

## 3.8 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section presents:

- changes to population and housing existing conditions and applicable regulations since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR in 2006; and
- an analysis of the potential population and housing effects of proposed amendments to the existing GP/CLUP.

### 3.8.1 Existing Conditions

This section addresses the same geographic areas as discussed in the 2006 Final EIR. The term *Goleta Valley* refers to the area west of Santa Barbara including the City of Goleta; Isla Vista; the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) campus; Hope Ranch; and the Santa Barbara Airport. Most of the available data relating to jobs by place of employment and other economic data pertains to this area. Demographic and housing data from the U.S. Census is reported by several different geographical levels. The smallest spatial area used for census data reporting is a *block*, which in developed areas usually represents one city block. Since the City was incorporated after the 2000 Census and its boundaries do not coincide with census block boundaries, data identified as pertaining to the City includes the census blocks and portions of blocks that make up the current incorporated area of the City.

Population, employment, and housing data referenced in this section have been updated, where applicable, from that shown in the 2006 Final EIR.

#### 3.8.1.1 Population

According to the California Department of Finance, the City of Goleta's population in January 2008 was 30,400, which was 7.1 percent of Santa Barbara County's population (California Department of Finance 2008). Santa Barbara County Association of Government's (SBCAG) Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) 2005–2040 Report includes the following population projections for the City and the County as listed in Table 3.8-1 and summarized below.

The 2000 median age within the City was 37.2 years, compared to the County median of 33.4 years, and the State median of 33 years of age. In 2000, slightly fewer than 25 percent of City residents were less than 18 years old, 12 percent were young adults of college age, and 11 percent were senior citizens over 65 years old. The age profile for the City contained two large "bulges:" one in the 35 to 45 age group (usually referred to as the working or family age group), and the other in the 20 to 30 age group, most likely attributable to the City's proximity to UCSB (City of Goleta 2004a).

In 2000, approximately three-quarters of the City's population were considered white with no other race identified in their heritage. The largest single racial minority was Asian, making up 8 percent of the population. Four percent of the population had a mixed racial heritage. Just over one quarter of the City's population (26.8 percent) identifies themselves as of Hispanic heritage. While in the past the U.S. Census of Population reported Hispanic heritage along with racial data, the Census no longer considers Hispanic heritage as a racial category, and persons of Hispanic heritage are now reported separately. This group is about evenly split between those

who define themselves as either a racial minority or of white heritage. The proportion of racial minorities in the City was similar to the County and Nation.

**TABLE 3.8-1  
SBCAG POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

Jurisdiction	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
City of Goleta	31,000	31,700	33,100	34,500	35,900	37,300	37,300	37,300
County Total	417,500	430,200	444,900	459,600	473,400	481,400	487,00	492,800
Source: SBCAG 2008								

### ***Household and Family Size***

The estimated 2000 average household size for the City was 2.99, and the average family size was 3.55. The difference between a *family* and a *household* is that a family is composed of two or more related people, while a household consists of related or unrelated persons residing in a dwelling unit. Because households include one-person households, the average household size is usually lower than the average family size. The southern half of the City had significantly more nonfamily households than family households. The northwestern area of the City had relatively larger households than the other areas. On the whole, 77 percent (22,141) of City residents are family members in a family household, compared to an average 75 percent for the County and 81 percent for the State. A total of 19 percent, or 5,470 residents, reside in a nonfamily household, either with nonrelated individuals or alone, compared to a County average of 17 percent and a State average of 18 percent.

The 1999 median annual household income within the current City limits was \$54,000, compared to the County median of \$46,677 and State median of \$47,493.

### **3.8.1.2 Employment**

The following section summarizes the employment patterns in Goleta Valley and the Goleta Census Defined Place (Goleta CDP). Since there is no established system of reporting employment information by place of work for just the City of Goleta, this type of information is reported here for the Goleta Valley. The information for this section is from three primary sources: the 2000 U.S. Census of Population,<sup>1</sup> which provides information for resident households; the UCSB Economic Forecast Project (UCSB 2004), which provides employment information; and SBCAG Regional Housing Needs (2008).

The largest sector of employment in Goleta Valley was the public sector, which includes County and City employees and educational workers in all public institutions. The single largest employer, with 9,528 employees, was UCSB, located just outside Goleta's city limits (UCSB 2004). Other large public employers in Goleta Valley include the County of Santa Barbara and the Goleta Union School District.

The service sector is the next largest with one-quarter of all jobs in the area. The largest employer in the service sector is Bacara Resort and Spa. Located within Goleta's city limits, Bacara Resort employed 752 people and was the 24th largest employer in the County.

<sup>1</sup> <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/BasicFactsServlet>

Manufacturing employment comprises 15 percent of total wage and salary employment. The largest employer in this sector is Raytheon with three divisions located in the City and more than 1,900 employees.

SBCAG has prepared estimates of current employment by geographic areas, known as Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ), to assist transportation planning in the County. These estimates (SBCAG 2000 in City of Goleta 2004b) indicate that approximately 50 percent of all jobs in the Goleta Valley area are in the City.

### ***Jobs-Housing Ratio and Jobs-Employed Residents Ratio***

The jobs-housing balance concept is a comparison of the number of jobs provided at workplaces located in an area to the number of workers who reside in that same area (one job for each resident worker is a 1:1 ratio). The concept of achieving an appropriate balance between housing, as measured by resident work force, and jobs in an area has been used in regional planning in an attempt to define possible public policy purposes, such as presumed reductions in traffic congestion and decreases in employee long-distance commuting. Although considerable attention has been given to the concept of jobs-housing “balance,” the question of what constitutes a desirable or superior ratio remains unsettled and may vary depending upon the geographic scale evaluated and from one area to another. The jobs to employed residents ratio is a more refined measure than the jobs to housing ratio since it takes into account variations in labor force participation. This is especially important in settings, such as Goleta, where there are larger than average proportions of households that may have atypical labor force participation, such as households composed of elderly persons and students.

The resident workers to jobs ratios are presented below for several different geographic areas within Santa Barbara County, including the Goleta Valley and Goleta CDP:

- The 2000 U.S. Census of Population reported a resident labor force of 41,361 in the Goleta Valley. In comparison, the July 2003 UCSB Economic Forecast Project (UCSB 2004) estimated a total of 39,375 jobs in the Goleta Valley in 2000, composed of 35,468 wage and salary jobs and the balance of nonwage jobs. Despite employment increasing at a faster rate than population growth over the last decade, as of 2000, the total number of jobs in the Goleta Valley (39,375) roughly equaled the number of workers who lived in the Goleta Valley (41,361). The jobs to employed residents ratio within the Goleta Valley was 0.95 based upon these two data sources. Stated differently, there were about 950 jobs located in the valley for each group of 1,000 employed residents of the valley, a slight jobs deficit and a slight net out-commute to jobs located in other areas.

The Goleta CDP includes the City of Goleta and most of the area between the City of Goleta and the City of Santa Barbara, including Hope Ranch. Unlike the term *Goleta Valley*, the Goleta CDP does not include Isla Vista (which is its own CDP), the UCSB campus, and the Santa Barbara Airport. The 2000 US Census estimates a total of 27,265 jobs in the Goleta CDP and 27,515 workers living in the CDP, or slightly less than one job per employed resident. The ratio of the number of jobs to the number of resident workers within the Goleta CDP was 0.99, as shown in Table 3.8-2.

**TABLE 3.8-2  
US CENSUS ESTIMATED DAYTIME POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT-RESIDENCE  
RATIOS (2000)**

Place Name	Total Resident Population	Total Workers Working in Place	Total Workers Living in Place	Employment – Residence Ratio
Goleta CDP	55,204	27,265	27,515	0.99
Isla Vista CDP	19,344	8,429	8,360	1.01
City of Santa Barbara	92,325	60,307	46,866	1.29
City of Santa Maria	77,423	34,358	29,874	1.15
City of Carpinteria	14,194	6,813	7,075	0.96
City of Lompoc	41,103	10,661	15,379	0.69
Santa Barbara County	399,347	188,900	179,445	1.05

Source: US Census 2000 PHC-T-40 from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/daytime/daytimepop.html>

The data in Table 3.8.2 also show equivalent information for other jurisdictions in Santa Barbara County. The data indicate that the cities of Santa Barbara and Santa Maria have excess jobs relative to the number of employed residents and are therefore net importers of labor or workforce from outside their boundaries. The Goleta CDP and the cities of Carpinteria and Lompoc, on the other hand, have more employed residents than jobs, or a net out-commute.

### 3.8.1.3 Housing Characteristics

As of January 2008, there were an estimated 11,516 housing units in the City, which represented 7.5 percent of the County's housing units at that time (California Department of Finance 2008). Comparisons of housing units, vacancy rates, and persons per household for January 2008 are shown in Table 3.8-3.

Since the City was not incorporated at the time of the 2000 Census of Population, no data is directly reported in the census for the City. Unless otherwise noted, the following data used in this section are estimates derived from census tract and block group data that make up the City.<sup>2</sup> According to the 2000 U.S. Census, over half of the housing units (57 percent, or 6,053 units) are owner-occupied, with 41 percent (or 4,467 units) occupied by renters. The remaining two percent (or 260) of the units at the time of the U.S. Census were vacant. In comparison, 69 percent of the housing units in the Goleta CDP, 56 percent of the County, and 66 percent of the State are owner-occupied.

Only 3 percent, or 329 of the units in the City in 2000 existed in 1950. The number of units added in each decade from 1960 has declined. A total of 4,374 units were added from 1960 to 1969; 2,789 units were added from 1970 to 1979; 1,209 units were added from 1980 to 1989; and 710 units were added from 1990 to 2000. From January 2001 through September 2005, a total of 691 units have been completed and added to the housing stock.

<sup>2</sup> These are estimates because the current City limits divide block groups, requiring the data to be allocated in those block groups between the City and the unincorporated areas.

**TABLE 3.8-3  
2008 HOUSING ESTIMATES**

	<b>Santa Barbara County Total</b>	<b>Percent of County</b>	<b>City of Goleta</b>	<b>Percent of City</b>
Housing Units	154,452	100%	11,516	7.5%
Single Family Detached Units	90,185	58.4%	5,870	51.0%
Single Family Attached Units	11,602	7.5%	1,588	13.8%
Multiple Family (2-4 Units)	13,858	9.0%	761	6.6%
Multiple Family (5+ Units)	30,063	19.5%	2,676	23.2%
Mobile Homes	8,744	5.7%	621	5.4%
		Difference with County		Difference with County
Percent Vacant	4.3%	-	2.5%	-1.9%
Persons per Household	2.8	-	2.7	-0.1

Source: California Department of Finance 2008.

### **Housing Affordability and Costs**

Data from the 2000 U.S. Census for Goleta summarizes the number of households in each income group by housing tenure (owner- and renter-occupied). While many renter and owner households are included in the middle-income household groups (\$25,000 to \$75,000 per year), as a group, owners include a greater share of higher income households, while renters have a greater share of lower income households (2000 US Census of Population)

Housing prices in the City have dropped within the last year; however, sales prices for housing continue to exceed the ability to pay of many low and moderate-income households, particularly for first-time homebuyers and new entrants to the local housing market. The median sale price in 2008 of all residential units in the City of Goleta (including new and existing, condos, and single-family units) was \$645,000 which dropped from the 2007 median sale price of \$827,250 (California Association of Realtors 2008). This represents about a 22% drop since the previous year, which is smaller drop than the County average (45.5%) and City of Santa Barbara average (34.5%) (California Association of Realtors 2008).

For Santa Barbara County, the median sales price was approximately \$550,000 (for the calendar year 2008). The median sale price for the City of Lompoc area was \$221,500, \$232,000 for the City of Santa Maria, and \$835,000 for the City of Santa Barbara. In general, housing prices are higher in Goleta than in other areas of the County but lower than the City of Santa Barbara (California Association of Realtors 2008).

Rents have increased in recent years but less rapidly than sales prices. The rental housing market is particularly influenced by demand from UCSB students. Rental housing is relatively more affordable than ownership housing. Average monthly rents in the Goleta market area in 2008 were \$1,439 for a 1-bedroom unit and \$1,455 for a 2-bedroom unit (Apartment Ratings 2009). A two-person household earning 80 percent of median income (\$41,400 per year) could afford a rent of about \$1,035 per month if they spent 30 percent of their income on housing.

The traditional standard for determining housing affordability is when housing costs do not exceed 30 percent of the income of a household. This standard is recommended by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines, which define housing costs that exceed 30 percent of the gross income of a household as *overpayment* for housing.

Approximately 34.2 percent of the 6,032 owner-occupied housing units in the Goleta market area (between 2005 and 2007) spent more than 35 percent of their income on housing. Approximately 42.8 percent of renters in the Goleta market area (between 2005 and 2007) spent more than 35 percent of their income on housing (US Census Bureau 2008). The City of Goleta incidence of households paying over 30 percent is similar to the average for the County and the City of Santa Barbara for owner-occupied units and but significantly lower for renters (US Census Bureau 2008).

### 3.8.1.4 **Regional Housing Needs and Available Land**

California law requires each city and county, when preparing its State-mandated Housing Element, to include local housing programs to provide sufficient sites to accommodate its allocated share of housing needs for all income groups. The *Regional Allocation Concept* seeks to ensure that each jurisdiction, to the extent feasible and appropriate, provides housing for its resident population, and those households who might reasonably be expected to reside within the jurisdiction, with a variety of housing appropriate to their needs.

As a result of SBCAG's Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA), the City of Goleta was allocated a total of 1,641 units for the 2007 to 2014 planning period as shown in Table 3.8-4. The City must demonstrate that adequate sites will be made available to address its share of the regional housing need for the same planning period. It should be noted that the planning period of the Housing Element's Action Program is from 2007 to 2014, The City is not required to respond to the new allocation until August 2009; therefore, until the City submits its Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the City is still in the previous allocation period of 2001 to 2009.

**TABLE 3.8-4  
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA) FOR GOLETA (2007–2014)**

	Number of Units	Percent of All 2008 Housing Units
Very-Low Income	377	3.3%
Low-Income	279	2.4%
Moderate-Income	230	2.0%
Above Moderate-Income	755	6.6%
Total	1,641	14.3%
Total Low- and Very Low-Income (Defined as Total "Lower-income" Units)	656	5.7%
Source: City of Goleta, Regional Housing Needs Assessment, June 2008		

### ***Housing Development Potential in Goleta***

State law classifies sites with permitted densities of 20 units or more per acre as being appropriate to accommodate housing for lower-income households in suburban jurisdictions. In other words, the effect of State law is that these sites are presumed to have densities sufficient to make production of affordable housing feasible for lower-income households. The GP/CLUP identifies sufficient sites at densities over 20 units/acre to achieve Goleta's RHNA allocation for lower income housing (656 units) between 2007 and 2014. This is shown in Table 3.8-5.

An analysis of potential housing sites was conducted for the 2006 GP/CLUP Housing Element. The analysis evaluated potential constraints so that the realistic development potential from each site could be determined. These data, which are in Tables 10A-16 through 10A-20 and

corresponding figures in the Housing Element Technical Report, are summarized in Table 3.8-5 below.

**TABLE 3.8-5  
SUMMARY OF HOUSING UNIT POTENTIAL IN GOLETA (2006–2009)**

Category	Over 20 Units Per Acre	Less Than 20 Units Per Acre	Total
Vacant Sites (Residentially Zoned)	1,266	486	1,755
Vacant Sites (To be Rezoned to Residential or Higher Density)	312	4	312
Vacant Sites Designated for Mixed Use	311	48	359
Redevelopment Sites	159	46	205
Total	2,048	583	2,631

Source: Land Inventory by City of Goleta, 2005 in City of Goleta , Housing Technical Appendix, GP/CLUP, September 2006

### 3.8.2 Changes in Regulatory Framework

#### 3.8.2.1 Federal and State

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP in 2006, there have been no changes to the following regulations that are relevant to the proposed amendments categorized as Track 3 revisions to the GP/CLUP:

- Federal Coastal Zone Management Act
- California Environmental Quality Act
- State of California General Plan Law and General Plan Guidelines (including requirements for Housing Elements)
- California Coastal Act

#### 3.8.2.2 Local

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR, the City adopted three General Plan amendments. First, the City adopted an amendment to Subpolicy CE 10.3 as part of the approval of the Village at Los Carneros. The amendment changed prohibitions against post-development stormwater discharge rates and was adopted on February 19, 2008. Second, the City adopted various clarifying amendments as part of the City-sponsored Track 2 amendments. The Track 2 amendments were adopted and the related CEQA Addendum was certified by the City Council on June 17, 2008. Third, the City adopted a land use designation re-classification (General Industrial to General Commercial) as part of the approval of the Harwin Family Trust project. All amendments are reflected in the text of the GP/CLUP cited in the Supplemental EIR.

The City has also established a new ordinance to the municipal code, Chapter 25b, titled “Change of Owner, Operator, or Guarantor for Certain Oil and Gas Facilities.” No other changes to the GP/CLUP and no new ordinances relative to land use designations and densities have been enacted by the City since October 2006. There have been modifications to enabling ordinances and resolutions related to the Design Review Board’s review of projects

and process. Moreover, in fall 2008, the City modified the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance to exempt from its consideration the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital Replacement Projects, along with associated medical office space and parking.

### **3.8.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation**

As in the 2006 Final EIR, the evaluation in this Supplemental EIR concerns the potential effects on population and housing that would result from implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and, in this case, from alternate versions of those policies in the form of GP/CLUP amendments.

#### **3.8.3.1 Thresholds of Significance**

The thresholds of significance applied in this Supplemental EIR are the same as those in the Final EIR.

##### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Manual***

The City of Goleta's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual does not contain specific significance thresholds for population and housing.

##### ***CEQA Thresholds***

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- induce "substantial" population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a), economic or social effects of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment. If the proposed project were to cause physical changes, then the physical effects (such as increased traffic from increased employment-related travel or destruction of habitat resulting from housing construction to accommodate increased population) could be considered significant. Those impacts are discussed in the applicable sections of this document.

#### **3.8.3.2 Relevant Discussion of GP/CLUP Policies**

The action under consideration by the City is to amend the existing GP/CLUP to approve the changes in Alternatives 2a, 2b, or 3; combine or eliminate changes proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3; or choose not to change the GP/CLUP at this time (Alternative 1).

The Housing, Land Use, and Transportation Elements of the GP/CLUP contain policies relevant to the evaluation of population and housing impacts. The following GP/CLUP policies are relevant to population and housing.

**Housing Element**

The Housing Element addresses the City of Goleta's housing needs through a required planning period ending June 30, 2009. The Element contains updated information and strategic directions (policies and specific actions) that the City is committed to undertake to address its housing needs. The GP/CLUP includes the following housing policies related to potential population and housing impacts:

- Policy HE 1: Equal Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs
- Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA
- Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing
- Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development

**Land Use Element**

The Land Use Element defines Goleta's planned long-range development pattern and physical character, as well as the extent and distribution of future growth in the City. The policies of this element are designed to balance the various concerns and needs of the City and its residents and will guide future change to fit the desired character of Goleta. The goal of the Land Use Plan is to "to maintain a land use pattern that provides continuity with the past and present use and development of the City and locates the various uses in a manner that is consistent with the fundamental goals and principles of the plan." The GP/CLUP includes the following land use policies related to potential population and housing impacts:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management

**Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element, also known in State law as the Circulation Element, guides the continued development and improvement of the transportation system to support land uses planned in the Land Use Element. This element contains goals and policies to improve overall circulation in Goleta and ensure that future development is supported by appropriate transportation facilities. The GP/CLUP includes the following transportation policies related to potential population and housing impacts:

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management

- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

### **3.8.3.3 Project Impacts**

In this Supplemental EIR, the evaluation of potential population and housing impacts of proposed amendments considers the potential effects of individual changes on population and housing in the City and on the mitigation provided by the Land Use Element and Transportation Element policies for impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation.

For purposes of the analysis, the source of direct and indirect impacts remain as identified in the Final EIR: (1) inducement of substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; (2) displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or (3) displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Identified impacts were evaluated in terms of their potential significance based on the thresholds indicated in Subsection 3.8.3.1 and the classes of impacts (I through IV) used by the City for CEQA analyses. Cumulative impacts were examined in terms of the combined effects of the impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation and foreseeable projects in areas adjacent to the City. Residual impacts are examined in terms of the potential for significant effects to occur after mitigation of any Class I, Class II, or significant cumulative impacts.

#### ***Methodology***

The analysis in this Supplemental EIR is intended to determine how impacts of GP/CLUP implementation and the mitigating effect of the policies in the GP/CLUP would change if some or all of the proposed amendments were adopted. To determine this, each policy change proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 was evaluated in terms of three questions:

1. Is the change to a policy cited as mitigation for a Class II impact of the existing GP/CLUP?
2. If the change were accepted, would implementation of the amended GP/CLUP result in greater or different impacts than those analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR?
3. Does the change have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the effects?

In response to Question 1, Table 3.8-6 provides a tabular summary of those policies cited as mitigation for a Class II population and housing impact identified in the existing GP/CLUP. Responses to Questions 2 and 3 are addressed in the analyses for each impact, as follows. A tabular summary of this analysis is presented in the alternative screening tables in Appendix B.

**TABLE 3.8-6  
POLICIES PROPOSED FOR AMENDMENT THAT ARE  
CITED AS MITIGATION FOR CLASS II POPULATION AND HOUSING IMPACTS IN FINAL  
EIR**

Proposed Policy Change (ID #)	Potential Impact Identified with One or More Action Alternative
<b>LU 3</b>	Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs
<b>LU 11</b>	Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the GP/CLUP is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs
<b>TE 13</b>	Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs

As presented in the 2006 Final EIR, at full Plan buildout an additional 3,880 residential units are allowed—a 33 percent increase over existing 2005 conditions. This includes construction of new units on vacant sites as well as redevelopment of existing sites to include new residential units in mixed-use projects, such as construction of some units on sites occupied by shopping centers. The new units allowed by the GP/CLUP would have a higher proportion that are in multi-family structures than the existing conditions. It is estimated that the additional residential development would allow an increase in population of about 7,420, an increase of just over 24 percent.

The plan would allow an additional 2,081,000 square feet of industrial and commercial development over the existing amount of commercial/industrial space within the City, a 17 percent increase over the 2005 condition.

It is estimated, based upon 2005 SBCAG traffic analysis zone data, that approximately 50 percent of jobs in the Goleta Valley were located within the boundaries of the City of Goleta, or a total of about 19,700 jobs. In its Regional Housing Needs Allocation Report (2002a), SBCAG estimated a total of 23,000 jobs within the City of Goleta. In its latest Regional Housing Needs Allocation Report (2008), SBCAG estimated a total of 23,561 as of 2005 and an additional 2,285 jobs projected to occur between 2007 and 2014 for a total of 25,846 jobs within the City. With a total of about 12,120,000 square feet of industrial and commercial floor area in 2004, estimates of the amount of square feet per job vary from 530 to 615 square feet. The GP/CLUP allows an estimated 2,081,000 additional square feet of industrial and commercial floor area. It is anticipated that newly developed space could likely to be more intensively used than the stock of older structures. With a potential range of one job per 500 square feet to one job per 615 square feet, the additional jobs that could occur as a result of implementation of the plan would range from 3,400 to 3,900.

As presented in the 2006 Final EIR, the jobs-to-housing ratio for the increment of growth allowed by the plan ranges from 0.87 to 1.01. This compares to a 2.07 ratio estimated by SBCAG in its 2007 RGF. If it is assumed that there will be about 1.5 employed residents per each new residential unit and that 95 percent of new units will be occupied, the increment of additional employed residents would be about 5,820. This would result in a jobs to employed residents ratio range of 0.58 to 0.67.

The following population and housing impact analysis considers issues related to proposed amendments to the City of Goleta GP/CLUP. Those issues include population and housing impacts resulting from changes in the locations of large regional development, revisions to growth management directives, access to open space, protection of biological resources, and traffic mitigation options. The analysis also includes review of cumulative population and housing impacts associated with development within, and adjacent to, the City of Goleta.

### ***Class I Impacts—None***

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short- or long-term significant and unavoidable impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

### ***Class II Impacts***

#### Short-Term Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there is no short-term potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

#### Long-Term Impacts

#### ***Impact 3.8-1. The Result of the Increased Population Would be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Lands within the City***

As stated in the 2006 Final EIR, although population growth would not in itself create physical effects to the environment, it could result in secondary or indirect impacts. The result of the increased population would be the need for additional housing and jobs, which would lead to the physical impact of residential and commercial development. The environmental issues associated with increased development include land use compatibility, noise, air quality, traffic biology, water resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials, geology/soils, aesthetics, public services, and public utilities. Please see those respective sections of this Supplemental EIR for a discussion of whether the GP/CLUP amendments listed in Table 2-1 would result in greater or different environmental impacts than those analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR or have the potential to result in new potentially significant environmental impacts.

**Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout**

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). Population growth associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP is anticipated to result in an additional 7,421 people, resulting in a population of about 38,100 by the end of the timeframe of the GP/CLUP. This represents an increase of 24 percent over the 2005 population of 30,679. The estimated population increase of 24 percent over the next 24 years is not considered in and of itself to be a significant impact; however, the indirect impacts of the population increase could be considered potentially significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-2. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP would ensure that indirect impacts from population and housing growth are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type.

- **Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management**

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse indirect impacts to population and housing as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1).

On May 3, 2003, the City Council adopted the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO) No. 03-04, with the purpose of establishing “interim regulations to control the rate of non-residential growth prior to completion and adoption of the City’s first general plan...” The GP/CLUP was adopted in October 2006 and included Policy LU 11 Non-Residential Growth Management (including sub-policies), and LU-IA-2 Update of the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance. As part of the Track 3 GPA analyses, Policies LU 11 and LU-IA-2 were initiated for removal.

The objective of Policy LU 11 Nonresidential Growth Management and its sub-policies is to manage the amount and timing of nonresidential development within the City, such that there is an appropriate balance between jobs and housing. The policies seek to accomplish this by limiting the floor area of nonresidential construction that may be approved each year, based upon the number of residential units approved for construction the previous year. The policies allow for any unused nonresidential allocation to carry over to the following year, and provide exemptions for certain projects within the City redevelopment project area defined by the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan.

To evaluate the environmental impacts associated with removing LU 11 and LU-IA-2 as a growth management tool, an analysis of remaining vacant acreage with residential and nonresidential land use designations was completed. The analysis concluded that development potential within the City is limited to a small amount of vacant lands. Of the total City acreage (5,075.1 acres), only 262.7 acres of vacant land with development potential remains (5.2 % of the City). Of those 262.7 total vacant acres, 28.5 acres are designated to be developed with commercial (0.6 % of the City), 74.2 acres with industrial (1.5% of the City), and 160.0 acres with residential (3.1% of the City). Please see Table 3.8-7 below for a breakdown of total vacant acreage with development potential and its associated GP/CLUP land use designation:

**TABLE 3.8-7  
TOTAL VACANT ACREAGE WITH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL AND PROPOSED  
RESIDENTIAL AND NONRESIDENTIAL LAND USE DESIGNATION**

General Use	GP/CLUP Land Use Designation	Acres	Percent of Total City Acreage/ Percent of Vacant
Commercial	Intersection	1.3	
Commercial	Community	6.2	
Commercial	General Commercial	7.6	
Commercial	Visitor Serving	13.4	
<b>Commercial Total</b>		<b>28.5</b>	<b>0.6 / 10.8</b>
Office and Industrial	General Industry	6.0	
Office and Industrial	Office and Institutional	9.4	
Office and Industrial	Business Park	20.6	
Office and Industrial	Services	38.2	
<b>Office and Industrial Total</b>		<b>74.2</b>	<b>1.5 / 28.3</b>
Residential	High Density	0.6	
Residential	Single-Family	21.5	
Residential	Planned Residential	33.2	
Residential	Medium Density	104.7	
<b>Residential Total</b>		<b>160.0</b>	<b>3.1 / 60.9</b>
<b>Total Vacant Acreage (2008)</b>		<b>262.7</b>	<b>100 / 5.2</b>
<b>Total City Acreage</b>		<b>5075.1</b>	

Focused discussion and analysis of non-residential growth management, highlighted that all growth within the City (commercial, industrial, residential, etc.) is currently regulated by GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map), adopted as part of the GP/CLUP in 2006 (and reproduced herein as Supplemental EIR Figure 2-3). The Land Use Plan Map specifies the amount, type, and location of land uses within the City (through build out) and was the basis for the jobs/housing balance impact analysis (at build out) evaluated in the 2006 Final EIR.

The final analysis indicates that with such a small amount of developable vacant land left remaining in the City, that GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 is an appropriate growth management tool, and that the currently specified land use designations have accounted for an acceptable ratio of development (60.9% residential, 28.3% Industrial, 10.8% commercial).

Elimination of the GGMO could encourage the reuse or revitalization of existing developed lands with more intensive (i.e., commercial and/or industrial) land uses, thereby increasing the number of jobs per square foot of such space in the City. The extent of such development, however, would be subject to the same jobs/housing balance impact analysis (at build out) evaluated in the 2006 Final EIR. Therefore, where as removal of the nonresidential growth policies from the GP/CLUP and elimination of the GGMO may affect the pacing of such growth within the City, removal of those specific regulations would not alter the amount, type, or location of nonresidential growth as previously analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR. Based upon the above, revisions to Policy LU 11 under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 11 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the LU policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 11 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the LU policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

**Impact 3.8-3. *Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,880 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock***

None of the policies included in the 2006 Final EIR as measures to reduce the significance of the above-listed impact are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.8.3.3 of the 2006 Final EIR for this impact, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

**Impact 3.8-4. *Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs***

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, as of 2000 Goleta had approximately 23,000 jobs within the City (SBCAG 2002b). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in an estimated 3,400 to 3,900 additional employment opportunities, for a total of up to 26,900 jobs citywide at full Plan buildout. As noted above, the additional housing units resulting from full Plan buildout would help maintain an existing balance between jobs and housing, or between jobs and employed residents. The jobs to housing ratio at full buildout could range from 1.49 to 1.74, depending upon the estimate of the number of existing jobs in the City as of 2005. By achieving a 1.74 jobs-to-housing ratio, the proposed project benefits the overall City jobs-to-housing balance.

In its latest Regional Housing Needs Allocation Report (2008), SBCAG estimated a total of 23,561 as of 2005 and an additional 2,285 jobs projected to occur between 2007 and 2014 for a total of 25,846 jobs.. Implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in an estimated 3,400 to 3,900 additional employment opportunities, for a total range of up to 29,246 to 29,746 jobs citywide at full Plan buildout. The new jobs to housing ratio at full buildout could range from 1.89 to 1.93 which is slightly higher than the jobs to housing ratio in the 2006 FEIR.

The increase in employment opportunities would be gradual over the next 24 years and managed by the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance, which regulates the rate of nonresidential development in order to ensure an appropriate balance between the rate of development of commercial-industrial space and the rate of housing growth in the City. It should be noted however that any increase in jobs resulting from the development of additional commercial/industrial space not coordinated with the construction of new residential development within the City could result in an exacerbation of the current job to housing balance and could result in an increase in the net out-commute, thereby potentially increasing the existing traffic volumes between Goleta and Santa Barbara on US-101.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.8-4. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP would ensure that impacts involving job and housing growth are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs (GP)
- Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing (GP)
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses

- **Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses**
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- **Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management**
- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management
- **Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development**
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse indirect impacts to population and housing as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1). Alternative 2a includes policy change LU 3 that would allow consideration of new commercial development at the time of a specific development application but would not propose any additions to the Regional Commercial (C-R) land use designation on the City's Land Use Plan Map. The proposed amendment to Policy LU 11 and LU-IA-2 would remove nonresidential growth management policies from the GP/CLUP. The impacts of the removal of the Policies LU 11 and LU-1A-2 are analyzed above. In summary, all growth within the City (commercial, industrial, residential, etc.) is currently regulated by GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map), adopted as part of the GP/CLUP in 2006. Given the small amount of developable vacant land left remaining in the City, GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 is an appropriate growth management tool, and the currently specified land use designations have accounted for an acceptable ratio of development. While removal of the nonresidential growth policies from the GP/CLUP and elimination of the GGMO may affect the pacing of nonresidential growth within the city, removal of those specific regulations would not alter the amount, type, or location of nonresidential growth in the City as previously analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR.

Policy change TE 13 would clarify the City's commitment to minimizing traffic impacts for projects where traffic mitigations are not fully funded, and it would have no practical effect on traffic at a programmatic general plan level.

Based upon the above, revisions to the Land Use Element and Transportation Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendments to Policy LU 3, LU 11, and TE 13 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element and Transportation Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 1 and 2a. The text of the proposed amendments to Policy LU 3 and LU 11 is identical among these alternatives. Policy TE 13 for Alternative 3 is identical to Alternative 1-No Project. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element and Transportation Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to population and housing.

### ***Class III Impacts***

#### Short-Term Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term less-than-significant impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

#### Long-Term Impacts

##### ***Impact 3.8-5 The GP/CLUP Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes***

The Housing Element identifies areas that are vacant where rezoning to residential or higher residential density are proposed, and areas that are designated nonresidential, where zoning amendments to allow residential uses are proposed. However, the GP/CLUP assumes that existing land uses will remain until land use changes would occur through voluntary means and through private redevelopment efforts. Furthermore, the proposed mixed-use area, for example, allowable mixed-use at the Fairview Shopping Center per the Housing Element, would provide more residential units than the existing land use. The Land Use Element also provides additional residential opportunities, through the Goleta Old Town Revitalization and Mixed-Use development, in areas that currently do not allow residential uses. As such, the 2006 Final EIR concluded that the GP/CLUP would not displace a substantial number of people or existing homes.

As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, impacts on the City's current population or existing homes are considered less than significant. Proposed GP/CLUP amendment LU 3.2 would remove the restriction limiting the location of Regional Commercial uses to those areas of the City designated for large box uses as of 2005 (Camino Real Shopping Center and K-Mart). This policy amendment could potentially lead to the conversion of land previously designated residential. It is acknowledged that new areas proposed for commercial development would be subject to project-level CEQA review; notwithstanding, the potential for displacement of new people or homes as envisioned by the GP/CLUP could occur. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.8.3.3 of the 2006 Final EIR for this impact. Any future project specific CEQA impacts would be addressed through Environmental Review associated with the land use entitlement process.

### ***Class IV Impacts***

#### Short-Term Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term beneficial (Class IV) impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

#### Long-Term Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, the anticipated reduction in the City's jobs to housing balance from 2.3:1 to 1.74:1 at full Plan buildout would be considered a long-term beneficial (Class IV) impact to population and housing associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

### **3.8.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, the geographic context for the analysis of cumulative population and housing impacts is the South Coast subregion as defined by SBCAG. The South Coast subregion includes the cities of Santa Barbara, Goleta, Carpinteria, and unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. The cumulative context within this geographic area includes all growth within the South Coast subregion as envisioned by SBCAG in their Regional Growth Forecast, which includes all growth anticipated to occur through 2040.

Population over the 2005 to 2040 period is forecast to increase by 75,300 persons or 18% countywide (SBCAG 2008). The South Coast is forecast to experience an increase in population of 12,200 or 6% (SBCAG 2008). According to the California Department of Finance, the City of Goleta's population in January 2005 was 30,679, which was 7.3 percent of Santa Barbara County's population (City of Goleta 2006). The 2010 population for the City is expected to be 31,700, which is an increase of 1,300 people over the 2008 population. The other South Coast cities of Carpinteria and Santa Barbara are forecast to increase in population over the 2005–2040 period by 7 and 3.5 percent respectively. Limited vacant land limits the potential for nonresidential development in the City of Santa Barbara. The primary areas expected to experience population growth include the Santa Maria Valley, Lompoc Valley, and unincorporated areas of the South Coast.

Cumulative development is anticipated to both accommodate and induce this growth, depending upon the type of development proposed. However, the population growth has been forecasted in local and regional planning documents, and appropriate plans, policies, and regulations are in place to accommodate this growth. The County is acknowledged to be facing a substantial affordable housing shortage, the portion of which in Goleta the GP/CLUP is intended to address. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant.

Population growth associated implementation of the GP/CLUP is anticipated to result in an additional 7,418 people, resulting in a population of 38,097 by the buildout year of 2030. This represents an increase of 24 percent over the current 2005 population of 30,679. The GP/CLUP's projected 2030 population forecast is slightly higher than that projected by SBCAG for the City by approximately 3,797 people. The GP/CLUP's estimated population increase of 24 percent over the next 25 years is not considered in and of itself to be a significant impact. The residential use and associated population increases for the cumulative study area have

been projected and considered in regional growth plans. Therefore, the contribution of the GP/CLUP to impacts associated with an inducement of substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would comprise a less-than-significant impact.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

In sum, the proposed amendments evaluated in this Supplemental EIR would not affect the level of significance of cumulative impacts determined for the 2006 Final EIR.

### **3.8.3.5 Mitigation**

#### ***Modifications to GP/CLUP Policies***

Proposed modifications to selected GP/CLUP policies are presented in Chapter 2.0 as amendments to the GP/CLUP. No further modifications are proposed for consideration beyond those identified as alternatives in this Supplemental EIR.

#### ***Additional Mitigation***

No mitigation is identified.

### **3.8.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the GP/CLUP land use policies, as amended under any of the alternatives under consideration herein, would reduce all significant Class II population and housing impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, there are no residual Class I or II population and housing impacts.

*This page intentionally left blank.*