

## 7.0 ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “*an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.*” The EIR is to consider a “reasonable range” of alternatives to foster informed decision-making and public participation.

CEQA requires the EIR to identify feasible alternatives to the proposed project that will avoid, or at least lessen, significant impacts associated with the project. CEQA defines “feasible” as follows:

*“‘Feasible’ means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors.”*

The City must also evaluate how an alternative may affect meeting the overall project objectives. An alternative cannot be dismissed simply because it prevents a project objective from being fully realized, nor can an alternative be rejected because it would not achieve all of the project objectives. As also described in Section 3.6 of this EIR, the objectives of the Project are:

1. Revise the project site’s existing land use designation and zoning classifications to allow multiple types of residential units to be developed on the site.
2. Develop a traditional-style neighborhood affordable to the local workforce that incorporates a variety of housing sizes and types and that creates a sense of place and community while respecting and integrating natural resources on site.
3. Complete the development of an existing neighborhood with a variety of housing size and types for approximately 60 families.
4. Develop the project site such that it minimizes the potential for compatibility conflicts with neighboring properties.
5. Provide recreation opportunities for use by both the residents of the site and the public.
6. To support the health of Goleta’s technology industry, provide a program for advance notification of availability of units to employees of local technology companies prior to offering units for sale to the general public.

## 7.1 ALTERNATIVES TO BE EVALUATED

The alternatives to the Project that have been evaluated in this EIR are described below.

**No Project – No Development.** The No Project – No Development Alternative assumes that no new development would occur on the project site and the site would remain in its vacant condition.

**No Project –Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations.** This alternative assumes that future development on the project site would consist of uses that are consistent with the site’s existing General Plan land use designations and would not require the approval of discretionary land use permits by the City. Development that is assumed to occur under this scenario includes: one (1) single-family dwelling on the northern portion of the project site, which has a Single Family Residential land use designation; and agricultural uses and one single-family dwelling on the southern portion of the project site, which has an Agriculture land use designation. Agricultural uses on the southern portion of the project site could include row crops and/or greenhouses.

**Increased Streamside Protection Area.** Requirements related to the establishment of a Streamside Protection Area adjacent to the edge of a stream’s riparian corridor, including the segment of El Encanto Creek that is located adjacent to the project site, are specified by General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 2.2. Policy CE 2.2 also states that a Streamside Protection Area may be reduced from a standard width of 100 feet to a minimum width of 25 feet if specified findings can be made. The Project seeks to reduce the width of the Streamside Protection Area on the central and northern portions of the project site from 100 to 50 feet. This alternative evaluates a modified Project design that provides a 100-foot Streamside Protection Area along the entire reach of El Encanto Creek on the project site.

**Revised On-Site Land Use.** This alternative would result in the construction of a “mixed use” development on the project site. The northern portion of the site would be developed with residential uses consistent with the existing Design Residential 4.6 units per acre zoning; and the southern portion of the site would be developed with neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with the existing C-1 (Limited Commercial) zoning. Implementation of this alternative would require the approval of a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the southern portion of the project site from Agriculture to Community Commercial.

**Revised Project Design.** This alternative would result in substantial changes to the design of the proposed Project in an effort to eliminate or reduce environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the Project. The major design revision evaluated by this alternative is that all residences developed on the project site would be townhouse units, instead of the mix of unit types that would be provided by the proposed Project, and all of the townhouse units would be clustered onto the central portion of the site.

## 7.2 ALTERNATIVES REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Several alternatives to the Project were considered but rejected from further analysis because the alternatives would not be feasible, or would not attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Alternatives rejected from further consideration are described below.

An alternative that would implement a recommendation of the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District that new residential development be located 500 feet from diesel particulate matter sources such as U.S. 101 was considered and rejected. This alternative was rejected as being economically infeasible because a 500-foot buffer would eliminate the potential for new development on roughly the southern two-thirds of the project site, and mitigation measures have been identified by this EIR that would reduce the potential impacts resulting from long-term exposure to diesel particulate matter to a less than significant level.

A land use alternative that would result in the development of farmworker housing on the project site was rejected. Farmworker housing could be permitted with the approval of a Major Conditional Use Permit on the northern portion of the project, which has a Single Family Residential land use designation. Single- and multi-family units for farmworkers could also be developed on the southern portion of the project site, which has an Agriculture land use designation, with the approval of a Development Plan. This alternative was rejected because it has not been demonstrated that there is a need for up to 60 units of farmworker housing to support agricultural operations located in or near the City. Based on an uncertain demand for farmworker housing, this alternative was considered to be infeasible due to possible economic, legal and social factors.

Alternative sites that could accommodate development of a similar scale to the Project were considered. These include the following:

- The approximately 10-acre Girsh/Westen site, located on the 7100 block of Hollister Avenue, west of Santa Felicia Drive.
- Several sites that are vacant with pending applications, including:
  - 8+ acres located at 6830 Cortona Drive (Cortona Apartments).
  - 43 acres located north of 1 and 73 South Los Carneros Road (Villages at Los Carneros site).
  - 17 acres located east of Los Carneros Road and north of Camino Vista (Heritage Ridge Apartments).
  - 12 acres located along Kellogg Way and South Kellogg Avenue (Old Town Village).
- The 290-acre Bishop Ranch property, which is currently designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP.

These sites were determined to be infeasible for a variety of reasons. None of these sites are owned by and could not be developed by the Applicant. Development of all or part of the Bishop Ranch site is subject to Measure G, which prohibits conversion of most agricultural land without a vote of the people. Additionally, it would result in a loss of agricultural land that is at least equal to that of the Project. The remaining vacant sites have non-agricultural designations, but most have applications for development pending with the City or have greater environmental issues and therefore were not considered to be a viable alternative site for the Project.

### **7.3 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR evaluate a “No Project” alternative. The purpose of this alternative is to “*allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.*” Two “No Project” Alternative scenarios are evaluated below.

#### **7.3.1 No Project – No Development Scenario**

Under the No Development scenario, the project site would remain in its existing vacant condition. Therefore, the No Development scenario compares the environmental effects of the project site remaining in its existing condition against environmental effects that would occur if the proposed Project were approved and implemented. This Alternative scenario would:

- Avoid the low probability but potentially significant and unavoidable (Class I) project-specific and cumulative impacts that may result from developing new residential uses in the vicinity of U.S. 101 and the UPPR and the health and safety impacts that may occur in the event that a major transportation-related accident results in the release of hazardous materials in the vicinity of the project site.
- Avoid the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biology, cultural resources, hazard and hazardous material, water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, that would result from the implementation of the Project.
- Avoid the less than significant (Class III) short-term construction emissions, hydrology, and water resources impacts that would result from the implementation of the Project.
- Not provide the beneficial pedestrian circulation improvements that would be provided by the Project. The proposed circulation improvements include improvements to existing trail segments located northeast and northwest of the project site, and providing a sidewalk adjacent to the project site that would connect to sidewalk segments to the east and west.

- Not provide the beneficial improvements to habitat areas adjacent to El Encanto Creek that would result from the implementation of the proposed habitat restoration plan.
- The proposed Project would resolve an inconsistency between the Agriculture land use designation of the southern portion of the project site and the “C-1” zoning that has been applied to the same area. This inconsistency would continue to exist if the No Development Alternative is implemented.

The No Development scenario would avoid all of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed Project. Beneficial aspects of the Project would not be provided under this scenario, including: enhanced pedestrian circulation in the project area; creating native habitats adjacent to El Encanto Creek that are currently occupied by low value non-native grassland; providing additional housing that is affordable to the local workforce; and the elimination of an inconsistency between the existing land use designation and zoning on the southern portion of the project site.

### **7.3.2 No Project –Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations**

#### **Introduction**

The Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations scenario compares the impacts of the proposed Project to impacts that may be reasonably expected to occur if future ministerial (i.e., no discretionary permits are required) development on the project site were to occur consistent with the project site’s existing Single Family Residential and Agriculture General Plan land use designations. Potential future project site development assumptions used in this analysis are described below.

**Residential Uses.** The northern portion of the project site (Assessor Parcel 077-130-006) has a Single Family Residential land use designation. One (1) single-family dwelling could be developed on this portion of the project site without the approval of discretionary permits. An additional single-family dwelling could also be developed on the southern portion of the project site (Assessor Parcel 077-130-008) as allowed by Zoning Code Section 35-216.3

**Agriculture Uses.** The southern portion of project site is approximately 3.6 acres in area and has an Agriculture land use designation. Conducting a commercial farming operation on such a small site would likely have substantial limitations as typically larger parcels are considered necessary to achieve the economies of scale required to conduct a successful farming operation. However, it may be feasible to use the relatively small site to grow high value crops such as organic produce. The use of organic farming methods may also reduce the potential for land use conflicts with surrounding residential land uses, which could result from operations such as the application of pesticides. The southern portion of the project site could also be used to develop greenhouses.

**Other On-Site Development.** The two “arm” parcels that are part of the project site (Assessor Parcels 077-130-019 and 077-141-049 have land use designations of Planned Residential (8 units per acre) and Single Family Residential (maximum of 5 units per acre), respectively. Due to the narrow configuration of these parcels and their historic use as pedestrian trails, this alternative assumes that the “arm” parcels would remain in their current undeveloped condition.

The topography of the project site is irregular and it is assumed that minor grading would be required to develop building pads for residences on the northern and southern portions of the site, and some additional grading would be required if greenhouses were to be developed on the southern portion of the site. Overall, however, this alternative scenario would result in a substantial reduction in grading volumes when compared to the amount of grading that would be required to implement the proposed Project.

### **Alternative Analysis**

**Aesthetics.** Establishing a row crop agricultural use and one dwelling on the southern portion of the project site and the development of a single-family residence on the northern portion of the site would predominately retain the existing open space visual character of project site and result in a substantial decrease in structural development when compared to the development that would occur if the proposed Project were implemented. Maintaining a mostly open space visual character on the project site would also reduce the potential for impacts to views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from nearby public viewing locations along U.S. 101 and Calle Real when compared to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the proposed Project.

If greenhouses were to be developed on the southern portion of the project site it is likely that the greenhouses would not be as tall as the two-story residences that would be developed by the proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative would likely have reduced impacts to mountain views when compared to the less than significant (Class II) impacts of the Project. The construction of greenhouses on the project site would have an appearance that is somewhat out of character with the residential development adjacent to the project site to the north, east and west. However, the appearance of greenhouses would not degrade the visual character of the project site and would not result in a significant aesthetic impact.

The two residential units that could be developed on the project site under this alternative would likely be located a substantial distance from Calle Real, U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks, which could eliminate or substantially reduce the need to construct sound attenuation walls on the project site. Eliminating or substantially reducing the need for on-site sound walls could avoid the significant and mitigable (Class II) aesthetic impact of the Project that would result from the construction of a wall along the southern perimeter of the project site. Constructing two residences on the project site would have minimal lighting-related impacts when compared to the

impacts of the Project, and could also avoid the significant and mitigable (Class II) lighting-related impact associated with the proposed Project.

**Air Quality.** This alternative would result in the development of two (2) residential units on the project site, which would be a reduction of 58 units when compared to the proposed Project. It is also assumed that some grading would be required to construct residences and greenhouses, however, the amount of grading required for this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the grading required to construct the Project. Therefore, short-term construction-related emissions of this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the less than significant (Class III) short-term emissions of the Project.

The two residences developed under this alternative would likely have increased separation distances from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the proposed Project. An increase in separation distance between on-site residences and nearby diesel particulate matter emission sources and the substantial reduction in the number of people residing on the project site would reduce the potentially significant and mitigable (Class II) health-related impacts associated with the proposed Project.

The reduction in the number of residential units on the project site that would occur if this alternative were to be implemented would result in a substantial reduction in the number of new vehicle trips and an associated reduction in long-term air emissions when compared to the less than significant (Class III) mobile emissions of the Project. Conducting agricultural operations on the southern portion of the project site could be a long-term source of nuisance dust and particulate matter, which would not be an impact associated with the Project. Overall, however, the long-term emissions of the criteria pollutants, primarily ozone precursors NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG that would result from this No Project alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the less than significant (Class III) long-term air quality impacts of the Project.

The use of the southern portion of the project site for agricultural purposes could result in farming-related conflicts with nearby residential uses, such as occasional odors that result from the use of organic fertilizers, and dust from periodic soil tilling. This would be an impact not associated with the proposed Project, but is not expected to result in a significant air quality impact to surrounding residential uses.

Overall, the air quality impacts of this No Project Alternative would be reduced when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project.

**Biological Resources.** Establishing an agricultural use and one single-family dwelling on the southern portion of the project site would likely result in non-native grassland and non-native tree habitat removal impacts that are similar to the impacts of the proposed Project. The development of one single-family residence on the northern portion of the site would reduce

impacts related to the removal of non-native habitat when compared to the impacts of the Project.

This alternative would reduce the potential for direct disturbance impacts to El Encanto Creek that would result from the construction of the proposed storm water discharge pipe, but could result in long-term disturbances if farming operations were to occur adjacent to the creek. This alternative would likely reduce the potential for indirect human intrusion impacts to riparian habitat along the entire reach of El Encanto Creek adjacent to the project site because it would result in a lower on-site population. The reduced amount of grading and construction that would occur under this alternative would also reduce the potential significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project related to the disturbance of nesting birds. This alternative, however, would not implement the Project's proposed habitat restoration plan, which would replace low value non-native grassland habitat with native habitat that would enhance environmental conditions adjacent to the creek. Overall, the impacts to biological resources that would result from the implementation of this alternative are considered to be similar to the impacts of the proposed Project.

**Cultural Resources.** The western edge of recorded prehistoric archaeological site CA-SBA-1093 is located on the northeast corner of the project site. The development of a single-family residence on the northern portion of the project site could feasibly avoid the archaeological site, which would reduce the potential for significant and mitigable (Class II) cultural resources impacts that could result from the implementation of the proposed Project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The two residences developed under this alternative would likely have increased separation distances from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the proposed Project. An increase in the separation distance between on-site residences and the U.S. 101/UPRR transportation corridor would reduce the potential for significant health and safety impacts in the unlikely event of an accidental hazardous material release. This alternative would also substantially reduce the number of people that would reside on the project site, which would reduce the potential consequences of an accidental hazardous material release. Due to the increased separation distance and a substantial reduction in on-site population density, this alternative would likely result in a less than significant (Class III) accidental hazardous material release impact. This impact would be substantially reduced when compared to the potentially significant and unavoidable (Class I) project-specific and cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed Project.

Agricultural operations were previously conducted on the project site and as a result residual soil contamination from the use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals may be encountered during project site grading. Since this No Project Alternative would result in substantially less grading than would be required to implement the proposed Project, the potential for this alternative to be affected by soil contamination would be reduced when compared to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.



The use of the southern portion of the project site for agricultural purposes could cause farming-related conflicts with nearby residential uses, such as pesticide drift, however, an organic farming operation and/or greenhouse operations would substantially reduce the potential for such impacts.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** It is assumed that some grading on the project site would be required to construct residences and greenhouses, however, the amount of grading required for this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the grading required to construct the proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative's potential to result in short-term construction-related water quality impacts would be reduced when compared to the less than significant (Class III) short-term impacts of the Project.

The substantial reduction in residential development on the project site that would occur if this alternative were to be implemented would reduce post-development runoff flows and the potential for discharges of urban pollutants when compared to the proposed Project. The use of the southern portion of the project site for agricultural purposes instead of residential development could have the potential to result in farming-related impacts to water quality. The potential discharges of fertilizers and pesticides that may be used must be managed in compliance with regulations of the State Water Resource Control Board, which would minimize the potential for significant water quality impacts. The development of greenhouses on the southern portion of the project site could result in storm water runoff flows that are similar to post-development conditions that would occur if the southern portion of the project site were developed with residential uses. The post-development runoff characteristics from the southern portion of the project site under this alternative would likely be similar to the characteristics of the proposed Project and similar low impact development (i.e., a storm water bio-retention basin) strategies would be required. Overall, however, this alternative would result in reduced hydrology and water quality impacts when compared to the impacts of the Project because less urban development less impervious surface area would be constructed on the entire project site.

**Noise.** This alternative would result in the development of two (2) residential units on the project site, and on-site grading required to implement the alternative, including the possible construction of greenhouses, would be reduced when compared to the grading required for the proposed Project. Therefore, short-term construction noise and vibration impacts that would result from the implementation of this alternative would be reduced when compared to the Project's significant and mitigable (Class II) short-term construction noise impacts, and the Project's less than significant (Class III) vibration impacts.

The two single-family residential units and agricultural operations associated with this alternative would generate substantially less traffic than the amount of long-term traffic generated by the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for this alternative to result in traffic noise impacts along streets in the vicinity of the project site would be reduced when compared to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the proposed Project.

The two residences developed under this alternative would likely have increased separation distances from Calle Real, U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would occur if the proposed Project were to be implemented. The increased separation distances would reduce the potential for the residences to be adversely affected by transportation noise when compared to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

The use of the southern portion of the project site for agricultural purposes could result in farming-related conflicts with nearby residential uses, such as occasional noise that results from the use of tractors and other mechanical equipment. This would be an impact not associated with the proposed Project, but the intermittent noise likely to result from farming operations is not expected to result in a significant noise impact to surrounding residential uses.

**Traffic and Circulation.** This alternative would result in the development of two residential units and on-site grading required to implement the alternative, including the possible construction of greenhouses, would be substantially reduced when compared to the grading required for the proposed Project. Therefore, short-term construction traffic impacts of this No Project Alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the proposed Project, and it would not be necessary to implement proposed mitigation measure to reduce short-term truck traffic impacts that could result from importing 9,000 cubic yards soil to the project site.

The two single-family residential units and agricultural operations associated with this alternative would generate substantially less traffic than the amount of long-term traffic generated by the proposed Project. Therefore, the traffic impacts of this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the less than significant (Class III) traffic impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed Project.

**Water Resources.** This alternative would result in the development of two residences on parcels of approximately 3.6 and 5.8 acres. The City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* states that single-family residences on large lots in the Goleta area have a water demand of 1.81 acre feet per year. Therefore, the water demand of the two residences that would be developed under this alternative would be approximately 3.6 acre feet per year.

Establishing an agricultural use on the southern portion of the project site would have a demand for irrigation water. This analysis has assumed that approximately three (3) acres of the southern portion of the project site would be put into agricultural production and the remaining 0.6 acres would be used to provide site access and buffers from adjoining residential uses. The City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* states that on the South Coast, farming operations such as strawberry production use three (3) acre feet of irrigation water per year, which would result in an agricultural water demand of nine (9) acre feet per year.

The combined water demand for residential and agricultural uses that would be established under this No Project Alternative would be approximately 12.6 acre feet per year, which would be similar to the proposed Project's estimated water demand of 10.9 to 13.82 acre feet per year, depending on the water demand factor used to estimate water use. Both the Project and this alternative would not receive water service from the Goleta Water District in excess of the property's historical use credit (1.86 acre feet per year) until normal water supply conditions from Lake Cachuma are restored and the District's Stage II and III Water Shortage Emergency Resolutions are suspended. Therefore the water demand impact of this alternative would be similar to the impact of the proposed Project.

## **7.4 INCREASED STREAMSIDE PROTECTION AREA ALTERNATIVE**

### **Introduction**

General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 2.2 provides requirements for development projects to establish a Streamside Protection Area (SPA) adjacent to the edge of a stream's riparian corridor. The policy indicates that the buffer may be reduced from a standard width of 100 feet to a minimum width of 25 feet if specified findings are made. The Project seeks to reduce the width of the SPA on the central and northern portions of the project site from 100 feet to 50 feet. The boundaries of a 50- and a 100-foot wide SPA on the project site, and the SPA boundary proposed by the Project, are shown on EIR Figure 3.4-2 (Site Plan). The environmental impacts of the proposed SPA width reduction are evaluated in Section 5.3.4 of this EIR. That analysis concludes that the reduced SPA width would not result in significant environmental impacts. The purpose of this Alternative is to evaluate the feasibility and environmental impacts of a project design that complies with the 100-foot SPA standard described by Policy CE 2.2.

General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 2.3 identifies the uses and activities that are allowed in SPAs. Examples of allowable structures and uses include: compatible agricultural operations, fencing, maintenance of existing roads and structures, public road and utilities crossings, trails and bicycle paths, resource restoration or enhancement projects, nature education and research, and interpretive and public access signage. New roadways are not a permitted use in an SPA. The Increased SPA Buffer Alternative has assumed that the following design changes to the Project would be required to provide a 100-foot wide SPA:

- As proposed by the Project, the central and northern portions of the project site's main access road would be located within a 100-foot SPA. To implement this alternative, the central and northern portions of the main project site access road would be relocated to the east so that the road is entirely out of the buffer area. Relocating the road to the east would require the removal of Building 32 (units 28 and 29), and the removal of the western portion of Building 26 (unit 14).

- A single-family residence that is proposed to be located near the northwest corner of the project site would be within a 100-foot SPA. To implement this alternative, that structure (Building 25) would be eliminated.

While other design alternatives capable of providing a 100-foot wide on-site SPA may be feasible, this analysis assumes that the number of residential units that could be developed on the project site would be reduced from 60 units proposed by the Project to 56 units. This analysis also assumes that the proposed storm water bio-retention basin, which would be located in the southwestern corner of the project site and within a 100-foot SPA, would be retained in its proposed location. The basin's location has not been revised because the basin implements General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 2.5 (Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems), which requires that "*Onsite treatment of stormwater through retention basins, infiltration, vegetated swales, and other best management practices (BMPs) shall be required in order to protect water quality and the biological functions of creek ecosystems.*" The location of the basin adjacent to El Encanto Creek and within a 100-foot SPA would be consistent with the intent of Policies CE 2.2, 2.3 and CE 2.5 in that the basin's location would not adversely affect the biological resources of El Encanto Creek, its location in the southwestern corner of the project site adjacent to the creek facilitates the temporary storage and treatment of runoff water from a majority of the project site, and the basin would be a low-intensity use that is similar to the types of uses allowed within SPAs.

### Alternative Analysis

**Aesthetics.** Implementation of the Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would remove two buildings and reduce the size of one building when compared to the proposed Project. These design changes would not substantially increase or decrease the effects of potentially significant and mitigable (Class II) aesthetic impacts that would result from the implementation of the Project, including impacts related to views of the sound wall that would be located along the southern edge of the project site, or the potential for night lighting impacts. This alternative would not substantially increase or decrease the less than significant (Class III) aesthetic impacts that would result from the implementation of the Project, including impacts to views of the Santa Ynez Mountains, and changes to the visual character of the project site. Therefore, the aesthetic impacts of the Increased SPA Alternative would be similar to the impacts of the proposed Project.

**Air Quality.** This alternative would provide four fewer residential units when compared to the Project. Grading volumes required to implement this alternative would likely be the same as the grading volumes required to implement the Project. Therefore, short-term dust emissions of this alternative would be the same as the impacts of the Project, and short-term emissions of criteria pollutants would also be the same as the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

The development of new residences on the project site under this alternative would have the potential to expose residents to diesel particulate emissions that result from nearby truck and train operations on U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks. The potential impacts to on-site residents under this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the proposed Project.

Long-term emissions from mobile and stationary sources that would result from this alternative would be slightly reduced when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project because the alternative would provide four fewer residential units. Overall, however, the long-term emissions of the alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

**Biological Resources.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would provide an increased setback area from El Encanto Creek on the central and northern portions of the project site, and the additional buffer area could be incorporated into the habitat restoration plan that has been proposed to enhance habitat adjacent to the creek. The increased SPA/restoration area would reduce the potential for impacts related to the intrusion of humans into El Encanto Creek when compared to the Project. An increase in the SPA/restoration area, however, would not avoid or reduce direct impacts to riparian habitat that would result from the construction of the proposed bio-retention basin discharge pipe when compared to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impact of the Project, and would not avoid or reduce impacts that may result from inadvertent construction-related intrusions into riparian habitat areas when compared to the potentially significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project. Overall, providing additional habitat enhancement area on the project site would have increased environmental benefits that would reduce the potential for impacts to riparian and aquatic resources when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project.

**Cultural Resources.** The western edge of archaeological site CA-SBA-1093 is located on the northeast corner of the project site. This alternative would likely result in the same grading and development characteristics on the northeast corner of the project site as the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential cultural resources impacts of this alternative would be the same as the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the proposed Project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would provide four fewer residential units when compared to the proposed Project, but minimum separation distances between on-site residents and U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks would be the same as the separation distances provided by the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for residences provided by this alternative to be impacted by a transportation-related accidental release of hazardous materials would be the same as the significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts of the proposed Project.

This alternative would require the same amount of grading on the project site as would be required to implement the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for this alternative to

encounter soils that have been impacted by the previous of agricultural chemicals would be the same as the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would provide four fewer residential units when compared to the proposed Project, and grading volumes required to implement this alternative would likely be the same as the grading volumes required to implement the proposed Project. Therefore, potential construction-related water quality impacts of this alternative would be the same as the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

Removing four residential units and expanding the managed open space area on the project site would incrementally reduce impervious area and associated storm water runoff volumes, and would incrementally reduce the potential for water quality impacts associated with runoff from urbanized areas. However, this alternative would require the construction and operation of a bio-retention basin and other storm water infrastructure that is similar to what would be provided for the proposed by the Project. Therefore, long-term hydrology and water quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to the impacts of the Project.

**Noise.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would result in the removal of four units when compared to the proposed Project. It is likely, however, that grading and construction operations required to implement this alternative would be similar to the construction operations required for the Project. Therefore, short-term noise impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

Residential units developed under this alternative would be exposed to ambient noise conditions that result from vehicle operations on Calle Real and U.S. 101 and train operations on the nearby railroad tracks. A reduction of four fewer residential units on the project site would not increase or decrease the effects of this significant and mitigable (Class II) impact when compared to the impacts of the Project.

This alternative would result in a small reduction in project-generated traffic, which would have a corresponding decrease in traffic noise impacts when compared to the Project. However, it is likely that the decrease in traffic noise would not be perceptible and the alternative's traffic noise impacts would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project. Overall, noise impacts of this alternative would be similar to the noise impacts of the Project.

**Traffic and Circulation.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would reduce that amount of development on the project site when compared to the Project by removing one (1) single-family dwelling and three (3) attached dwellings. Trip generation characteristics of this alternative are depicted on Table 7.4-1.

**Table 7.4-1  
 Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative  
 Trip Generation**

Land Use	Size	Average Daily	
		Rate	Trips
Single-family homes	12 units	9.57	115
Attached townhouses	44 units	5.81	256
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56 units</b>	---	<b>371</b>

This alternative would generate approximately 371 average daily vehicle trips, which would be 26 fewer average daily trips than would be generated by the Project. The reduction in total trip generation would be a beneficial effect, however, the traffic impacts of the alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

Grading volumes required to implement this alternative would likely be the same as the grading volumes required to implement the Project, which would require the import of 9,000 cubic yards of soil to the project site. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

**Water Resources.** The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative would provide four fewer residential units when compared to the Project, which would result in a decrease in potable water demand. Using City of Santa Barbara (2009) water demand factors, approximately 10.9 AFY would be required to serve the Project, while this alternative would have a water demand of approximately 10.16 AFY. The reduction in water demand would be a beneficial effect, however, water supply impacts of the alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project because both the Project and this alternative would not receive water service from the Goleta Water District until normal water supply conditions from Lake Cachuma are restored and the District’s Stage II and III Water Shortage Emergency Resolutions are suspended. Therefore, the impact would be similar to the Project.

## **7.5 REVISED ON-SITE LAND USE**

### **Introduction**

The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative evaluates the development of land uses on the project site that are consistent with the site’s existing zoning classifications, and would result in the construction of a “mixed use” development on the 9.39-acre main portion of the project site. The 5.8-acre northern portion of the site would be developed with residential uses consistent with the site’s Design Residential 4.6 units per acre zoning; and the 3.6-acre southern portion of the project site would be developed with neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with the site’s C-1 (Limited Commercial) zoning. Implementation of this alternative would require the

approval of a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the southern portion of the project site from Agriculture to Community Commercial.

**Residential Uses.** The northern portion of the project site is approximately 5.8 acres, and approximately 0.2 acres of the northern area is occupied by riparian habitat ESHA associated with El Encanto Creek. Since the ESHA area is not considered to be developable, the “net” area considered by this alternative is approximately 5.6 acres in size. The construction of residential units at a density of 4.6 units per acre consistent with existing zoning requirements would result in the development of 25 residential units.

The Project would result in the construction of 13 single-family units, which would be approximately 20 percent of the total proposed 60 units, and the construction of 37 multi-family homes, which would be approximately 80 percent of the proposed units. Using a similar unit type mix as the Project, this alternative would provide five (5) single-family residences and 20 multi-family units. This analysis has assumed that access to the residences on the northern portion of the site would be from a driveway that is similar to the access for the Project.

**Commercial Uses.** The southern approximately 3.6 acres of the project site has a C-1 (Limited Commercial) zoning classification, and the intent of the C-1 zone is to “...*provide areas of commercial activities, including both retain businesses and service commercial activities, that serve the local community.*” Approximately 0.1 of an acre of the southern portion of the site is occupied by riparian habitat ESHA associated with El Encanto Creek, which reduces the potentially developable area to approximately 3.5 acres. To provide site improvements required for commercial uses (i.e., parking and landscaping) and to comply with applicable setback standards, this analysis has assumed new commercial development would occupy approximately 30 percent of the buildable portion of the site, which would result in the development of approximately 46,000 square feet of commercial building area.

### **Alternative Analysis**

**Aesthetics.** Similar to the Project, this alternative would change the visual character of the project site from an open area covered with non-native grasses to views of a site developed with urban uses. Views of the project site from the Calle Real/U.S. 101 corridor would be dominated by new the commercial building(s), rather than the residences that would be developed by the Project.

The commercial uses developed under this alternative would not be “noise sensitive uses” and would not require the construction of a noise barrier wall, which would eliminate a significant and mitigable (Class II) aesthetic impact of the Project. Commercial buildings on the southern portion of the site, however, could appear to be out of character with on-site residential uses to the north, and off-site residential areas to the east and west. This potentially significant impact would likely be reduced to a less than significant level by complying with the City’s development standards and design review requirements. Commercial structures on the southern



portion of the project site could be two stories in height, which would have the potential to result in impacts to views of the Santa Mountains that are similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project. The overall visual characteristics of the Project and this alternative would be somewhat different, however, both would change the visual character of the project site from an open space area to a developed condition. Therefore, the visual impacts of the Project and this alternative are considered to be similar.

**Air Quality.** Implementation of the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would likely require on-site grading and result in construction operations that are similar to the construction characteristics of the Project. Therefore, short-term construction-related emissions of this alternative would be similar to the short-term emissions of the Project.

The residences developed under this alternative would have an increased separation distances from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the Project. A substantial increase in separation distance between on-site residences and nearby diesel particulate matter emission sources would reduce the significant and mitigable (Class II) health-related impacts associated with the Project, although it is likely that mitigation measures to reduce concentrations of diesel particulate matter in on-site residences would also be required for this alternative.

As described in the Traffic and Circulation subsection below, the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would generate approximately 2,128 average daily trips compared to the 397 average daily trips that would be generated by the Project. Due to the large increase in vehicle trips and related mobile emissions, this alternative is considered to have air quality impacts that are greater than the impacts of the Project.

**Biological Resources.** Implementation of the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would result in grading and construction activities that are similar to the construction activities required to implement the Project, and both the alternative and Project would convert the project site from mostly non-native grassland habitat to a developed condition. Therefore, this alternative and the Project would result in similar impacts to biological resources, and the alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures similar to those required for the Project.

**Cultural Resources.** The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would result in similar grading and development characteristics on the northeast corner of the project site in the vicinity of archaeological site CA-SBA-1093 as would result from the implementation of the Project. Therefore, the potential impacts of this alternative to cultural resources would be similar to the significant and mitigable impacts of the Project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The residences developed under the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would be located on the northern portion of the project site, which would provide an increased separation distance from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when

compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the Project. An increase in the separation distance between on-site residences and the U.S. 101/UPRR transportation corridor would reduce the potential for significant health and safety impacts in the unlikely event of an accidental hazardous material release. This alternative would also reduce the number of residents on the project site, which could reduce the potential consequences of an accidental hazardous material release. Due the increased separation distance and reduced on-site population, this alternative would reduce the potential for adverse effects to on-site residents in the unlikely event of a hazardous material release. However, the development of 25 new residences near the U.S. 101/UPRR transportation corridor would still result in a potentially significant and unavoidable (Class I) project-specific and cumulative impact, similar to the impacts identified for the Project.

The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would likely result in grading characteristics that are similar to the grading required to implement the Project. Therefore, this alternative would have a similar potential to be affected by soil contamination associated with the former use of the project site for agricultural operations. The operation of commercial uses on the project site could result in an increase in the use and storage of hazardous materials when compared to the impacts of the Project, however, it is anticipated that potential hazardous material release impacts from on-site uses would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation and enforcement of existing regulatory requirements. Overall, the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative is considered to have potential hazards and hazardous material impacts that are similar to those of the Project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would result in the development of new structures on the entire project site and would likely require a similar amount of grading as required to implement the Project. Therefore, potential construction-related water quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to the impacts of the Project.

The development of commercial uses on the southern portion of the project site would require areas devoted to vehicle parking, which could result in an increase in the amount of impervious area when compared to the Project. Potential long-term impacts related to post-development runoff and runoff water quality, however, would generally be similar to the impacts of the Project and this alternative would require the construction and operation of a bio-retention basin and other storm water management infrastructure. Therefore, long-term hydrology and water quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to the impacts of the Project.

**Noise.** The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would result in the development of new structures on the entire project site and would likely require a similar amount of grading and construction activity as required to implement the Project. Therefore, short-term construction noise and vibration impacts that would result from the implementation of this alternative would be similar to the Project's significant and mitigable (Class II) short-term construction noise impacts, and the Project's less than significant (Class III) vibration impacts.

As described in the Traffic and Circulation subsection below, the Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would generate approximately 2,128 average daily trips compared to the 397 average daily trips that would be generated by the Project. Due to the increase in vehicle trips, this alternative would result in traffic noise impacts that are greater than the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

The commercial uses that would be developed on the southern portion of the project site under this alternative would not be noise-sensitive uses, which would eliminate the need to construct sound barrier walls on the site. The commercial building(s) would also serve as a noise barrier for residential uses that would be developed on the northern portion of the site. The noise barrier effect and the increased separation distance between residences and the Calle Real, U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks could eliminate or substantially reduce the significant and mitigable (Class II) noise impact to sensitive receptors that would occur if the Project were to be developed.

Commercial buildings on the southern portion of the site would have the potential to result in noise impacts to nearby residential areas, which would be an impact not associated with the Project. It is anticipated, however, that this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level by complying with the City's development standards and design review requirements.

Overall, on-site noise impacts of this alternative would be reduced when compared to the Project due to the reduction in transportation-related noise impacts to the residences that would be developed on the project site. However, the potential for off-site traffic noise impacts would be increased due to the substantial increase in traffic generated by the commercial component of this alternative. If necessary, it is more feasible to implement mitigation for on-site noise impacts than it is to mitigate potentially significant off-site traffic noise impacts. For this reason, the noise impacts of this alternative are considered to be increased when compared to the noise impacts of the Project.

**Traffic and Circulation.** The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would reduce the amount of residential development on the project site when compared to the Project, and would provide commercial element that would not be a component of the Project. Trip generation characteristics of this alternative are depicted on Table 7.5-1.

**Table 7.5-1  
 Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative  
 Trip Generation**

Land Use	Size	Average Daily	
		Rate	Trips
Single-family homes	5 units	9.57/unit	48
Attached townhouses	20 units	5.81/unit	116
Neighborhood Commercial	46,000 sq. ft.	42.69/1000 sq. ft.	1,964
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56 units</b>	---	<b>2,128</b>

The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would generate approximately 2,128 average daily vehicle trips, which would be an increase of 1,731 average daily trips when compared to the traffic generation characteristics of the Project. The increase in trip generation would have an increased potential to result in significant traffic impacts when compared to the impacts of the Project.

Grading volumes required to implement this alternative would likely be the same as the grading volumes required to implement the Project, which would require the import of 9,000 cubic yards of soil to the site. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

**Water Resources.** The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would include 25 residential units and approximately 46,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial building space. Based on the City of Santa Barbara (2009) water demand factors of 0.26 AFY for single-family units, 0.16 AFY for multi-family units, and 0.17 AFY per 1,000 square feet for service commercial uses, the residential component of this alternative would have a water demand of 4.5 AFY and the commercial uses would have a water demand of 7.8 AFY. The total water demand of this alternative would be approximately 12.3 AFY, which would be higher than the Project’s demand of 10.9 AFY estimated using City of Santa Barbara water demand factors. Both the Project and the development that would occur under this alternative would be required to obtain a will serve letter from the Goleta Water District after water supply conditions return to normal and the District rescinds its existing Stage II and Stage III drought emergency restrictions on new water service connections. However, since this alternative would have a water demand that is 1.4 AFY higher than the demand of the Project, this alternative’s water supply impacts are considered to be greater than the impacts of the Project.

## **7.6 PROJECT REDESIGN**

The Project Redesign Alternative would result in substantial changes to the design of the Project in an effort to eliminate or reduce environmental impacts that would result from the

implementation of the Project. Design-related assumptions that are evaluated by this alternative include:

- 60 townhouse units would be developed on the project site rather than the proposed mix of single-family and multi-family residential units.
- The townhouse units would be clustered on the central portion of the project site. Such a design would increase the distance between the new residential units and the perimeters of the project site when compared to the design of the Project.
- On-site parking and recreation areas would generally be consolidated into areas around the perimeter of the project site rather than being interspersed throughout the site.
- Access to the project site from Calle Real would be similar to the access that would be provided for the Project.
- Grading required to construct the Project Redesign Alternative would be similar to the grading required to construct the Project.
- Similar to the Project, a bio-retention basin facility would be constructed on the project site to manage post-development storm water flows.

**Aesthetics.** The Project Redesign Alternative would change the visual character of the project site from an open area covered with non-native grasses to views of a site developed with residential buildings and accessory uses. Views of the project site from the Calle Real/U.S. 101 corridor would be dominated by clustered residential development rather than the dispersed single-family and attached units that would be developed by the Project.

The visual characteristics of this alternative could vary somewhat from the characteristics of the Project. For example, views of clustered residential units could be incompatible with existing single-family dwellings that are adjacent to the project site to the north and east, and this alternative could result in views of open parking areas and/or parking structures (i.e., carports or free-standing enclosed garages). The Project would minimize views of parking areas by providing most on-site parking in garages that are attached to residential units. Impacts associated with views of parking areas, however, would likely be reduced to a less than significant level by complying with the City's development standards and design review requirements. The overall visual characteristics of the Project and this alternative would be different, however, both would change the visual character of the project site from an open space area to a developed condition. Therefore, the visual impacts of the Project and this alternative are considered to be similar.

**Air Quality.** Implementation of the Project Redesign Alternative would require on-site grading and result in construction operations that would be similar to the construction characteristics of the Project. Therefore, short-term construction-related emissions of this alternative would be similar to the short-term emissions of the Project.

The residences developed under this alternative are assumed to have an increased separation distances from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the Project. It is unlikely, however, that the increased separation distances would substantially reduce the potential for the significant and mitigable (Class II) diesel particulate matter emission exposure impacts that would result from the implementation of the Project, and the alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures to reduce concentrations of diesel particulate matter in on-site residences that are similar to the mitigation measures identified for the Project.

As described in the Traffic and Circulation subsection below, the Project Redesign Alternative would generate approximately 349 average daily trips compared to the 397 average daily trips that would be generated by the Project. The reduction in vehicle trips and the corresponding reduction in mobile emissions would be beneficial, however, the mobile emission impact of this alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impact of the Project.

Overall, the long-term air quality impacts of the Project Redesign Alternative would be slightly reduced when compared to the impacts of the Project. However, similar mitigation measures would be required to minimize potential diesel particulate matter exposure impacts, and mobile emissions from project-generation would not be reduced substantially. Therefore, this alternative and the Project are considered to result in similar air quality impacts.

**Biological Resources.** By increasing setback distances between the project site perimeters and new residential units, the Project Redesign Alternative would provide an increased development setback from El Encanto Creek, and that additional area could be incorporated into the habitat restoration plan that would be implemented to enhance habitat adjacent to the creek. The increased SPA/restoration area would reduce the potential for impacts related to the intrusion of humans into El Encanto Creek when compared to the Project. An increase in the SPA/restoration area, however, would not avoid or reduce direct impacts to riparian habitat that would result from the construction of the proposed bio-retention basin discharge pipe when compared to the significant and mitigable impact (Class II) impact of the Project, and would not avoid or reduce impacts that may result from inadvertent construction-related intrusions into riparian habitat areas when compared to the potentially significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project. Overall, providing additional habitat enhancement area on the project site would have increased environmental benefits that would reduce the potential for impacts to riparian and aquatic resources when compared to the impacts of the Project.

**Cultural Resources.** The Project Redesign Alternative would result in grading on the northeast corner of the project site in the vicinity of archaeological site CA-SBA-1093 that would be similar to the grading required to implement the Project. Therefore, the cultural resource impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The residences developed under the Project Redesign Alternative would have an increased separation distance from U.S. 101 and the UPRR tracks when compared to the minimum separation distances that would be provided for residences developed by the Project. An increased separation distance could reduce the potential for significant health and safety impacts in the unlikely event of an accidental hazardous material release. However, despite the increased separation distance, the risk of an accidental release affecting the units developed under this alternative would remain a significant and unavoidable (Class I) project-specific and cumulative impact, similar to the impacts identified for the Project.

The Project Redesign Alternative would result in a similar amount of grading as would be required to implement the Project. Therefore, this alternative would have a similar potential to be affected by soil contamination associated with the former use of the project site for agricultural operations. Overall, this alternative is considered to have potential hazards and hazardous material impacts that are similar to those of the Project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** The Project Redesign Alternative would result in the development of 60 residential units on the project site along with required access roads and other accessory uses, and grading required to implement this alternative would be similar to the grading required to implement the Project. Therefore, potential construction-related water quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

Clustering the residential units on the project site and expanding the managed open space/recreation areas around the perimeter of the project site could incrementally reduce impervious area and associated storm water runoff volumes, and would incrementally reduce the potential for water quality impacts associated with runoff from urbanized areas when compared to the impacts of the Project. However, this alternative would require the construction and operation of a bio-retention basin and other storm water infrastructure that is similar to what would be provided for the Project. Therefore, long-term hydrology and water quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to the impacts of the Project.

**Noise.** The Project Redesign Alternative would result in grading and construction operations similar to the construction operations required to implement the Project. Therefore, short-term noise impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

Residential units developed under this alternative would be exposed to ambient noise conditions that result from vehicle operations on Calle Real and U.S. 101 and train operations on the nearby railroad tracks. The increased building setback from the transportation corridor that would be facilitated by this alternative could reduce, but may not eliminate the need to construct a sound attenuation wall, or to construct buildings (i.e., detached garages) along the southern perimeter of the site that would have sound attenuation benefits.

As described in the Traffic and Circulation subsection provided below, this alternative would result in a small reduction in traffic when compared to the Project, which would have a corresponding decrease in traffic noise impacts on local streets. However, it is likely that the decrease in traffic noise would not be perceptible and the alternative’s traffic noise impacts would generally be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project. Overall, noise impacts of this alternative would be similar to the noise impacts of the Project.

**Traffic and Circulation.** The Project Redesign Alternative would result in the development of townhouse units on the project site, and would eliminate the single-family residences that would be developed by the Project. Trip generation characteristics of this alternative are depicted on Table 7.6-1.

**Table 7.6-1  
 Project Redesign Alternative  
 Trip Generation**

Land Use	Size	Average Daily	
		Rate	Trips
Attached townhouses	60 units	5.81	349

This alternative would generate approximately 349 average daily vehicle trips, which would be 48 fewer average daily trips than would be generated by the Project. The reduction in total trip generation would be a beneficial effect, however, the traffic impacts of the alternative would be similar to the less than significant (Class III) impacts of the Project.

Grading required to implement this alternative would be similar to the grading required to implement the Project, which would require the import of 9,000 cubic yards of soil to the project site. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts of this alternative would be similar to the significant and mitigable (Class II) impacts of the Project.

**Water Resources.** The Project Redesign Alternative would result in the development of 60 residential units, which would have the same water demand as the 60 units that would be developed by the Project. Water supply impacts of this alternative would be the same as the less than (Class III) impacts of the Project. Both the Project and this alternative would not receive water service from the Goleta Water District until the District’s Stage II and III Water Shortage



Emergency Resolutions are suspended. Therefore the impacts of this alternative are the same as the Project.

## **7.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

Each of the alternatives to the Project are listed on Table 7.7-1. This table summarizes the potential for each alternative to avoid, or result in reduced, similar or increased environmental impacts when compared to the respective impacts of the Project. Table 7.7-2 summarizes the ability each of the evaluated alternatives to implement or partially implement the objectives of the Project.

The No Project – No Development Alternative would avoid all of the significant environmental impacts associated with the Project. The No Project – Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations Alternative would result in environmental impacts that are for the most part reduced when compared to the impacts of the Project. Therefore, both of the No Project Alternatives are environmentally superior to the Project. As depicted on Table 7.7-2, however, both of the No Project Alternatives would not implement any of the Project’s objectives and would not provide any of the public benefits from the Project, such as providing additional housing in Goleta or enhancing habitat areas adjacent to El Encanto Creek. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that “*if the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.*”

The Revised On-Site Land Use Alternative would result in increased environmental impacts when compared to the impacts of the Project, primarily due to the substantial increase in traffic and a small increase in water use that would result from the development of commercial uses on the southern portion of the project site consistent with the C-1 zoning that currently exists on that portion of the site. Therefore, this alternative would not be environmentally superior to the Project.

The environmental impacts of the Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative and the Revised Project Design Alternative would both be similar to the impacts of the Project, except both alternatives would result in reduced impacts to biological resources, primarily resulting from increased habitat setbacks and restoration area that would be facilitated by the alternatives. The Increased Streamside Protection Area Alternative, however, would best implement the objectives of the Project because that alternative would be consistent with the objectives to provide a mix of housing types and sizes on the project site. The Revised Project Design Alternative would provide only townhomes on the project site, which would not fully implement the housing style and size objectives. Therefore, The Increased Streamside Protection Area alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative while implementing all of the objectives of the Project.

**Table 7.7-1  
 Alternatives Comparison Summary – Environmental Impacts**

Alternative	Issue Area								
	Aesthetics	Air Quality	Biologic Resources	Cultural Resources	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hydrology and Water Quality	Noise	Traffic and Circulation	Water Resources
No Project – No Development	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided	Avoided
No Project – Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations	Reduced	Reduced	Similar	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Increased Streamside Protection Area	Similar	Similar	Reduced	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Revised On-Site Land Use	Similar	Increased	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Increased	Increased	Increased
Revised Project Design	Similar	Similar	Reduced	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

**KEY**

Avoided = Environmental impacts of the Project would not occur under this alternative.

Reduced = This alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts when compared to the impacts of the Project.

Similar = This alternative would result in environmental impacts that are similar to or the same as the impacts of the Project.

Increased = This alternative would result in increased environmental impacts when compared to the impacts of the Project.

**Table 7.7-2  
 Alternatives Comparison Summary – Project Objective Implementation**

<b>Project Objective</b>	<b>Alternative</b>				
	<b>No Project – No Development</b>	<b>No Project – Development Consistent with Existing Land Use Designations</b>	<b>Increased Streamside Protection Area</b>	<b>Revised On-Site Land Use</b>	<b>Revised Project Design</b>
Revise the project site’s existing land use designation and zoning classifications to allow multiple types of residential units to be developed on the site.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved
Develop a traditional-style neighborhood affordable to the local workforce that incorporates a variety of housing sizes and types and that creates a sense of place and community while respecting and integrating natural resources on site.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved
Complete the development of an existing neighborhood with a variety of housing sizes and types for approximately 60 families.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved
Develop the project site such that it minimizes the potential for compatibility conflicts with neighboring properties.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Achieved
Provide recreation opportunities for use by both the residents of the site and the public.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
To support the health of Goleta’s technology industry, provide a program for advance notification of availability of units to employees of local technology companies prior to offering units for sale to the general public.	Not Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved

**KEY**

Not Achieved = The alternative would not implement any of this Project objective.  
 Partially Achieved = The alternative would implement aspects of this Project objective.  
 Achieved = The alternative would fully or mostly implement this Project objective.