeological remains in two of these areas. As a result a Phase 2 archaeological testing program was conducted at these two locations.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed construction involves three separate areas within City College:

1) Proposed parking lot 1D covering approximately 8,000 square feet, including access roads, located near the entrance to East Campus and extending east along the northern bluff (Figures 3).

2) Proposed student parking structure to be located on the West Campus of Santa Barbara City College to the northeast of existing parking lots 4B, 4C, and 4D, and a new access road from the entrance to West Campus from Cliff Drive and connecting with the new parking structure. The proposed structure would have a footprint of approximately 49,822 square feet (Figure 4).
3) Proposed maintenance facility to be located on West Campus on the west side of the existing Drama and Music Complex. This structure would have a footprint of approximately 3000 square feet (Figure 5).

PREHISTORIC RESOURCES

A site records search was completed at the Central Coast Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara (see attached letter). No prehistoric archaeological resources are recorded on the project parcels. Three prehistoric sites are recorded within a 0.25 mile radius of the project parcel (SBa-29, SBa-30 and SBa-31).

SBa-30 and the adjacent site of SBa-31 comprise the site of Mispu, a large Chumash village. Both sites are located on the southeastern end of East Campus on the bluff above La Playa Stadium. SBa-30 and SBa-31 are approximately 800 feet southeast of the proposed parking lot 1D and 1400 feet southeast of the proposed student parking structure and the proposed maintenance facility. Rogers described SBa-30 as an extensive bed of dense camp refuse. SBa-31 is recorded as being immediately southwest of SBa-30 and is described, by Rogers, as being less extensive (Rogers 1929:111). Sporadic excavations have occurred at SBa-31 since 1929. Results of these excavations have not been published in detail. Construction of La Playa Stadium and Cabrillo Boulevard/Shoreline Drive removed extensive portions of both of these sites. The extent of intact prehistoric deposits is currently unknown. Recent archaeological studies in the area of these sites has documented some intact deposits still present on City College property (Wilcoxon et al. 1989; Haley et al. 1989). It is also believed that the excavations and construction removed El Castillo, the Spanish gun battery, although the exact location of the site has never been assessed.

SBa-29 is a large prehistoric or contact period Chumash village located at the junction of Castillo Street and Cabrillo Boulevard and probably extending into the southern portion of Plaza del Mar. This site does not extend onto City College property.

Five Phase 1 archaeological surveys have been conducted within 0.25 miles of the parcel (Snethkamp and McDowell 1990; Snethkamp and Haley 1988; Spanne 1978, 1986; Wilcoxon et al. 1989). One Phase 1 study involved the construction of the bus turnouts located on the northeastern and southeastern corners of Loma Alta Drive and Cliff Drive, immediately adjacent to the entrance to East Campus (Spanne 1978). This project involved both a surface survey and a series of soil auger borings. In the southeastern corner of this intersection, a shallow, 15 to 20 cm. deep, cultural deposit was encountered. This deposit contained a mix of both prehistoric and recent historic, i.e. glass and plastic, remains. It was assessed that this area contained a "thoroughly disturbed" archaeological deposit (Spanne 1978:5).

One Phase 1 survey (Wilcoxon et al. 1989) was conducted on the southern portion of the East Campus. This project was conducted in conjunction with the Santa Barbara Water Reclamation Project. Surface survey, shovel divots, and limited soil auger borings revealed that SBa-31 extends farther to the northwest than originally mapped by Rogers (1929:111).

No prehistoric or historic remains were discovered during the other three Phase 1 projects.

One Phase 2 and Phase 3 archaeological evaluation and mitigation project has been conducted on City College property. These projects have focused on evaluating the integrity and significance of the cultural deposits associated with the site SBa-31 (Haley et al. 1989). Artifacts, including bone tools fragments, chipped stone, ground stone, and fire-cracked rock, were recovered. The final results of the Phase 3 project are not yet available.
HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Information on potential historic archaeological resources was derived from a review of major historical maps of the City of Santa Barbara dating between 1820 and 1931. Maps consulted and the results obtained are as follows:

1820  
Santa Barbara Presidio.  (Map from the Vischer Papers, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.)

- This map was drawn to show the location of the Presidio. The map is not drawn to scale and as a result it is difficult to precisely identify the exact location of the few depicted outlying structures. One structure is shown on the map to the southwest of the Presidio and is labeled "J. Chapman" (?, illegible on original map).

1852  
Map of the Port of Santa Barbara, California. U.S. Coast Survey. Register No. 373. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- This map appears to have been updated in 1870. No buildings are shown in the vicinity of the project parcels. The area is shown as open space.

1853  
Preliminary Sketch of Santa Barbara, California. U.S. Coast Survey. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- No buildings are shown in the vicinity of the project parcels. The area is shown as open space.

1853  
Map of the City of Santa Barbara. Drawn by V. Wackenreuder. No. 2. February (Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation.)

- The project parcels lie outside the area of map coverage.

1853  
Map of the City of Santa Barbara. Drawn by V. Wackenreuder. No. 1. April (Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation.)

- The project parcels lie outside the area of map coverage.

1854  
Survey of Point Near Santa Barbara for a Light House Site. U.S. Coastal Survey. November (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- The project parcels lie outside the area of map coverage. Approximately 80 percent of the Mesa is shown. The Mesa appears to be undeveloped. No structures, roads, or agricultural fields are shown on the Mesa.

1870  
Santa Barbara Channel from Santa Barbara to Pelican Point. U.S. Coastal Survey. Section X. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- No structures are shown on the project parcels. Approximately fifteen structures are shown on the Mesa. The western half of the Mesa is largely undeveloped. Several plowed fields are shown on the eastern half of the Mesa. A road following approximately the same route as Cliff Drive crosses the Mesa, connecting Santa Barbara and the Arroyo Burro area. The project areas are shown as open space.
1870 Sketch of the City of Santa Barbara, California Showing Part of the Survey of 1870. U.S. Coastal Survey. M. Section X. 43a. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- No buildings are shown in the vicinity of the project areas. These areas are shown as open space.

1877 Bird's Eye View of Santa Barbara, California. Drawn and published by E.S. Clover. (Oblique drawing, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation.)

- Several roads are shown in the vicinity of present day City College: one forms a rough triangle on the southeastern end of the Mesa and another runs along the northern end above what appears to be present day Cliff Drive. There is one structure shown that has a large tower and one outbuilding. This structure may have been in the subsequent location of the Dibblee mansion. This map is not drawn to scale so that it is difficult to assess if this structure and its associated roads are in the project locations.

1870-8 Sketch of the City of Santa Barbara, California Showing Part of the Survey of 1870 and Changes and Improvements to January 1878. U.S. Coastal Survey. M. Section X. 43c. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- East Campus area is depicted with trees and structures. Two structures are indicated: one large structure is located in the northern half of the East Campus and approximately 400 feet south of Cliff Drive, a smaller structure is shown just to the west of the large structure.

  West campus is depicted as open space.

1886 Santa Barbara, California. Sanborn Map & Publishing Company, Ltd., New York. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)

- The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.


- The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.

1888 Santa Barbara. Reproduced from an original 1888 lithograph as a supplement to the 1971 Fiesta Edition of the Santa Barbara News-Press. (Oblique drawing, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation.)

- The *Punta del Castillo Residence of Thos. B. Dibblee* is shown in roughly the center of East Campus. It is depicted as a large house with roads along the west and south sides of the house that extend out to the Point Castillo bluff edge.

  No buildings are shown in the vicinity of the proposed construction on West Campus. These areas are shown as fenced grazing land.

1889 Map of the City of Santa Barbara, California. Published by C.G. Sanborn. Compiled by Charles Mensch. (UCSB Library Map & Imagery Laboratory.)
This map primarily shows property divisions and land ownership. Dr. Wencraft (?), illegible on original map, owned a 300 foot square parcel at the southwest corner of Cliff and Loma Alta Drives. The remaining portion of West Campus appears to have been owned by Mrs. Weldon. East Campus property was owned by Thos. B. Dibblee. The areas of proposed construction are depicted as undeveloped open land.

The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.

No structures are shown in the project areas. These areas are shown as open spaces with several roads and trees present.

No structures are shown directly in the project areas. One structure is depicted on the southeast end of Oceano Drive adjacent to City College West Campus and the location of the proposed maintenance facility. In addition, a small inlet is shown approximately where present day Loma Alta Drive connects with Cabrillo Boulevard.

The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.

The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.

The project areas lie outside the region of map coverage.

No structures are shown on either East or West Campus. The southern portion of West Campus is subdivided into smaller lots.

o No structures are shown in the vicinity of the project areas on West Campus. These areas have been subdivided but not developed.

Several structures are shown on East Campus and are associated with Santa Barbara State College. No structures are located directly in the project area.

Based on our review of the above referenced maps, the project areas on West Campus were vacant until sometime after 1946. East Campus appears to have structures and roads on it by the 1870's, although it is not possible to assess if these early historic structures were directly in the project area.

It is believed that El Castillo, the Spanish gun battery that guarded the harbor, was located on the southeastern edge of East Campus. If this was present in that area, it would have been removed during the construction of La Playa stadium and Cabrillo Boulevard/Shoreline Drive.

Interviews with individuals familiar with the history of the development of City College (D. Ringer and D. Trent, personal communications) and a brief review of existing blueprints from the initial construction on East Campus indicate that the temporary buildings present in the area of proposed parking lot 1D on East Campus have been there since the early 1950’s. This just postdates the initial construction of the present day Administration Building.

Although the Mesa lies outside the coverage of most of the above referenced maps, maps from 1854, 1870, 1889, and 1903 document the development of the Mesa. Additional information is provided by Walker Tompkins’ brief history of the Mesa (Tompkins 1989). Based on these sources the Mesa appears to have been largely undeveloped until the construction of the lighthouse in 1856. By 1870 portions of the eastern half of the Mesa were under cultivation (U.S. Coastal Survey Map 1870). During the late 1800’s and early 1900’s the Mesa continued to be a part of the rural hinterland of Santa Barbara. The 1903 USGS 15 minute quadrangle shows only 29 structures on the Mesa. In the 1920’s oil development occurred on the Mesa around Flora Vista Drive (Tompkins 1989). By 1946 two residential subdivisions are shown on the eastern half of the Mesa on the Sanborn Insurance map. The project parcel for the proposed maintenance facility is included within these subdivisions.

In summary, the East Campus of City College appears to have been undeveloped, with the exception of El Castillo, until the 1870’s when a large structure was built there. It is believed that remains of El Castillo were probably removed during the construction of Cabrillo Boulevard/Shoreline Drive. During the 1880’s the Dibblee Mansion and its road and outbuildings was constructed in approximately the center of East Campus. The mansion was destroyed during the 1925 earthquake. After that time, the property passed into the hand of the University of California and became the campus of Santa Barbara State College.

West Campus of City College appears to have been undeveloped until the 1970’s. Areas around the project parcels were subdivided between 1931 and 1946, however, no structures appear to have been built there. The southeastern half of West Campus was severely graded during the early 1970’s for a proposed condominium complex which was never constructed. City College purchased the property and regraded and stabilized the southeastern area. The northwestern section of West Campus was undisturbed until the construction of parking lots 4A-D. The proposed new maintenance facility and student parking structure both fall within the area graded during the 1970’s. The proposed access road is located within the previously undisturbed area.

RESULTS OF SURFACE SURVEY

A Phase 1 archaeological survey was conducted on the project areas on July 11, 1990. The three project areas were walked in their entirety. Surface visibility on the parcels was variable, ranging from 10 to 100 percent visibility. On East Campus, the area proposed for parking lot 1D is partially covered by
nine temporary structures and the pea gravel paths surrounding those structures (Figure 6). On West Campus, the area for the proposed maintenance facility contains a watered lawn. There are, however, a number of flower beds and bare areas allowing for an accurate assessment of potential cultural remains. The area for the proposed student parking structure ranged from 90 percent clear of vegetation in areas of past grading to being approximately 25 percent clear in the lawn and flower beds that are present in the path of the proposed access road. All exposed soil, such as found in flower beds and rodent burrows, was carefully examined for artifacts.

Three areas of surface archaeological remains were located during the Phase 1 surface survey:

1) Numerous fragments of various shellfish species, such as Chione sp. and Mytilus californianus, were present over almost the entire area proposed for parking lot 1D on the East Campus (Figure 6). A few fragments of Olivella biplicata were also noted. One biface fragment of Monterey chert and a light scatter of obsidian flakes were identified in the area. The obsidian flakes were located under a bench near the Social Science Building and are probably the result of a student flint knapping experiment.

2) On West Campus, just west of the proposed student parking structure, a low sandstone wall was identified (Figure 7). No other cultural material was present in the immediate area of this wall. The curvature of the wall and its placement on the edge of Arroyo Honda suggest that this may have been a retaining wall built to prevent erosion into the arroyo.

3) On West Campus, west of the proposed student parking structure, a low density shell midden with two historic ceramic fragments was identified (Figure 8). The shellfish consisted of Chione sp. and Tivela stultorum, species often associated with early 1900's refuse deposits.

It was not possible to adequately assess the remains on East Campus and in the area of the shell midden on West Campus from the surface survey. A Phase 2 archaeological testing program was conducted to further investigate these two deposits.

RESULTS OF PHASE 2 TESTING

PARKING AREA 1D, EAST CAMPUS
Eight backhoe trenches were excavated in and around the temporary buildings located in the northern portion of East Campus (Figure 6). The placement of the trenches was assessed by the location, or possible location, of underground utility lines, including the high pressure natural gas line running along the bluff edge just above Cliff Drive. The trenches ranged between 190 cm and 230 cm in length, approximately 18 inches (45.7 cm) wide, and between 40 and 80 cm deep, depending on the deposits encountered.

Test trenches 1, 2, 5, and 6 each contained a layer of midden characterized by fragments of shell and a few Monterey chert flakes in a dark grayish brown sandy loam. This layer directly overlaid, with no mixing of strata, either a yellowish brown silty sand containing no cultural material, light brown silty sand that also contained no cultural material, or a strata of culturally sterile mixed gravel, sand, and clay (Figure 11). The clean break between the cultural material and the underlying soils indicates that the cultural strata was recently redeposited on top of the other soils. This was probably done in conjunction with grading and filling the area prior to the placement of the temporary structures.

Test trenches 3, 4, 7, and 8 contained no cultural material and contained only the culturally sterile soils described above.
Additional trenches that were already open on the northern side of the old library were examined. These also showed a layer, approximately 20 cm deep, of redeposited archaeological material directly overlying a culturally sterile silty sandy soil.

PROPOSED STUDENT PARKING STRUCTURE, WEST CAMPUS
Five backhoe trenches were excavated in and around the light shell scatter (Figure 8). The trenches were randomly placed to maximize the information available. The trenches were approximately 250 cm, long, 45.7 cm (18 inches) wide, and between 70 and 110 cm deep. No cultural material was recovered from any of the trenches and, except for the top few centimeters, all the soils encountered appear to be naturally occurring (Figure 12). The top few centimeters in each trench contained a brown silty sand which may have been imported in as top soil. Based on these profiles, the cultural material was probably imported into the area with the top soil and does not belong to an in situ deposit.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

On July 13, 1990, a meeting was held with a representative of the Candelaria Indian Council and the Environmental Defense Center apprising them of the result of the Phase 1 survey.

On July 18, 1990, Louis Alvarado, Jr., of the Candelaria Indian Council served as a Native American monitor for the excavation of the backhoe trenches in the area of the proposed parking lot 1D. He recorded in his field notes that it was "soon apparent on each dig site at about 3 to 4 feet that the soil was sterile and a lot of it was fill sand from grading' and that no significant artifacts were found.

RECOMMENDATIONS

No intact prehistoric or historic archaeological remains greater than fifty years of age as defined by criteria set forth in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Appendix K, were identified on the project parcel on East Campus. Background research indicates that existing structures were constructed on the parcel in the early 1950's. There was, however, a layer of redeposited archaeological midden present across the majority of the area. Only one tool fragment and several obsidian flakes, probably of recent origin, were identified in the area.

One intact historic archaeological site was identified on West Campus, a low sandstone wall. The date of the construction of this wall is unknown. It is not considered a significant resource.

The project areas are located within 0.25 miles of SBa-30 and SBa-31. No indication that these sites extend into the project areas was noted during the project.

Remaining ground disturbance for the proposed project on East Campus involves the removal of the temporary structures present in the area, grading of the area, landscaping, and paving over of the surface. Ground disturbance for the proposed maintenance facility will probably involve the excavation of footings for the structure and will have a footprint of approximately 3000 square feet. Ground disturbance for the proposed student parking structure and access road will involve grading of the area, excavation of footings for the parking structure, and paving the access road. This construction will have a footprint of approximately 55,000 square feet. Due to the previous grading on West Campus and the lack of intact cultural material on East Campus, no further archaeological investigations are recommended for any of the project areas.

If in situ prehistoric or historic archaeological materials or features greater than fifty years in age are encountered during construction, the remains should be recorded and assessed in the field by a qualified archaeologist.
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*     *     *

If you have any questions regarding this report please contact me at (805) 685-4415.

Sincerely,

DAMES & MOORE

Pandora E. Snethkamp, Ph.D.
Senior Archaeologist

Lauren Michals
Staff Archaeologist
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To Whom It May Concern:

July 12, 1990

An archaeological records search was conducted in this office by Lauren Michals of Dames & Moore for proposed construction of a new maintenance building parking structure and parking lot 1D and the improvements to the east and west campus entrance of Santa Barbara City College.

Sincerely,

Gwen Bell
Assistant Coordinator