

CHAPTER 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 Introduction

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires an assessment of a reasonable range of alternatives to a project. The alternatives must meet most of the objectives and avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the project. CEQA also requires that an EIR assess the No Project alternative, providing an assessment of what would reasonably be expected to occur if the project were not implemented.

5.1.2 Rationale for Selecting the Alternatives

The City of Goleta evaluated alternatives during two stages in developing the GP/CLUP. First, four alternatives were identified and analyzed in 2003 and 2004 to evaluate policy options that the City could consider in the development of the Discussion Draft General Plan (Discussion Draft). These alternatives, identified as the *Planning Alternatives*, included Environmental Vitality, Economic Stability, Economic Center, and Housing Needs. Each of the four alternatives reflected a common theme to guide further development of the City of Goleta based on the existing character of the City.

The Planning Alternatives were evaluated to consider the implications for the City's infrastructure, both in terms of what facilities would be needed and at what cost. The alternatives were designed to encourage public discussion and to provide a basis for analysis of many of the significant policy decisions facing the community. On the basis of that discussion and analysis, the Planning Agency provided broad direction to the City Administration to develop a Discussion Draft GP/CLUP.

The Planning Alternatives are described in detail in the following references: *Implications of Planning Alternatives on the Elements of the Natural And Human Environment* and *Statement of General Plan Alternatives*, both dated June 21, 2004, and prepared by the City of Goleta. These references are provided on the City of Goleta's website (www.cityofgoleta.org). Ultimately these alternatives were rejected from further consideration, as discussed below in Section 5.2.

After completion of the Discussion Draft GP/CLUP, another set of alternatives was developed and analyzed for the EIR process; these alternatives are presented below. From the EIR process, three potentially feasible alternatives to the development policies proposed under the GP/CLUP have been identified. These alternatives were selected for their ability to avoid or mitigate potential impacts resulting from implementation of the GP/CLUP policies while still achieving many of the basic policy objectives. Specifically, the two *Reduced Development Scenario Alternatives* were considered as a way to reduce traffic impacts to Storke Road and Hollister Avenue. These alternatives are summarized below in Section 5.3.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

As discussed above, four Planning Alternatives were identified and rejected as not feasible during the process of developing the GP/CLUP. These planning alternatives include Environmental Vitality, Economic Stability, Economic Center, and Housing Needs. A summary of each alternative is provided below.

5.2.1 Environmental Vitality Alternative

This alternative would have ensured the protection of environmental assets and resources by reducing or controlling development that could create significant impacts on environmental quality. Since environmental resources and values are fragile, environmental limits would have been set conservatively to ensure that any miscalculation of potential impacts would not inadvertently damage resource values. Environmental values would set the envelope within which development could occur.

This alternative was rejected because it was determined that this alternative, while providing maximum protection to environmental resources, would be too restrictive to allow the City to meet its goals and objectives for promotion of a healthy business climate, protection of agricultural resources, and provision of residential development to meet the housing needs of all economic segments of the City.

5.2.2 Economic Stability Alternative

This alternative planned a sustainable economy and was based on the carrying capacity of the City's natural resources, and it would have provided for a level of development that did not cumulatively conflict with or degrade the value of those resources. To safeguard the value of these resources for future generations, the measures to protect or enhance such resources would have been conservatively applied. Consistent with the carrying capacity approach, this alternative also would have limited growth to the infrastructure that the community can afford and would accept, consistent with other aspects of the alternative. The alternative would have included an agricultural element directed at promoting City programs in sustainable agriculture including a farmer's market, promotion of local production and consumption of agricultural goods, home-based agriculture, and so on.

This alternative was rejected because although it would protect environmental, scenic, and agricultural resources, the protective policies it included would still have been too limiting on the City's business community to ensure the long-term health of the business climate and would have to restrictive on the City's future efforts to address its housing needs.

5.2.3 Economic Center Alternative

This alternative maintained the role of the community as an employment center for the South Coast by continuing to provide opportunity for employment growth to keep pace with regional needs. It would have been able to accommodate a rate of private sector employment growth consistent with past trends of between 1.2% and 2.5% per year. To accommodate this, the alternative placed priority on reserving areas for income-producing activities to the area. This alternative would have continued the development of the City as a regional shopping area by increasing the area designated for regional commercial uses. It provided the most amount of economic opportunity.

This alternative was rejected because it did not provide sufficient protection of environmental resources, scenic vistas, open space, and agricultural resources while contributing to worsening regional traffic congestion and increased, unsustainable demand for water, sewer, police, fire, and recreational services and facilities as well as failing to meet growing housing needs that would occur as a result of this alternative.

5.2.4 Housing Needs Alternative

This alternative met the regionally defined housing needs currently allocated to Goleta and anticipated future regionally defined needs. It placed highest priority on providing the maximum potential for housing while at the same time allowing further intensification of existing employment areas. It allocated most of the vacant areas in the City to housing at higher densities than the Environmental Vitality alternative did. While all of these initial alternatives would have incorporated some mixed use, this alternative provided the most opportunity for integrating housing with commercial activities and employment opportunities.

This alternative was rejected because it did not sufficiently protect environmental resources, scenic vistas, agricultural resources, open space, or adequately manage the demand for police, fire, water, sewer, and recreational services. In addition, the lack of appropriate limits on business and economic growth would have substantially reduced City efforts to address existing/future traffic congestion by increasing the City's housing supply for all segments of the community.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE EIR

Table 5-1 compares the net change in residential units and commercial/industrial square footage proposed by the GP/CLUP and alternative land use scenarios analyzed in this EIR. The specific characteristics of alternative land uses are shown in Figures 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3, respectively.

**TABLE 5-1
PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVE LAND USE SCENARIOS**

Description	Existing	Project	No Project	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Residential Units	11,615	+ 3,880	+ 1,327 ⁽¹⁾	+ 3,030	+ 2,270
Commercial/ Industrial Sq Ft.	12,119,000	+ 2,081,000	+ 268,000	+ 1,215,000	+ 1,111,000

Note: Numbers shown represent net changes in comparison to existing conditions.
⁽¹⁾ Represents production of new housing that has come on the market or is in the pipeline, since the beginning of the RHNA period (January 1, 2001 through December 2005), refer to Table 3.8-5)

5.3.1 No Project Alternative

CEQA requires that the EIR address a *No Project* alternative. In this instance, the No Project alternative is defined as the existing conditions plus the projects that had received planning approvals but were not completed prior to preparation of the Draft GP/CLUP. The No Project alternative consists of implementing existing zoning and other City regulations and ordinances continued into the future without a GP/CLUP. The interim plan policies are not part of the No Project alternative because the interim plan measures anticipate the adoption of a GP/CLUP.

Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 1,327 housing units, and 268,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. No new parks, open space, or street and highway improvement projects would be constructed under this alternative.

A No Project, or no plan, alternative would be illegal under State law, and even if it were not, would place the City in the position of having no comprehensive long-range policy direction, which could lead to no control over development and degradation of the environment.

5.3.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

The *Reduced Development Scenario 1* alternative considers adoption of the Land Use Element and other GP/CLUP elements with reduced numbers of residences and reduced square footage of commercial and industrial development, in comparison to the proposed GP/CLUP. Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 3,030 housing units, and an additional 1,215,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. This alternative includes all of the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements identified for the proposed GP/CLUP. The overall reduction in development potential would incrementally reduce impacts across all environmental issue areas.

5.3.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

The *Reduced Development Scenario 2* alternative also considers adoption of the Land Use Element and other GP/CLUP elements with reduced numbers of residences, and reduced square footage of commercial and industrial development, in comparison to the proposed GP/CLUP. Land uses proposed under this alternative are similar to, but somewhat different than, Reduced Development Scenario 1. Buildout under this alternative would result in an additional 2,270 housing units, and an additional 1,111,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development. This alternative includes all of the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements identified for the proposed GP/CLUP. The overall reduction in development potential would incrementally reduce impacts across all environmental issue areas.

5.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACT SUMMARY

5.4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

5.4.1.1 No Project

Under the No Project alternative, the City would continue to function under the direction of the existing adopted interim policies such as the Inland and Coastal Zoning Ordinances, and Coastal Act policies, which regulate aesthetics and scenic resources. Without a GP/CLUP, there would be few policies and regulations to preserve scenic resources and guide future development. The No Project alternative would accommodate an additional 1,327 housing units and population growth, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. It is possible that certain individual views of scenic resources and scenic corridors, identified in Section 3.1.1.4, could be affected by the new development (Class II). Such impacts might be mitigated through building design features, but project-specific review would be required. This alternative would not include GP/CLUP policies that would include improvements to the visual quality of City gateways or creation of well-defined public spaces as discussed under impacts 3.1-4 and 3.1-5. Overall, impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the limited amount of development that would occur. However, there would be few policies to protect scenic resources in the future without implementation of a GP/CLUP.

5.4.1.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Visual impacts could be less substantial than with the GP/CLUP due to the reduced level of density proposed by Alternative 1; however, even within the proposed reduction in density, future development of vacant or underutilized land could impact views from scenic corridors along Hollister Avenue and major gateways to the City. Similar to the GP/CLUP, this would be considered a significant adverse impact (Class I); however, impacts would be at a slightly lower

level than the proposed project due to the reduced density of development. Development of vacant or underutilized land under this alternative could also result in a significant change to the visual character of the City. Similar to the GP/CLUP, this would be considered a significant adverse impact (Class I); however, impacts would be at a slightly lower level than the proposed project due to the reduced density of development.

Under this alternative, impacts to views from US-101, Hollister Avenue, SR-217, and Los Carneros Lake would be similar to or slightly less than the GP/CLUP due the reduced density of proposed development. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant but mitigable (Class II).

Light and glare impacts associated with development of vacant land along Hollister and US-101 (see Figure 3.10-2) would also be less than the proposed GP/CLUP. The proposed GP/CLUP policies that support improvements to the visual quality of City gateways and creation of well-defined public spaces would apply under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact.

5.4.1.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Impacts would be similar to those described above for Alternative 1. Even within the proposed reduction in density, future development of vacant or underutilized land could impact views from scenic corridors along Hollister Avenue and major gateways to the City. Similar to the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1, this would be considered a significant adverse impact (Class I); however, impacts would be at a slightly lower level than the proposed project due to the reduced density of development. Development of vacant or underutilized land under this alternative could also result in a significant change to the visual character of the City. Similar to GP/CLUP and Alternative 1, this would be considered a significant adverse impact (Class I); however, impacts would be at a slightly lower level than the proposed project due to the reduced density of development.

Under this alternative, impacts to views from US-101, Hollister Avenue, SR-217, and Los Carneros Lake would be similar to or slightly less than the GP/CLUP due the reduced density of proposed development. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant but mitigable (Class II).

Impacts to the visual character of natural open space and agricultural areas would be less than the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1 since more parcels of land would remain in agricultural use. This is also considered a potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) impact.

Light and glare impacts associated with development of vacant land along Hollister and US-101 (see Figure 3.10-2) would also be less than the proposed GP/CLUP. The proposed GP/CLUP policies that support improvements to the visual quality of City gateways and creation of well-defined public spaces would apply under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, this would be considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact.

5.5.2 Agriculture and Farmland

5.4.2.1 No Project

The No Project alternative would result in the loss of a 10.26-acre agricultural site that is part of an approved project called Sumida Gardens (a 21.2-acre site referred to as Site #8 on Figure

3.2-1, Existing Agriculture Lands and Proposed Land Use Designations). The site is not classified as Important Farmland, but does contain prime agricultural soils. The conversion of agricultural lands would be considered a significant adverse impact (Class I), but at a lower level than the proposed project, due to the limited amount of agricultural lands that would be lost. This alternative would limit the amount of development within or adjacent to agriculturally productive areas reducing potential land use conflicts. Impacts involving conflicts between agricultural production and future new development under this alternative are considered less than significant (Class III).

Other than existing State and Federal policies identified in Section 3.2.2.1, without implementation of the GP/CLUP there would be few local policies and regulations addressing the preservation of agricultural resources in the long-term.

5.4.2.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Alternative 1 would result in fewer agricultural lands being converted to nonagricultural uses than as proposed in the GP/CLUP. Under Alternative 1, existing agriculture Site #9 (12.2 acres) would remain in agricultural use (refer to Figure 3.2-1) thereby increasing the amount of protected agricultural lands to 365.5 acres. As such, under Alternative 1 the conversion of agricultural lands would still be considered a significant impact (Class I); but at a lower level than the proposed project, due to the lesser amount of agricultural lands that would be lost.

Impacts from the introduction of incompatible uses within or adjacent to agriculturally productive areas are similar to those described for the project. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant but mitigable (Class II).

5.4.2.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Under Alternative 2, existing agriculture Sites #5, 6, and 9 would remain in agriculture use (refer to Figure 3.2-1, Existing Agriculture Lands and Proposed Land Use Designations) resulting in 381.5 acres of protected agricultural land. As such, the conversion of agricultural lands under Alternative 2 would still be considered a significant impact (Class I); but at a lower level than the proposed project, due to the lesser amount of agricultural lands that would be lost.

Impacts from the introduction of incompatible uses within or adjacent to agriculturally productive areas are similar to those described for the project. Such impacts would be considered potentially significant but mitigable (Class II).

5.4.3 Air Quality

5.4.3.1 No Project

While no new development would be permitted under this alternative, there may be short-term air impacts from the construction of projects already permitted or approved but not constructed. These short-term air impacts, however, would be less than those under the GP/CLUP, due to the limited amount of construction activities that would occur in the No Project alternative.

The number of households and population forecasts associated with the No Project Alternative is less than that forecasted by SBCAG, therefore, it would be considered consistent with SBCAG regional growth forecasts and consistent with the 2004 CAP. This alternative would not

hinder attainment of State or Federal air quality standards. Impacts are considered less than significant (Class III).

Similar to the proposed project, the No Project alternative would result in an increase of VMT. However, the increase in VMT's would be less than the proposed project due to the limited growth associated with the No Project alternative. Impacts would be considered less than significant (Class III).

Long term operational contributions to air pollutant emissions resulting from activities associated with future development under the No Project alternative would be less than the proposed project, due to the limited development proposed under this alternative. Stationary operational would be regulated and permitted on a project-by-project basis. (Class III).

Cumulative emissions from ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be less under this alternative due to the limited amount of development; however, Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment of State standards for these pollutants and any projected generated increase could exacerbate such nonattainment. The No Project Alternative's contribution to cumulative levels of ozone emissions would therefore be considered significant and unavoidable (Class I). The No Project Alternative's contribution to cumulative levels of PM₁₀ emissions would be potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) with implementation of existing standard City Grading Ordinance and SBAPCD dust-control measures.

5.4.3.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

The number of households and population forecasts associated with Alternative 1 is less than that forecasted by SBCAG, therefore, it would be considered consistent with SBCAG regional growth forecasts and consistent with the 2004 CAP. This alternative would not hinder attainment of State or Federal air quality standards. Impacts are considered less than significant (Class III).

Maximum daily emissions associated with construction activities would be similar to those for the GP/CLUP. However, because the overall amount of development is expected to be lower under Alternative 1, construction-related emissions over the 20-year period through 2030 would be less than under the GP/CLUP.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative would result in an increase of VMT. However, the increase in VMT's would be less than the proposed project due to the reduce level of development associated with Alternative 1. Impacts would be considered less than significant (Class III).

Long term operational contributions to air pollutant emissions resulting from activities associated with new residential and non-residential development would be less than the proposed project, due to the reduced level of development proposed under this alternative. Stationary operational would be regulated and permitted on a project-by-project basis and are subject to further regulation and permitting. Impacts are considered less than significant (Class III).

Cumulative emissions from ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ would be less under this alternative due to the limited amount of development; however, Santa Barbara County is currently in nonattainment of State standards for ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ and any increase in such emission levels could exacerbate such nonattainment. This alternative's contribution to cumulative levels of ozone emissions would be considered significant and unavoidable (Class I). The Alternative's contribution to cumulative levels of PM₁₀ emissions would be considered potentially significant

but mitigable (Class II) with implementation of existing standard City Grading Ordinance and SBAPCD dust-control measures.

5.4.3.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Air quality impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to or slightly less than those described above for Alternative 1, due to the reduced amount of development.

5.4.4 Biological Resources

5.4.4.1 No Project

Under the No Project Alternative, no new development other than those projects that were constructed or have received planning approvals but were not completed prior to preparation of the GP/CLUP would occur. Impacts would be similar to those described for the proposed project, but at a lower level due to the limited development potential. Without implementation of the GP/CLUP, the protection of ESHAs and maintenance/management of regional and neighborhood open space areas would not occur.

5.4.4.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Impacts related to existing site-specific conditions, such as vegetation and wildlife, could be similar to those with the proposed project, depending on whether specific parcels were designated for substantially less density. As those impacts would be largely a function of whether a particular parcel were developed and would be less dependent on the nature of development, a uniform reduction in permitted density would not in and of itself result in substantially different impacts compared those anticipated under buildout of the GP/CLUP. If development on more environmentally sensitive parcels were more highly restricted, this alternative could have less impact than the proposed project on those parcels. The same policies proposed under the GP/CLUP would also apply to Alternative 1.

5.4.4.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Biological resource impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to those discussed for Alternative 1.

5.4.5 Cultural Resources

5.4.5.1 No Project

Under the No Project Alternative, no new development other than those projects that were constructed or have received planning approvals but were not completed prior to preparation of the GP/CLUP would occur. Therefore, no additional disturbance of known historic and cultural resources would be anticipated under this alternative. Such impacts are therefore less than that anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

5.4.5.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Impacts related to cultural resources would largely be a function of the location and not the nature or density of development; therefore, impacts would be similar to those of the GP/CLUP. The same policies proposed under the GP/CLUP would also apply to Alternative 1.

5.4.5.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Cultural resources impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to those discussed for Alternative 1.

5.4.6 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

5.4.6.1 No Project

Grading and ground disturbance associated with the construction of approved or pending residential projects could result in soil erosion and deposition of sediment into nearby drainages and/or waterways. Existing Federal and State regulations requiring the preparation of a SWPPP be prepared and implementation of the City's existing grading ordinance would reduce the level of impact to potentially significant but mitigable (Class II). Such impacts would not be as severe as the proposed project due to the limited amount of development proposed under this alternative.

The City is in a seismically active region, and seismic activity could cause surface fault rupture, strong ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, and/or liquefaction. Unless constructed to withstand the potential fault rupture and shaking caused by an earthquake, future structures could collapse or be shifted off their foundations. Compliance with the CBSC would help mitigate potential impacts (Class II). Since limited development would occur under this alternative, there would be a reduced probability of injury or property damage from future seismic events in comparison to the GP/CLUP.

Expansive and/or compressible soils occur in the City, and development on these soils could lead to significant damage to structures and utilities. Existing Federal and State regulations would reduce the level of impact (Class II). Potential impacts from soil hazards also would be less than the GP/CLUP due to the limited amount of development involved under this alternative. Development on unstable geologic or soil units, on sites with steep slopes, or along coastal bluffs is not anticipated under the No Project alternative; therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Impacts from exposure to radon would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP, because areas of the Rincon Formation are located in existing open space areas within the City and along the City's northern border.

5.4.6.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Impacts related to existing site-specific conditions, such as geology and soils, could be similar to those with the proposed project, depending on whether specific parcels were designated for substantially less development intensity. As those impacts would be largely a function of whether a particular parcel were developed and would be less dependent on the nature of development, a uniform reduction in permitted intensity would not itself result in substantially different impacts compared to the proposed project.

5.4.6.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Geology, soils, and mineral resource impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to those described for the proposed GP/CLUP and Alternative 1. See discussion under Section 5.4.6.2.

5.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

5.4.7.1 No Project

Potential risk of upset impacts from the EOF for the No Project alternative are identical to those anticipated from the GP/CLUP, because most of the proposed residential development surrounding the EOF was approved in 2005, prior to preparation of the GP/CLUP, or consists of existing residential neighborhoods. The risk-reducing measures identified in existing plans have substantially reduced the level of risk associated with the EOF; however, the hazards resulting from an upset condition at the EOF would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).

The overall risk associated with the transport or handling of hazardous wastes and materials would be less for the No Project alternative than for the GP/CLUP due to the limited amount of development that would occur along major transportation corridors. Conformance with existing Department of Transportation (DOT) and Caltrans regulations pertaining to the transport of hazardous materials would reduce but not mitigate the resulting exposure of the public to such risks below a level of significance (Class I).

The re-commissioning of oil production at the S.L. 421 Well would create risks to marine and land resources and neighboring populations (i.e., Comstock Homes) associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Such risk exposure would be similar to that described under the GP/CLUP.

Nearly the entire City is contained within the influence area of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Because of the close proximity of residential and other developed areas to air traffic, the Airport creates an existing significant safety hazard within the City. In the City, existing land uses within any of the Airport's Clear Zones are limited to the business park at 6300 Hollister, portions of the existing Cabrillo Business Park, and a mix of industrial development along Kellogg west of SR-217. There are two existing residential areas within the One-Mile Zone from the end of the Airport's runways. Other existing land uses within the one-mile markers of the Approach Zones of Runways 7-25 and 15-33 include general industrial, office and institutional, and business park developments. Under the No Project alternative, less development would occur within the Airport's Clear Zone than the GP/CLUP; therefore, the resulting risk exposure for people and property would be considered less than the GP/CLUP.

Oil storage and transfer operations at EMT create risks to marine and land resources and approved residential projects associated with spills, leaks, or pipeline ruptures. Impacts due to oil releases would be significant but mitigable (Class II) through implementation of existing SPCC Plans, pursuant to 40 CFR Part 112, that are currently required of the EMT and implementation of a pipeline safety, maintenance, operation and inspection program.

Most of the existing residential and other developed areas (i.e., Bacara Resort and Glenn Annie Golf Course) near the northern and western limits of the City are located adjacent to wildland fire hazard areas. The fire risk to existing homes and other structures within these areas is considered significant; however, no additional development would occur adjacent to the wildland fire hazard areas under the No Project alternative. Such impacts would be considered less than the proposed project.

Selected sites that are scheduled for future development under the No Project alternative are located near one or more listed hazardous materials sites. Impacts due to potential releases of hazardous materials from these sites would be similar to those described under the GP/CLUP;

however, there would be fewer people exposed to hazardous materials because only a limited amount of development would occur under the No Project alternative. Cleanup of contaminated sites prior to proposed future development would be expected to reduce potentially adverse impacts associated with listed contaminated sites to a less-than-significant level; however, impacts would be dependent on the site conditions, toxicity, and magnitude of the removed and remaining contaminants.

5.4.7.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

The risk of exposure to hazards under Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP, because the same environmentally impaired parcels would be developed. Cleanup of contaminated sites prior to proposed future development would be expected to reduce potentially adverse impacts associated with listed contaminated sites to a less-than-significant level; however, impacts would be dependent on the site conditions, toxicity, and magnitude of the removed and remaining contaminants. Risks of exposure related to the increased handling and use of hazardous materials would be similar or slightly less than the GP/CLUP because limited new commercial/industrial uses would be expected under this alternative. This alternative also reduces the amount of proposed residential development near US-101, which is a major transportation corridor used to transport hazardous materials.

Potential risk of upset impacts from the EOF would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP; however this alternative would reduce the amount of proposed residences north of the EOF. Air safety hazards would be slightly less than the GP/CLUP, since this alternative reduces the amount of proposed development within the Airport's Clear Zones.

Impacts from wildfires would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP because of the proximity of existing homes and other structures and from future development proposed near undeveloped wildland fire hazard areas. The fire risk to homes and other structures within these areas is considered significant.

5.4.7.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Hazards impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1 because the same environmentally impaired parcels would be developed. Cleanup of contaminated sites prior to proposed future development would be expected to reduce potentially adverse impacts associated with listed contaminated sites to a less-than-significant level; however, impacts would be dependent on the site conditions, toxicity, and magnitude of the removed and remaining contaminants. Risks related to the increased handling and use of hazardous materials would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP; however, impacts would be at a lower level because of the reduced density of commercial/industrial uses. Alternative 2 would also reduce the amount of proposed residential development near US-101, which is a major transportation corridor used to transport hazardous materials. Potential risk of upset impacts from the EOF is identical to Alternative 1.

Air safety hazards for Alternative 2 would be slightly less than for the GP/CLUP and identical to Alternative 1, since this alternative would limit the amount of proposed development within the Airport's Clear Zones.

Impacts from wildfires for Alternative 2 would be slightly less than for Alternative 1, since two parcels located near the northern City limits would remain under agriculture instead of being

designated for future residential development; however, the fire risk to existing homes and other structures near the fire hazard areas would be identical to those described for the GP/CLUP.

5.4.8 Population and Housing

5.4.8.1 No Project

The No Project alternative would result in an additional 1,327 housing units that are part of residential projects that have been completed between January 2001 to September 2005 or that are part of residential projects that have been approved but not yet completed as of October 2005, refer to Table 3.8-5. Production of new housing that has come on the market, or is in the pipeline, since the beginning of the RHNA period (January 1, 2001) through December 2005 has met all of the City's need for above-moderate-income housing (refer to Table 3.8-5). The City's remaining need as of December 2005 is 1,061. This alternative would still result in some increased housing and population growth, but to a lesser extent than the GP/CLUP (Class II). Under this alternative, the City would not meet its fair share allocation to provide adequate housing and address regional growth since there would be a remaining need of 1,061 units. The lack of housing in City under this alternative would increase development pressures on surrounding cities and the County. The result could be indirect, significant effects on population and housing in those communities.

The alternative would allow an additional 268,000 square feet of industrial and commercial development, and would provide an additional 436 to 536 jobs, for a total of 23,436 to 23,536 jobs citywide. If it is assumed that there would be about 1.5 employed residents per each new residential unit and that 95 percent of new units would be occupied, the increment of additional employed residents would be about 1,809. This would result in a jobs-to-employed residents ratio range of 0.24 to 0.29, which would not maintain the existing balance between jobs to employed residents,.. The jobs-to-housing ratio under the No Project is expected to be 0.71 to 1.41 which is slightly lower than the range of the GP/CLUP.

Under the No Project Alternative, existing land uses plus approved but unbuilt projects will remain without further development; therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or existing homes. Such impacts would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP (Class III).

5.4.8.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Alternative 1 would result in the development of an additional 3,030 housing units, which would result in an increase in future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than would occur under the GP/CLUP. The number of units proposed under this alternative (3,030) plus the number of units that are approved, pending, or under construction as of 2005 (1,327 housing units) would ensure that the City is able to meet its fair share allocation, provide adequate housing, and address regional growth. Impacts would be similar to those resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP.

The alternative would allow an additional 1,215,000 square feet of industrial and commercial development, and would provide an additional 2,000 to 2,400 jobs, for a total of 25,000 to 25,400 jobs citywide. If it is assumed that there would be about 1.5 employed residents per each new residential unit and that 95 percent of new units would be occupied, the increment of additional employed residents would be about 4,300. This would result in a jobs-to-employed residents ratio range of 0.47 to 0.56. Similar to the GP/CLUP, the additional housing units would

help maintain an existing balance between jobs and housing, or between jobs and employed residents. The jobs-to-housing ratio under Alternative 1 is expected to be 1.73, which is similar to the range of the GP/CLUP.

Under Alternative 1, existing land uses will remain until land use changes would occur through voluntary means and through private redevelopment efforts; therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or existing homes. Such impacts would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP (Class III)

5.4.8.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Alternative 2 would result in the development of an additional 2,270 housing units, which would result in an increase in future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the GP/CLUP. The number of units proposed under this alternative (2,270) plus the number of units that are approved, pending, or under construction as of 2005 (1,327 housing units) would ensure that the City is able to meet its fair share allocation, provide adequate housing, and address regional growth. Impacts would be similar to those resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP.

The alternative would allow an additional 1,111,000 square feet of industrial and commercial development, and would provide an additional 1,800 to 2,200 jobs, for a total of 24,800 to 25,200 jobs citywide. If it is assumed that there would be about 1.5 employed residents per each new residential unit and that 95 percent of new units would be occupied, the increment of additional employed residents would be about 3,235. This would result in a jobs-to-employed residents ratio range of 0.56 to 0.68. Similar to the GP/CLUP, the additional housing units would help maintain an existing balance between jobs and housing, or between jobs and employed residents. The jobs-to-housing ratio under Alternative 2 is expected to range from 1.79 to 1.81, which is slightly higher than the range of the GP/CLUP.

Under Alternative 2, existing land uses will remain until land use changes would occur through voluntary means and through private redevelopment efforts; therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people or existing homes. Such impacts would be similar to those described for the GP/CLUP (Class III).

5.4.9 Water Resources

5.4.9.1 No Project

The No Project alternative would increase offsite runoff due to increased surface coverage by pavements and structures, although the increase would be less than under the GP/CLUP because of the limited development allowed under this alternative. This alternative also could result in the degradation of surface runoff quality due to increased levels of pollutants from additional development. Similar to the GP/CLUP, new development would also result in increased amounts of impervious surface, reducing the ability for stormwater to percolate and recharge the groundwater basin. Overall, water resources impacts would be less than for the GP/CLUP.

Additional development in the City would result in a significant water supply impact if it would result in overall City or GWD water demand in excess of water supplies available in normal, critical dry, and multiple dry years with water from all existing entitlements and sources, or if the development would require new or expanded water entitlements or resources. The WSA prepared for the City concluded that water supplies are adequate to serve future buildout under

the GP/CLUP. Since development proposed under the No Project alternative would be less than for the GP/CLUP, water supplies would also be considered adequate to serve the No Project alternative.

5.4.9.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

The WSA prepared for the City concluded that water supplies are adequate to serve future buildout under the GP/CLUP. Since development proposed under Alternative 1 would be less than for the GP/CLUP, water supplies would also be considered adequate to serve Alternative 1.

Impacts related to potential contamination of surface waters due to point-source pollution could be somewhat less than with the project due to the lesser level of development resulting from this alternative; however, actual effects would depend on the nature of the development approved.

5.4.9.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

The WSA prepared for the City concluded that water supplies are adequate to serve future buildout under the GP/CLUP. Since development proposed under Alternative 2 would be less than for the GP/CLUP, water supplies would also be considered adequate to serve Alternative 2.

5.4.10 Land Use and Recreation

5.4.10.1 No Project

Under the No Project alternative, existing land uses would remain in effect. The City would continue to function under the direction of the existing interim ordinances, such as the Inland and Coastal Zoning Ordinances and the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance. An additional 1,327 housing units would be constructed. Land use and planning impacts associated with the No Project alternative would be less than those for the GP/CLUP because a smaller area of undeveloped lands would be converted to urban uses and substantially less development would occur.

5.4.10.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Alternative 1 assumes that the majority of proposed land uses would be consistent with the GP/CLUP land use designations; however, there would be 850 fewer housing units and 866,000 less square feet of commercial/industrial space than that proposed by the GP/CLUP. This alternative has the potential to reduce the funding available for new recreation facilities because of the reduced potential for collection of impact mitigation fees. Under this alternative, land use impacts would generally be similar to or less than those of the GP/CLUP.

5.4.10.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Alternative 2 assumes that the majority of proposed land uses would be consistent with the land use designations in the GP/CLUP, with the exception of four existing agricultural parcels that would remain in agricultural use instead of being converted to non-agricultural uses. In addition, development on 22 sites would occur at a density lower than what was assumed for the GP/CLUP (1,610 less housing units and 970,000 less square feet commercial/industrial space) and Alternative 1 (850 less housing units and 104,000 less square feet of commercial/industrial

space). This alternative has the potential to reduce the funding available for new recreation facilities because of the reduced potential for collection of impact mitigation fees. Under this alternative, land-use impacts would generally be similar to or less than those for the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1.

5.4.11 Noise

5.4.11.1 No Project

Under the No Project alternative, existing land uses would remain in effect. Noise related to vehicle, rail, and airport traffic would continue to contribute most significantly to the local noise environment. As a result of reductions in the number of housing units and employment, traffic volumes throughout the City would be less for this alternative than for the GP/CLUP.

Construction of approved residential projects would marginally increase noise sources. However, the new noise sources would be controlled through existing regulations, and noise impacts would otherwise be mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.

Two of the new housing sites would be exposed to traffic and railroad noise levels exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. Other existing noise sensitive land uses located near the UPRR, US-101, SR-217, and other major roadways would continue to be exposed to levels in excess of 65 dBA (refer to Figure 3.11-1). Under the No Project alternative, no new noise sensitive land uses would be exposed to aircraft noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. With less residential development than the GP/CLUP, this alternative would result in the creation of fewer noise-sensitive land uses. Overall, impacts associated with the No Project alternative would be less than for the GP/CLUP.

5.4.11.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Development under Alternative 1 would occur at a density lower than that assumed for the GP/CLUP (850 fewer housing units and 866,000 fewer commercial/industrial square feet). Less residential development would occur particularly along US-101, Hollister Avenue, and along the UPRR corridor; as a result, a smaller portion of residents would be exposed to traffic and rail noise impacts. Similar to the GP/CLUP, none of the areas planned for the development of noise-sensitive land uses would be exposed to aircraft noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. With less residential development than the GP/CLUP, this alternative would result in the creation of fewer sensitive land uses that could be exposed to industrial and commercial noise. The same policies as the proposed GP/CLUP would apply under this alternative, requiring that new noise sources be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements. Overall, noise impacts of Alternative 1 would be slightly less than for the GP/CLUP.

5.4.11.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Under Alternative 2, less residential development would occur than proposed for the GP/CLUP, particularly along US-101, Hollister Avenue, and along the UPRR corridor. As a result, a smaller portion of residents would be exposed to traffic and rail noise impacts. Similar to the GP/CLUP, none of the areas planned for development of noise-sensitive land uses would be exposed to aircraft noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. Under this alternative, more land would remain as agriculture and open space/recreation. With less residential development than the GP/CLUP, this alternative would result in the creation of fewer sensitive land uses that could be exposed to industrial and commercial noise. The same policies as the proposed GP/CLUP would apply under this alternative, requiring that new noise sources be controlled and noise impacts

otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements. Overall, noise impacts for Alternative 2 would be slightly less than for the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1.

5.4.12 Public Services and Utilities

5.4.12.1 No Project

Under the No Project alternative, no new development would occur other than those projects that were previously approved. Therefore, there would be a smaller increase in demand for services and utilities than for the GP/CLUP.

5.4.12.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)

Demand for public services and facilities under Alternative 1 would be less than for the GP/CLUP due to the reduced amount of development proposed by Alternative 1. Demand for police and fire protection, wastewater services, solid waste, gas and electric utilities, schools, and library facilities would increase, but less than for the GP/CLUP.

5.4.12.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

Demand for public services and facilities under Alternative 2 would be less than for the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1 due to the reduced amount of development proposed by Alternative 2. Demand for police and fire protection, wastewater services, solid waste, gas and electric utilities, schools, and library facilities would increase, but less than for the GP/CLUP and Alternative 1.

5.4.13 Transportation and Circulation

5.4.13.1 No Project

This analysis tests the ability of the existing street network to accommodate future traffic growth generated from buildout of the No-Action alternative by 2030. Table 5-2 summarizes PM peak hour intersection LOS projected under these conditions. The table shows that the following ten locations are projected to exceed the City standard of LOS C, three of which exceed the standard under existing conditions:

- Hollister Avenue/Canon Green Drive—LOS D
- Hollister Avenue/Storke Road—LOS D
- Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road—LOS D
- Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road—LOS D
- Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road—LOS F (operating at LOS F under existing conditions)
- Fairview Avenue/Calle Real—LOS E (operating at LOS D under existing conditions)
- Fairview Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp—LOS D
- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 SB-Ramp—LOS E
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB-Ramp—LOS F (operating at LOS D under existing conditions)
- Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue—LOS D

**TABLE 5-2
INTERSECTION LOS 2030 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE—EXISTING TRANSPORTATION
NETWORK**

ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control ¹	Existing Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use + Cumulative— Recommended Transportation	
				V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS
1	C	Hollister Avenue/ Calle Real ³	Unsignalized	13.9s	B	17.6s	C	8.7s	A
2	C	Hollister Avenue/Entrance Road	Signal	0.43	A	0.51	A	0.46	A
3	C	Hollister Avenue/ Canon Green Drive	Signal	19.3s	C	>>50s	F	0.55	A
4	C	Hollister Avenue/ Pacific Oaks Road	Signal	0.55	A	0.84	D	0.74	C
5	C	Hollister Avenue/ Market Place Drive	Signal	0.57	A	0.55	A	0.52	A
6	D	Hollister Avenue/ Storke Road	Signal	0.77	C	0.91	E	0.89	D
7	C	Storke Road/ Market Place Drive	Signal	0.56	A	0.64	B	0.70	B
8	C	Storke Road/ Phelps Road	Signal	0.42	A	0.46	A	0.59	A
9	C	Cathedral Oaks/ Glen Annie Road	Signal	0.62	B	0.69	B	0.66	B
10	C	Glen Annie Road/ Del Norte Drive	Unsignalized	9.5s	A	9.8s	A	9.7s	A
11	C	Glen Annie Road/Calle Real/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.65	B	0.73	C	0.72	C
12	C	Storke Road/ US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.51	A	0.49	A	0.53	A
13	C	Cathedral Oaks/ Alameda Avenue	Signal	0.46	A	0.51	A	0.45	A
14	C	Cathedral Oaks/ Los Carneros Road	Signal	19.8s	C	35.0s	D	0.64	B
15	C	Los Carneros Road/ Calle Real Road	Signal	18.8s	C	42.7s	E	0.65	B
16	C	Los Carneros Road/ US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.56	A	0.60	A	0.60	A
17	C	Los Carneros Road/ US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.71	C	0.82	D	0.56	A
18	C	Los Carneros Road/ Calle Koral Road	Signal	0.70	B	0.73	C	0.73	C
19	C	Los Carneros Road/Castilian Drive	Signal	0.64	B	0.71	C	0.73	C
20	C	Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.69	B	0.85	D	0.78	C
22	C	Los Carneros Way/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.46	A	0.61	B	0.46	A
23	C	Hollister Avenue/ Aero Camino Road	Signal	0.51	A	0.59	A	0.56	A
24	C	Hollister Avenue/ La Patera Lane	Signal	0.60	A	0.59	A	0.73	C
25	C	Cathedral Oaks/ Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.52	A	0.57	A	0.57	A
26	C	Fairview Avenue/ Stow Canyon Road	Signal	70.3s	F	>>50s	F	0.61	B
27	C	Fairview Avenue/ Encina Lane	Signal	0.46	A	0.45	A	0.52	A

(continued on next page)

TABLE 5-2 CONTINUED

ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control ¹	Existing Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use + Cumulative— Recommended Transportation	
				V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS
28	C	Fairview Avenue/ Calle Real	Signal	0.81	D	0.90	D	0.80	C
29	C	Fairview Avenue/ US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.77	C	0.86	D	0.75	C
30	C	Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.68	B	0.82	D	0.78	C
31	C	Hollister Avenue/ Pine Avenue	Signal	0.65	B	0.73	C	0.62	B
32	C	Hollister Avenue/Rutherford Street	Signal	0.50	A	0.68	B	0.62	B
33	C	Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive	Signal	0.31	A	0.35	A	0.36	A
35	C	Calle Real/ Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.38	A	0.43	A	0.43	A
36	C	Hollister Avenue/ Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.71	C	0.92	E	0.74	C
37	C	Hollister Avenue/ SR-217 SB Ramp	Unsignalized	0.79	C	0.96	E	19.5s	C
38	C	Hollister Avenue/ SR-217 NB Ramp	Unsignalized	0.68	B	0.70	B	3.9s	A
42	C	Patterson Avenue/ US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.72	C	0.83	D	0.77	C
43	C	Patterson Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.89	D	1.01	F	0.75	C
44	C	Patterson Avenue/Overpass Road	Signal	0.56	A	0.60	A	0.61	B
45	C	Hollister Avenue/ Patterson Avenue	Signal	0.79	C	0.83	D	0.74	C
51	C	Fairview Avenue/ US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.62	B	0.81	D	0.71	C
54	C	Hollister/ US-101 NB Ramp	--	8.5s	A	8.0s	A	n/a	n/a
55	C	Ellwood Station Road/Calle Real	Signal	8.4s	A	13.3s	B	0.64	B
56	C	Hollister/ US-101 SB Ramp ⁴	Signal	11.6s	B	13.2s	B	0.43	A
57	C	Winchester Canyon Road/Calle Real	Unsignalized	9.0s	A	9.8s	B	11.3s	B
58	C	Fairview Avenue/ Ekwill Street	Unsignalized	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.0s	C
59	C	Fairview Avenue/ Fowler Street	Unsignalized	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.2s	A
60	C	Ekwill Street/ Pine Street	Unsignalized	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.2s	A
61	C	Ekwill Street/ Kellogg Street	Unsignalized	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.7s	B
65	C	Cathedral Oaks/ Hollister Avenue	Signal			18.2s	C	0.44	A
67	C	Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	Signal	10.8s	B	8.9	A	0.44	A
68	C	La Patera/ Calle Real	Signal	n/a	n/a	18.5s	C	0.79	C

(continued on next page)

TABLE 5-2 CONTINUED

ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control ¹	Existing Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use— Existing Transportation		2030 Proposed Land Use + Cumulative— Recommended Transportation	
				V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS	V/C, or Delay (s) ²	LOS
69	C	La Patera/ Cathedral Oaks	Unsignalized	n/a	n/a	12.6s	B	12.2s	B
70	C	Hollister Avenue/ Ellwood Station	Signal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.71	C

¹ Traffic control in this table reflect recommended transportation network.
² Data are expressed as V/C ratios for signalized intersections and as seconds of delay (s) for unsignalized intersections.
³ Becomes NB-Ramp intersection with recommended transportation network.
⁴ Becomes Cathedral Oaks/US-101 SB-Ramp intersection with recommended transportation network.
See Figure 3.13-6.
Source: Dowling and Associates 2006

5.4.13.2 **Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1)**

This analysis tests the effect that a lower density land use plan, as described under Alternative 1, would have on 2030 traffic conditions, assuming construction of the recommended infrastructure improvements identified in the GP/CLUP. Figure 3.13-2 shows areas where proposed land uses under Alternative 1 differ from those identified under the GP/CLUP.

Table 5-3 summarizes PM peak hour intersection LOS projected under buildout conditions resulting from implementation of Alternative 1. The table shows that some minor improvements to LOS over conditions resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP and construction of identified transportation improvements would occur at some locations. However, the Storke/Hollister intersection, expected to operate at LOS D at buildout under the GP/CLUP, would still be expected to remain at LOS D under this reduced development alternative. Thus, no significant improvements in traffic operations at City intersections are expected to result from implementation of this lower density land use alternative.

**TABLE 5-3
INTERSECTION LOS—2030 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 1 (ALTERNATIVE 1)**

Map ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control	V/C, or Delay (s) ¹	LOS
1	C	Hollister Avenue/Calle Real	Unsignalized	7.7s	A
2	C	Hollister Avenue/Entrance Road	Signal	0.45	A
3	C	Hollister Avenue/Canon Green Drive	Signal	0.51	A
4	C	Hollister Avenue/Pacific Oaks Road	Signal	0.75	C
5	C	Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive	Signal	0.52	A
6	C	Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	Signal	0.84	D
7	C	Storke Road/Market Place Drive	Signal	0.69	B
8	C	Storke Road/Phelps Road	Signal	0.56	A
9	C	Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road	Signal	0.67	B
10	C	Glen Annie Road/Del Norte Drive	Unsignalized	9.7s	A
11	C	Glen Annie Road/Calle Real/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.72	C

(continued on next page)

TABLE 5-3 CONTINUED

Map ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control	V/C, or Delay (s) ¹	LOS
12	C	Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.51	A
13	C	Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue	Signal	0.47	A
14	C	Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road	Signal	0.62	B
15	C	Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road	Signal	0.72	C
16	C	Los Carneros Road/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.59	A
17	C	Los Carneros Road/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.50	A
18	C	Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Road	Signal	0.60	A
19	C	Los Carneros Road/Castilian Drive	Signal	0.67	B
20	C	Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.87	C
22	C	Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.50	A
24	C	Hollister Avenue/La Patera Lane	Signal	0.68	B
25	C	Cathedral Oaks/Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.58	A
26	C	Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road	Signal	0.61	B
27	C	Fairview Avenue/Encina Lane	Signal	0.45	A
28	C	Fairview Avenue/Calle Real	Signal	0.86	C
29	C	Fairview Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.69	B
30	C	Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.75	C
31	C	Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue	Signal	0.59	A
32	C	Hollister Avenue/Rutherford Street	Signal	0.62	B
33	C	Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive	Signal	0.38	A
35	C	Calle Real/Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.43	A
36	C	Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.84	C
37	C	Hollister Avenue/SR- 217 SB Ramp	Unsignalized	18.8s	C
38	C	Hollister Avenue/SR- 217 NB Ramp	Unsignalized	3.7s	A
42	C	Patterson Avenue/Rte. 101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.84	C
43	C	Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.84	C
44	C	Patterson Avenue/Overpass Road	Signal	0.61	B
45	C	Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue	Signal	0.84	C
51	C	Fairview Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.71	C
55	C	Ellwood Station Road/Calle Real	Signal	0.64	B
56	C	Hollister Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.46	A
57	C	Winchester Canyon Road/Calle Real	Unsignalized	10.4s	B
58	C	Fairview Avenue/Ekwill Street	Unsignalized	18.4s	C
59	C	Fairview Avenue/Fowler Street	Unsignalized	3.9s	A
60	C	Ekwill Street/Pine Street	Unsignalized	3.9s	A
61	C	Ekwill Street/Kellogg Street	Unsignalized	12.9s	B
65	C	Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.43	A
67	C	Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	Signal	0.39	A
68	C	La Patera/Calle Real	Signal	0.78	C
69	C	La Patera/Cathedral Oaks	Unsignalized	11.9s	B
70	C	Hollister Avenue/Ellwood Station	Signal	0.71	C

¹Data are expressed as V/C ratios for signalized intersections and as seconds of delay (s) for unsignalized intersections.
Source: Dowling and Associates 2005

5.4.13.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2)

This analysis projects 2030 PM peak hour traffic conditions for Reduced Development Scenario 2 assuming construction of the recommended infrastructure improvements identified in the GP/CLUP. The land use defined for this alternative is of lower density than Alternative 1 discussed above.

Figure 3.13-6 shows areas where proposed land uses under Alternative 2 differ from those identified in the GP/CLUP.

Table 5-4 summarizes the PM peak hour intersection LOS projected under this alternative. The table shows that some minor improvements to LOS over conditions projected for the GP/CLUP at 2030 would occur at some locations. However, the Storke/Hollister intersection, expected to operate at LOS D at buildout under the GP/CLUP, would still be expected to operate at LOS D under this alternative. Thus, no significant improvements to intersection operations within the City beyond those anticipated under implementation of the GP/CLUP are expected to result from implementation of this even lower density land use alternative.

**TABLE 5-4
INTERSECTION LOS—2030 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO 2 (ALTERNATIVE 2)**

Map ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control	V/C, or Delay (s) ¹	LOS
1	C	Hollister Avenue/Calle Real	Unsignalized	7.7s	A
2	C	Hollister Avenue/Entrance Road	Signal	0.45	A
3	C	Hollister Avenue/Canon Green Drive	Signal	0.51	A
4	C	Hollister Avenue/Pacific Oaks Road	Signal	0.74	C
5	C	Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive	Signal	0.51	A
6	C	Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	Signal	0.84	D
7	C	Storke Road/Market Place Drive	Signal	0.69	B
8	C	Storke Road/Phelps Road	Signal	0.56	A
9	C	Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road	Signal	0.66	B
10	C	Glen Annie Road/Del Norte Drive	Unsignalized	9.7s	A
11	C	Glen Annie Road/Calle Real/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.72	C
12	C	Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.51	A
13	C	Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue	Signal	0.48	A
14	C	Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road	Signal	0.61	B
15	C	Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road	Signal	0.71	C
16	C	Los Carneros Road/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.57	A
17	C	Los Carneros Road/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.50	A
18	C	Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Road	Signal	0.59	A
19	C	Los Carneros Road/Castilian Drive	Signal	0.67	B
20	C	Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.86	B
22	C	Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.49	A
24	C	Hollister Avenue/La Patera Lane	Signal	0.67	B
25	C	Cathedral Oaks/Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.57	A
26	C	Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road	Signal	0.60	A

(continued on next page)

TABLE 5-4 CONTINUED

Map ID	LOS Standard	Intersection Location	Traffic Control	V/C, or Delay (s) ¹	LOS
27	C	Fairview Avenue/Encina Lane	Signal	0.45	A
28	C	Fairview Avenue/Calle Real	Signal	0.85	C
29	C	Fairview Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.68	B
30	C	Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue	Signal	0.75	C
31	C	Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue	Signal	0.59	A
32	C	Hollister Avenue/Rutherford Street	Signal	0.62	B
33	C	Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive	Signal	0.38	A
35	C	Calle Real/Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.43	A
36	C	Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue	Signal	0.83	C
37	C	Hollister Avenue/SR- 217 SB Ramp	Unsignalized	20.0s	C
38	C	Hollister Avenue/SR- 217 NB Ramp	Unsignalized	3.8s	A
42	C	Patterson Avenue/Rte. 101 NB Ramp	Signal	0.83	C
43	C	Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.83	C
44	C	Patterson Avenue/Overpass Road	Signal	0.61	B
45	C	Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue	Signal	0.83	C
51	C	Fairview Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.70	B
55	C	Ellwood Station Road/Calle Real	Signal	0.60	A
56	C	Hollister Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp	Signal	0.46	A
57	C	Winchester Canyon Road/Calle Real	Unsignalized	10.3s	B
58	C	Fairview Avenue/Ekwill Street	Unsignalized	18.0s	C
59	C	Fairview Avenue/Fowler Street	Unsignalized	3.9s	A
60	C	Ekwill Street/Pine Street	Unsignalized	3.9s	A
61	C	Ekwill Street/Kellogg Street	Unsignalized	12.9s	B
65	C	Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Avenue	Signal	0.42	A
67	C	Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	Signal	0.38	A
68	C	La Patera/Calle Real	Signal	0.76	C
69	C	La Patera/Cathedral Oaks	Unsignalized	11.8s	B
70	C	Hollister Avenue/Ellwood Station	Signal	0.71	C

¹Data are expressed as V/C ratios for signalized intersections and as seconds of delay (s) for unsignalized intersections.
Source: Dowling and Associates 2005

Recommended Policy Revision to LOS Standard

For the Storke/Hollister intersection that fails to perform at the LOS C standard with all planned transportation improvements, it is recommended that it instead be subject a standard of LOS D as discussed in the Transportation section of this EIR.

While implementation this policy is expected to result in all intersections meeting adopted LOS standards through 2030, traffic impacts resulting from implementation of any of these alternatives at Storke/Hollister would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Of the alternatives evaluated, the No Project (existing conditions) alternative has by far the fewest impacts. Therefore, it can be considered environmentally superior to any alternative that proposes to change existing conditions. However, CEQA requires that if the environmentally

superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative from those that meet project objectives. Based on the analysis in this EIR, the Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2) would be the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project.

CHAPTER 5.0 1

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT 1

5.1 INTRODUCTION 1

5.1.1 Introduction..... 1

5.1.2 Rationale for Selecting the Alternatives 1

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED..... 1

5.2.1 Environmental Vitality Alternative..... 2

5.2.2 Economic Stability Alternative..... 2

5.2.3 Economic Center Alternative..... 2

5.2.4 Housing Needs Alternative 3

5.3 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE EIR 3

5.3.1 No Project Alternative 3

5.3.2 Reduced Development Scenario 1 (Alternative 1) 4

5.3.3 Reduced Development Scenario 2 (Alternative 2) 4

5.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACT SUMMARY..... 4

5.4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources 4

5.4.2 Agriculture and Farmland 5

5.4.3 Air Quality 6

5.4.4 Biological Resources 8

5.4.5 Cultural Resources 8

5.4.6 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources 9

5.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 10

5.4.8 Population and Housing..... 12

5.4.9 Water Resources 13

5.4.10 Land Use and Recreation 14

5.4.11 Noise 15

5.4.12 Public Services and Utilities 16

5.4.13 Transportation and Circulation 16

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE 22

Acronyms

Discussion Draft General Plan (Discussion Draft 1

Draft General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP 1

Santa Barbara County 2004 Clean Air Plan (CAP 7

State Implementation Plan (SIP **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Department of Transportation (DOT 10

Citations

Dowling and Associates 2006..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Dowling and Associates 2006..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Tables

TABLE 5-1 3

Table 5-2 Intersection LOS 2030 No Project Alternative—Existing Transportation Network
17

Table 5-3 Intersection LOS—2030 Reduced development scenario 1 (Alternative 1) 19

Table 5-4 Intersection LOS—2030 reduced development scenario 2 (Alternative 2)..... 21

Figures

Figure 3.13-5..... 19

Figure 3.13-6..... 21

Miscellaneous

Error! No table of figures entries found.

Glossary

Error! No table of figures entries found.