NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW FOR
DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

TO CONCERNED PARTIES:

The Santa Barbara City College Board of Trustees is proposing the projects listed below for the Main Campus of Santa Barbara City College.

California State law requires that an evaluation be conducted to determine if the projects could significantly effect the environment. Based upon an initial review, the following determination has been made:

X The proposed projects incorporating the identified mitigations have been found to have no significant adverse effect on the environment.

Projects:

1) Construction of a 10 ft. wide bikeway around the perimeter of the upper level of East Campus, the addition of new bicycle parking areas, and construction of a bluff-top walkway and interpretive stations on the West and East Campuses outside the area of the sensitive bluff scrub/shrub habitat.

2) Construction of a 936 sq. ft. one-story restroom building at the top of La Playa Stadium.

Use of Project: Use of the bikeway is for student and faculty transportation and mobility.

Use of the restroom facility is for students and stadium event visitors.

Sponsor: Santa Barbara City College

Site Area: The bikeway will be located on the upper East Campus parallel and adjacent to existing vehicle parking, road, and pedestrian walkway areas.

The restroom facility is for students and stadium just west of the pedestrian entrance-way to the stadium seating.

Uses Permitted by Long-Range Development Plan: Yes X No _

The Public Review period for the Draft Negative Declarations is from January 14, 1994, to March 17, 1994. A public hearing will be held March 17, 1994, to determine the adequacy of the Negative Declarations, and if adequate, to certify them as consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The hearings on the Negative Declarations will begin at 4:00 p.m. in the Board hearing room (A-211), second floor of the Administration Building, East Campus 721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara CA 93109-2394. All written or verbal comments on the Negative Declarations should be directed to Dr. Charles Hanson, Vice President of Business Services, at the above address or 805/965-0581.
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

Construct New Bikeway Around Perimeter of East Campus

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
721 CLIFF DRIVE, SANTA BARBARA CA. 93109-9990
CONTACT PERSON: DR. CHARLES HANSON
TELEPHONE: (805) 965-0581

December 8, 1993

Prepared by

Stanley & Associates
1316 Oakes Ave
Everett Wa. 98201
(206) 259-0761
PROJECT APPLICANT: Santa Barbara City College

PROJECT LOCATION: SBCC Campus, 721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara California

PROPOSED PROJECT: On the upper terrace of the SBCC East Campus, construct a bikeway around the campus perimeter. On both the West and East Campuses construct a pedestrian walkway along, but away from the bluff, out of sensitive bluff habitat. The bikeway will have an asphalt surface from 8 to 10 ft. wide, and be located immediately adjacent to, and parallel with existing parking lots, roadways and sidewalks on the campus. Where the bikeway is proposed adjacent to parking lots and roadways, these existing surfaces will have to be widened. (see sheets 1 thru 3 Figure 1). The project includes:

- Scarification of the earth surface to 6" depth and compaction for the bikeway. This will be necessary to prepare a construction surface where roadway or parking lots have to be widened in order to allow the finished grade of the bikeway to be even with the existing road or parking lot surface. In some locations, the bikeway would be constructed on fill.

- Footings for the construction of retaining walls may be necessary in areas proposed for new bicycle parking facilities.

Introduction

Santa Barbara City College has prepared this Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND) for construction of the development set forth in the Project Description. This Mitigated 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 proposed project to the California Coastal Commission which shall for review it for conformance with the policies of chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.

This document meets the Coastal Commission’s environmental information requirements set forth in section 13353 of the California Administrative Code.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration document describes the potential adverse impacts of a proposed project and explains why, with the described mitigations, the project avoids significant impacts to the physical environment.

Summary

The Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for Santa Barbara City College contains policies and standards for the broad range of resource and public service issues including those required under the California Coastal Act. The CEQA Checklist prepared for the proposed project indicates that the project has a relationship to only two of those issues, i.e., cultural (because
the East Campus is a Chumash site), and biological (because portions of the project are proposed in the vicinity of coastal scrub and woodland habitat). Accordingly, this Mitigated Negative Declaration addresses only those two issues. Of the two, only cultural resources were found to be potentially impacted by the project.

Project History

The proposed project is consistent with the LRDP goal and requirement that transportation modes which are alternative to the personal automobile be encouraged by the college as a means to reduce student parking demands and other transportation related adverse impacts. The proposed bikeway and bicycle parking facilities will allow for the increased use of the bicycle as a means of student travel. The California Coastal Commission certified the LRDP as consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act in 1985, and again as an amended LRDP, in 1988.

Biological Resources

The proposal would occupy an area previously disturbed, intensely used by students and pedestrians on a daily basis and currently in either paved surface or landscaping.

Consistency With the LRDP

Biological resources of importance on the SBCC Campus are designated as: the Arroyo Honda Riparian and Oak Woodland on West Campus; the Pershing Park oak woodland on the east slope of East Campus, and the remnant habitats on the West and East Campus bluff faces.

Because the project is located within existing disturbed areas outside of the mapped biological resources, there will be no significant impacts to their flora or fauna.

Archaeological And Historical Resources

Campus Site History

Both the east and west campuses of the college contain historic and prehistoric cultural sites of importance as well as unimportant accumulations and scatterings of material which have been identified as imported from other portions of the property; these were deposited during major grading and construction activities of the past.

Prehistoric Coastal Indians were the first known inhabitants of the Campus site. Two cultural sites presently identifiable on the East Campus are (CA-SBa-30 and CA-SBa-31) were part of the historic Canalino Village of Mispup. A dense bed of camp refuse and cemetery areas along the bluffs and in the area of the LSG building, deposits in the area of the East Campus parking lot above Cliff Drive, an area of flakes and shell on the West Campus bluff (SBCC-1), all attest to extensive prehistoric occupation of the campus site.
Historic use of the campus site began when the Spanish constructed a gun battery at Punta Del Castillo sometime between 1796 and 1829. The presence of this "Castillo" provided the name for Point Castillo. The location of the gun emplacement, which was quite extensive, was later destroyed by coastal erosion, and construction of Cabrillo Blvd, La Playa Stadium, and the Santa Barbara breakwater and harbor.

Archaeological Sensitivity Map
An Archaeological Sensitivity Map is on file at the college. The map designates historical and archaeological resources on the campus as "high, moderate, or low" sensitivity zones. The map was prepared as part of the campus LRDP, and as a tool to assist campus planners when locating designing and implementing campus development projects. Sensitivity Zone boundaries were defined by the surface indications of cultural materials.

High Sensitivity - the High Sensitivity Zone includes locations of known intact Archaeological deposits relating to CA-SBa-30 and CA-SBa-31; those areas where intact deposits may still exist. Any development activity or other actions which disturb the site in these areas may cause significant adverse impacts to the resource. This included modifications to the edge bluff for erosion control or other purposes.

Avoidance of impacts in these areas is always the preferred project alternative. If impacts are unavoidable, then a Phase II investigation to determine the integrity and sensitivity of the site is necessary. Depending upon the findings of the investigation, Phase II mitigation may be warranted.

Moderate Sensitivity - the Moderate Sensitivity Zone is where surface evidence is present but research and field investigation indicate heavy past disturbance. In these areas, intact subsurface deposits may have survived previous development activity.

Avoidance of impacts in this zone is also the preferred project alternative.

Low Sensitivity Zones - Low Sensitivity Zones are areas without surface indications and with a history of substantial grading and land modification. This includes areas with documented evidence of "redeposited" materials. The majority of the Low Sensitivity Zones are areas without surface evidence and a history of substantial land form modification. This zone overlays a majority of the West Campus and the northern portion of the East Campus.

SBCC Long Range Development Plan Policies Regarding Cultural Resources

8.1 In matters relating to the mitigation of project impacts upon Native American cultural resources, a qualified archaeologist should be retained, who shall perform the appropriate and required procedures under CEQA and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act and implementing regulations (43CFR Part 7), CEQA Appendix K, and the Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
8.2 Significant adverse impacts to cultural resources shall be avoided wherever feasible. Such activities within areas on the Sensitivity Map are considered to have such potential. Avoidance measures shall be implemented in consultation with a qualified archaeologist and include:

a) Placing the area within a permanent conservation easement.

b) Applying construction techniques which avoid contact with the archaeological resource.

c) Capping — according to standard archaeological procedures may be used in areas where soils covered will not suffer from serious compaction, the site has been recorded, and the natural processes of deterioration of the site have been effectively arrested.

8.3 Where avoidance and in-situ preservation is not feasible, data recovery through the removal and analysis of artifacts, supplemented by the appropriate ethnohistoric or historic studies shall be undertaken to mitigate adverse impacts.

a) Phase II and III mitigation measures, performed to standards employed by the Santa Barbara County Division of Environmental Review shall be implemented to reduce impacts to insignificant levels, prior to the resumption of the project. Where subsurface disturbance of Native American archaeological sites is unavoidable, monitoring of data recovery by qualified Native American monitors from groups designated by the State of California Native American Heritage Commission shall be required.

b) Monitoring of project construction is required following data recovery and other mitigation measures when portions of the site are left in-situ.

c) Artifacts shall be given to curation. Curation should take place at the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History according to that institution’s guidelines.

8.4 If cultural resources are discovered unexpectedly during construction activities, construction shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist retained to assist in the implementation of the policies and actions above.

Potential Project Impacts

The pedestrian walkway would be placed on grade, with no potential for significant impacts. Significant portions of the proposed bikeway would require scarification and compaction of soils in areas indicated as High Archaeological Sensitivity on the Campus Archaeological Sensitivity Map. These are the locations of the proposed project beginning at the southwest corner of the Administration Building and paralleling the roadway and parking lot as they trend to the south and east, to a point seaward of the Humanities Building, where the bikeway would follow the
Fire Road north until its switchback and decent down the Oak woodland slope to Pershing Park. An additional area of high sensitivity is at the entrance to the Cliff Drive entrance to the campus.

Excavation of soils in High Sensitivity Archaeological Areas has the potential to damage or adversely impact important cultural resources. However, within the area of the proposed project, there has been previous disturbance of the upper soil profile to varying depths for different construction activities over time (See Attachment 1, Archaeological Survey letter). Therefore, given the very surficial nature of the proposed project, and the proposed monitoring of all construction by an archaeologist and Native American (mitigation #2), the potential for adverse impacts is not as high as would be the case in areas with no prior disturbance.

Mitigations

Avoidance of sensitive archaeological resources is the preferred mitigation. Pursuant to LRDP policy 8.2, avoidance can be accomplished by either relocating the project, or by "capping" the resource.

With the exception of those areas which would have to be excavated for footings to support retaining walls for new or expanded bicycle parking, avoidance by relocation and capping will be the applied mitigation for this project. Mitigations are as follows:

1. Wherever feasible, relative to the ability of the project to function as designed, the walkway and bikeway shall be located so as to enable its construction on fill. Locations enabling fill (capping) are preferred over locations requiring scarification.

2. Where the application of the mitigation described in #1 above is neither feasible or desirable, scarification and/or excavation to a level not exceeding 6 inches is permissible, where it proceeds under the monitoring of a qualified archaeologist and Native American (see Attachment 1, letter from Lori Santoro).

3. Excavations below six inches, unless authorized by the on-site monitor, shall require phase II investigations with follow up per LRDP Policy 8.3.

Consistency With The LRDP

LRDP policies call for either "avoidance" first, which can be done by alternative project sites. If avoidance is not possible then "investigation to determine cultural significance of the proposed site is required. If significant artifacts are found, then avoidance by "in-situ measures is a possibility. If in-situ avoidance is not feasible, then data recovery through removal and analysis of artifacts is required to mitigate the project impacts on the resource.

With the application of the above mitigations potentially adverse impacts to archaeological resources will be avoided consistent with the requirements of the LRDP.
PROPOSED SBCC EAST CAMPUS BIKEWAY

FIGURE 1, Sheet #2
PROPOSED SBCC EAST CAMPUS BIKEWAY
December 1, 1993

Stephen Stanley
Stanley and Associates
1316 Oakes Ave.
Everett, Washington 98201

Dear Stephen:

This letter is in response to your request for information on the archaeological sensitivity of portions of the Santa Barbara Community College Campus (SBCC) regarding a proposed SBCC East Campus Bikeway System. An archaeological sensitivity map produced for the SBCC Long Range Development Plan indicates that the southern portions of the eastern campus contain archaeological site deposits that are associated with sites CA-SBA 30 and 31. This area has been designated as Chumash Point. Other archaeologically-sensitive areas include a segment to the south of the Administration Building and Occupational Education building, and an existing fire access road which is the Dibblee Estate driveway dating to the 1870s.

Based on the plans produced by Associated Transportation Engineers, and my discussion with Robert Faris, the proposed bikeway has been designed to either follow existing pavement, or will be constructed on fill where possible. Where construction on fill is not possible, the excavation for the bikeway shall not exceed 6 inches. A portion of the existing parking lot to the north of the stadium next to the Bookstore will be expanded into the lawn area to the north of the parking lot.

The areas to the south of the Bookstore have been archaeologically tested for the reclaimed water pipeline system at various locations along the proposed bikeway. These tests indicated that the upper 6-8 inches of the archaeological deposit have been disturbed as a result of past construction activities that have occurred on the campus over the years. According to historic maps and land use maps, the area where the parking lot will be expanded has been graded and disturbed. A portion of the high sensitivity area falls around the entranceway to the Campus off Cliff Drive but this area has also been recently developed after archaeological studies were performed.

Based on the data gathered from these past excavations, it can be determined that the areas of archaeological sensitivity that may be impacted by this project are most likely disturbed. As indicated in the development plans, only the upper 6 inches of the deposit will be disturbed; therefore, it is not necessary to perform a Phase II or Phase III archaeological study because impacts to the intact portions of the archaeological site deposits will be minimal. It will be necessary, however, for the project construction to be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American. If undisturbed dense archaeological deposits are encountered, the archaeologist and Native American shall be empowered to halt construction, and an evaluation of the deposit must occur.

If changes to the concept plan occur, a qualified archaeologist must be consulted to determine if a Phase II is necessary based on the changes.

Please contact me if you have any questions, or if changes to the plan are made. I suggest that you also contact a Native American representative for their input. I will be more than
Stephen Stanley

happy to perform the archaeological monitoring for this project. If requested, I will submit a proposal, and a contract to you or Dr. Hanson at SBCC. My current rate is $35.00 per hour and the monitoring will be on a Time and Materials basis. The amount of hours will of course be dependent on the construction schedule.

If you have any questions feel free to call me at 805-967-3820, or leave a message at 805-967-3752. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lori Santoro
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 93109-2394  
   805/965-0581 Ext. 2357  

3. Date of Checklist Submitted  December 3, 1993  

4. Agency Requiring Checklist  Santa Barbara City College  

5. Name of Proposal, if applicable  EAST CAMPUS BIKEWAY AND EAST/WEST CAMPUS PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY

II. Environmental Impacts

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Earth. Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

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 of 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?
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)?
   
   b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?
   
   c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?
   
   d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?

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)?
   
   b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
   
   c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
   
   d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

6. **Noise.** Will the proposal result in:
   
   a. Increases in existing noise levels?
   
   b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

7. **Light and Glare.** Will the proposal produce new light or glare?

8. **Land Use.** Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

9. **Natural Resources.** Will the proposal result in:
   
   a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?
15. Energy. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?
   b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

16. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:
   a. Power or natural gas?
   b. Communications systems?
   c. Water?
   d. Sewer or septic tanks?
   e. Storm water drainage?
   f. Solid waste and disposal?

17. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:
   a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
   b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

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?

19. Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

20. Cultural Resources.
   a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

November 24, 1993

Date

Signature

For SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

(Note: This is only a suggested form. Public agencies are free to devise their own format for initial studies.)