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CHAPTER 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CHAPTER 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

On October 11, 2005, Shelby Family Partnership LP (Shelby) submitted an application to the City of Goleta (City) for a residential development on a 14.38-acre property located at 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road (Shelby property). This property currently has a land use designation of Agriculture under the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP). The application requests (1) a zoning ordinance text amendment, zone change, vesting tentative map, and development plan for a residential project; (2) an amendment to the GP/CLUP Conservation Element Policy CE 11.2 to allow the conversion of agricultural lands as designated on the Land Use Plan Map (Land Use Element Figure 2-1) to other uses so long as the process for such conversion is consistent with the Goleta Agricultural Land Preservation Initiative (Initiative); (3) a land use designation change in the Land Use Plan Map (Land Use Element Figure 2-1) for the Shelby property from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential; and (4) removal of the Shelby property from the Open Space Plan (Open Space Element Figure 2-3) (collectively referred to as “the Application”).

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) will only analyze the third and fourth requests of the Application (hereinafter “GPA”) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000 et seq.). The environmental impacts of the first request will be reviewed in a separate environmental impact report (EIR). The second request is a ministerial act and is exempt from CEQA because it conforms the GP/CLUP with the provisions of the Initiative (Pub. Resources Code § 21080, subd. (b)(1); CEQA Guidelines § 15268).

In 2012, voters in the City passed the Initiative, also known as Measure G, which, in relevant part, states that prior to December 31, 2032, any change to the land use designation of heritage farmlands or to the existing and proposed General Plan language adopted by the Initiative would be effective only if approved by the voters of the City. The Initiative defines “heritage farmlands,” in relevant part, as “lands within the City having a land use designation of ‘Agriculture’ and which are 10 or more acres in size.” In addition, the Initiative exempts from the voter approval requirement any development project or ongoing activity that has obtained, as of the effective date of the initiative, a vested right pursuant to state law.

The Subdivision Map Act (Gov. Code, § 66410 et seq.) confers a vested right to applications for a tentative map. It states, in relevant part, “[I]n determining whether to approve or disapprove an application for a tentative map, the local agency shall apply only those ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the local agency has determined the application is complete pursuant to section 65943 of the Government Code.” (Gov. Code, § 66474.2.) Section 65943 of the Government Code requires public agencies to determine in writing whether an application for a development project is complete within 30 calendar days after receipt of the application. (Gov. Code, § 65943.)

The Initiative was passed and became effective on November 6, 2012. The Application was deemed complete by the City on March 14, 2011, more than a year before the effective date of the Initiative. Therefore, the Application is exempt from the Initiative.
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE SEIR

The CEQA lead agency for this SEIR is the City. A SEIR was chosen for this project following conditions and definitions in CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15163.

This SEIR provides analysis of only the impacts related to implementation of the GPA. A separate project-specific EIR for the first request of the Application, known as the Shelby Residential Project (City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; Shelby Project EIR), has been prepared at the same time as and in coordination with this SEIR. Decision-makers will consider the SEIR before taking action on the proposed GPA.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this SEIR, including an SEIR scoping document, was circulated for review and comment by the public, agencies, and organizations as required under CEQA. The NOP and comments received on the NOP are provided in Appendix A. The NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse at the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to officially solicit statewide agency input on the project. A public notice for the NOP was published in the Santa Barbara News Press on July 26, 2012 to solicit comments. The 30-day public review period for the NOP began on July 23, 2012 and ended on August 23, 2012. A separate NOP for the Shelby Project EIR was circulated for public review and comment between July 23, 2012 and September 6, 2012.

A total of 25 comments were received in response to the NOPs for the Shelby GPA SEIR and the Shelby Project EIR, including 13 unique letters for this Shelby GPA SEIR. This SEIR has taken into consideration all of the comments received in response to the NOP, including comments received during a public scoping meeting on August 8, 2012. The project to be analyzed for the SEIR originally included an amendment to the language of GP/CLUP Policy CE 11.2, as well as changes to the Land Use Plan Map and Open Space Map for the Shelby property (see Appendix A for additional information). Since the publication of the NOP, the scope of the project being analyzed in this SEIR has been narrowed to encompass only the changes to the Land Use Plan Map and Open Space Map for the Shelby property (see Section 1.3.2, below).

Pursuant to CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, this Draft SEIR is being circulated for public review for a period of at least 45 days. This Draft SEIR is available for general public review at the Goleta Public Library and at the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review office, and will also be posted online at the City of Goleta’s website, www.cityofgoleta.org/. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on this Draft SEIR during the 45-day comment period to the City at the following address:

Mr. Shine Ling, Associate Planner
City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Review Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117
sling@cityofgoleta.org

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City will review and prepare written responses to each comment as required by CEQA and CEQA Guidelines. A Final SEIR will then be prepared, incorporating all of the comments received, responses to the comments. All responses to comments will be provided to public agencies at least 10 days before final action on the GPA. In addition, all persons who commented on the Draft SEIR will be notified of the
availability of the Final SEIR and of the dates of all applicable public hearings concerning the Final SEIR. The Final SEIR will then be presented to the City for certification.

Public input is encouraged at all public hearings concerning the proposed GPA.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.3.1 Objectives

As summarized in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the fundamental objectives of the GP/CLUP are to:

1. Ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community’s cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources.
2. Provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for the current and future residents.
3. Maintain adequate service standards, including levels of service (LOS) on area highways.
4. Enable income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs.

These objectives are retained as part of this SEIR. In addition, Shelby’s objective for the GPA is to:

1. Develop a residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families.

1.3.2 GP/CLUP Amendments Subject to Environmental Review

The GPA proposes the following:

1. Change the Agriculture land use designation on the Shelby property to Single-Family Residential on the Land Use Element, Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1 of the GP/CLUP); and
2. Remove the Shelby property from the Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map (Figure 3-5 of the GP/CLUP).

1.4 STRUCTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This executive summary summarizes the project description and conclusions of the impact analyses provided in this SEIR. Chapter 2, “Project Description,” provides a detailed description of the project evaluated in the SEIR. Chapter 3, “Related Projects,” includes a list of pending and approved projects in the project vicinity, which is used, where applicable, in the environmental issue area evaluations of cumulative impacts.

Chapter 4, “Environmental Impact Analysis,” addresses the GPA’s effect on the impacts and mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. It provides an analysis of the maximum potential development that could occur with the proposed land use designation.

Chapter 5 describes alternatives to the GPA and the extent to which each alternative would reduce and/or avoid the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the GPA. Chapter 6 identifies growth-inducing impacts and significant irreversible environmental changes resulting from implementation of the GPA. Chapter 7 lists the EIR preparers, contacts, and references used in preparation of the EIR.
1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

1.5.1 Impacts of the GPA

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following environmental areas that could potentially be significantly impacted from the implementation of the GP/CLUP:

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- agriculture and farmland;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- noise; and
- transportation and circulation.

The GPA would result in incremental increases to the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the GP/CLUP in these environmental areas (Class I impacts):

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- noise; and
- transportation and circulation.

The incremental increase in agriculture and farmland impacts can be eliminated with the implementation of a new mitigation measure. The aesthetics and visual resources impacts and noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

In addition, the GP/CLUP Final EIR identified other environmental areas with potentially significant impacts that could be reduced with mitigation measures or policies from the GP/CLUP to a less-than-significant level (Class II impacts). These areas include:

- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural resources;
- geology, soils, and mineral resources;
- land use and recreation.
- population and housing;
- public services and utilities;
- transportation and circulation; and
- water resources.

The GPA would result in incremental increases to these Class II impacts. The same mitigation measures and GP/CLUP policies that were identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR to reduce these Class II impacts to a less-than-significant level would also reduce the GPA’s impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would not change the classification of these impacts as Class II impacts.
Sections 4.1 through 4.13 provide a detailed discussion of the environmental setting of the GPA, the impacts that would result from the GPA, and mitigation measures and GP/CLUP policies that would reduce those impacts. A summary of the impacts, mitigation measures and GP/CLUP policies, and residual impacts is found in Table ES-1.

1.5.2 Cumulative Impacts

The GPA would result in incremental increases to cumulative impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR for the following environmental areas:

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural resources;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- land use and recreation;
- noise;
- population and housing;
- public services and utilities; and
- transportation and circulation.

With mitigation measures and policies identified in the GP/CLUP, the cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of the GPA for the environmental areas listed below would still be reduced to a less-than-significant level despite the GPA’s incremental increases to these impacts:

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- biological resources;
- cultural resources;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- land use and recreation;
- population and housing; and
- public services and utilities.

The remaining impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. A detailed discussion of the cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of the GPA is found in Sections 4.1 through 4.13.

Table 1-1 summarizes the potential environmental impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, as well as mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce these impacts, plus whether these impacts would occur with the implementation of the GPA. For a more detailed discussion of project impacts and mitigation measures, please refer to the individual issue area sections of this SEIR. As stated above, Table 1-1 categorizes project impacts by impact classification (Class I, II, or III) and then by environmental issue.
# TABLE 1-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 4: Design Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 3: Community Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 4: Design Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-3. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 4: Design Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-4. Impacts from Light and Glare</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Policy VH 4: Design Review</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 4.12: Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>III Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-5. Improvements to Visual Quality of City Gateways</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA decrease impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-6. Creating Well Defined Public Spaces</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA decrease impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-1. Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-2. Incompatible Land Uses and Structures</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-3. Preservation of Agricultural Land</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA decrease impact? Yes</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2.4. Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.3-1. Construction Emissions</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Implementation of SBCAPCD-recommended techniques:</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance with SBCAPCD Rule 1001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated “clean” diesel engines) should be utilized wherever feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The engine size of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be the minimum practical size.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The amount of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient construction management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturer’s specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction equipment operating on site shall be equipped with two or four degree engine timing retard or precombustion chamber engines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All diesel-powered equipment shall use ultra low sulfur diesel fuel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters, as certified and/or verified by EPA or California, shall be installed, if available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading should be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction worker’s trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems should be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gravel pads must be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area should be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prior to land clearance, the applicant shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with map, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.3-2, GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Consistent with the Clean Air Plan</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact 3.3-3. The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled is Greater Than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area

**With GPA:**
- Does GPA increase impact? Yes
- Class: III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same, except GP/CLUP Policies LU 10, SE 8, SE 9, and PF 8 would not be applicable to the GPA.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.3-4. Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout

**With GPA:**
- Does GPA increase impact? Yes
- Class: III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOx Emissions

**With GPA:**
- Does GPA increase impact? Yes
- Class: I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Cumulatively Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.3-6. Cumulative PM_{10} Emissions

**With GPA:**
- Does GPA increase impact? Yes
- Class: III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of City Grading Ordinance and SBCAPCD dust-control measures</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy List
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management
- Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation)
- Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation
- Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation
- Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan
- Policy TE 12: Transportation Systems Management
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
- Policy TE 14: Financing Transportation Improvements
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

Adherence to the requirements of the State Implementation Plan and the provisions under the SBCAPCD’s Clean Air Plan.
## Chapter 1. Executive Summary

### Impact 3.3-7. Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With GPA:** Does GPA increase impact? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**With GPA:** Does GPA increase impact? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 2014
| Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats | II | Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy  
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands  
Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats  
Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality  
Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access  
Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline  
Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage  
Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways  
Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area  
Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan  
Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map  
Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies  
Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses  
Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites) | Less Than Significant |

| Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats | II | Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy  
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands  
Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats  
Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality  
Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area | Less Than Significant |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-4.</strong> Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see Impact 3.4-2</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-5.</strong> Harm to Listed Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special Status Species see also Impact 3.4-1 and 3.4-2</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-6.</strong> Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-5</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-7.</strong> Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-5</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-8.</strong> Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see Impacts 3.4-2, 3.4-3, and 3.4-4</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-9.</strong> Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see previous Impacts</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-10.</strong> Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>see previous Impacts</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-11.</strong> Impacts to Non-Special-Status Habitats and Species</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-12.</strong> Resources Not Affected by Maintenance/Management</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA decrease impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-13. Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Space Area</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA decrease impact? No</strong></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-14. Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-1. Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 5: Historic Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-2. Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 5: Historic Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-3. Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 5: Historic Resources&lt;br&gt;Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 1. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Development on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General&lt;br /&gt;Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-5. Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon</strong></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Policy SE 1.9: Reduction of Radon Hazards</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</strong></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS


April 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.12: Consultation with Pipeline Operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.13: Setbacks from Gas Pipelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.15: Pipeline Marking and Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.7-2: Transport</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.2: Consideration of Offshore Gas Processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.4: Enhanced Preparedness for Hydrogen Sulfide Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 10.2: Compliance with Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.1: Education and Awareness Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.2: Improved Information Transfer during Emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.4: Incorporation of Emergency Response Plans into GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 11.5: Monitoring of Trends and Improvements in Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.7-3: Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 10-3a: Oil and Gas Transport and Storage Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal | II    | Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards  
SE 8.3: Annual Safety Audits Required  
SE 8.6: Quantitative Risk Assessment  
SE 8.9: Safety Requirements for New Petroleum Pipelines  
SE 8.10: Safety, Inspection, and Maintenance of Oil and Gas Pipelines  
SE 8.14: Pipeline Burial Depths |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No     | II    | Same                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Less Than Significant |
| Impact 3.7-5. Airport                       | II    | Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards  
SE 9.1: Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone Regulations  
SE 9.2: Height Restrictions  
SE 9.3: Limitations on Development and Uses  
SE 9.4: Maintenance of an Airport Safety Corridor for Runway 7  
SE 9.5: Limitations on Density  
SE 9.6: Limitations on Residential Development  
SE 9.7: Real Estate Disclosure  
SE 9.8: Limitations on Hazardous Facilities |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No     | II    | Same                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Less Than Significant |
| Impact 3.7-6. Wildland Fires                | II    | Policy SE1: Safety in General  
SE 1.1: Maintenance of Maps and Resources on Hazards  
SE 1.2: Guidelines for Siting Highly Sensitive Uses and Critical Facilities  
SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies |
<p>| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No     | II    | Same                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Less Than Significant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1.4: Deed Restriction in Hazardous Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1.5: Subdivision of New Lots in Hazard Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1.6: Enforcement of Building Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1.7: Abatement of Public Safety Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1.8: Reduction of Non-Conforming or Substandard Structural Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.2: Review of New Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.3: Identification of Fire Hazard Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.4: Fuel Modification Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 7.6: Standards for Rebuilding in High Fire Hazard Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact 3.7-7: Surface Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.3: Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.4: Illegal Destruction of ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to EHSAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.8: ESHA Buffers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 1.10: Management of ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.1: Designation of Protected Creeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.2: Streamside Protection Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.3: Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.4: Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 2.6: Restoration of Degraded Creeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.1: Definition of Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.2: Designation of Wetland ESHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.4: Protection of Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.5: Wetland Buffer Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.6: Mitigation of Wetland Fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.7: Lagoon Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3.8: Vernal Pool Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.4: New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.5: Beachfront and Blufftop Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 10.3: Hazard Assessment Required for Hazardous Materials Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 10.4: Prohibition on New Facilities Posing Unacceptable Risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SE 10.2: Compliance with Law  
SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities  
SE 10.6: Responsibility for Cleanup by Responsible Party  
SE 10.7: Identification, Transport, and Disposition of Potentially Contaminated Soil (formerly MM 3.7-1) | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No | II | Same | Less Than Significant |
| **Impact 3.7-10. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines** | III | No mitigation is required | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No | III | Same | Less Than Significant |
| **Impact 3.7-11. Ellwood Facility** | III | Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No | III | Same | Less Than Significant |
| **Impact 3.7-12. EMFs** | III | No mitigation is required | |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No | III | Same | |
| **Impact 3.7-13. Upset and Accident Conditions** | III | No mitigation is required | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes | III | Same | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes | III | Same | Less Than Significant |

**LAND USE AND RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities** | II | Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses  
Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy  
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands  
Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas | Less Than Significant |
### Chapter 1. Executive Summary

**Impact 3.10-2.** Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

Does GPA increase impact? Yes

II | Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites | Less Than Significant |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 1. Executive Summary

**Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta’s RHNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas (GP/CP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas (CP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy VH 3: Community Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 9: Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong> Does GPA increase impact? Yes <strong>Impact 3.10-5.</strong> Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy VH 3: Community Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy VH 4: Design Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF 5: School Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong> Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Does GPA increase impact? No</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.10-7.</strong> Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses&lt;br&gt;Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 5: Historic Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 5: School Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

**Does GPA increase impact? Yes**

**Impact 3.10-8. Physical Division of an Established Community Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 1.2 Transportation and Land Use Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

**Does GPA increase impact? No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 1.2 Transportation and Land Use Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

**Does GPA increase impact? Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

**Does GPA increase impact? No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.11-3.</strong> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.11-4.</strong> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 4: Railway Noise&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.11.5.</strong> Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 5: Industrial and Other Point Sources&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.11-6.</strong> Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 3: Airport Noise&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.11-7.</strong> Cumulative Traffic Noise</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy NE 2: Traffic Noise Sources&lt;br&gt;Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.8-1.</strong> 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 Land within the City</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With GPA:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 1. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

- Does GPA increase impact? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.8-3. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,730 Residential Units to the City’s Housing Stock</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy HE 1: Equal Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta’s RHNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

- Does GPA increase impact? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With GPA:**

- Does GPA increase impact? Yes
### Chapter 1. Executive Summary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.8-5</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

#### Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.12-1</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.12-2</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.12-3</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.12-4</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 6: Utilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.12-5</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 5: School Facilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand on Library Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.12-6.</strong> Increased Demand on Library Facilities</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.12-7. Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.12-7.</strong> Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

## Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-1.</strong> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-2.</strong> Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-3. Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-3.</strong> Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-4. LOS under 2030 is expected to improve or remain unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-4.</strong> LOS under 2030 is expected to improve or remain unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA decrease impact? Yes</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-5. No Impacts To Air Traffic Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-5.</strong> No Impacts To Air Traffic Patterns</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA decrease impact? Yes</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-6. Increased Transit Ridership and Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-6.</strong> Increased Transit Ridership and Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA decrease impact? No</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Impact 3.13-7. No Impacts of the City of Goleta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.13-7.</strong> No Impacts of the City of Goleta</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA decrease impact? No</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Residual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants | II    | Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands  
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA:                                  |       | Does GPA increase impact? Yes                                                                          |                       |
Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs  
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality  
Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling  
Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities  
Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA:                                  |       | Does GPA increase impact? Yes                                                                          |                       |
| Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply from New Development               | II    | Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality  
Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling  
Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities | Less Than Significant |
| With GPA:                                  |       | Does GPA increase impact? Yes                                                                          |                       |
| Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion | II    | Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies  
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas  
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas  
Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats  
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality  
Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities  
Policy SE 1: Safety in General  
Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards  
Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character | Less Than Significant |
<p>| With GPA:                                  |       | Does GPA increase impact? Yes                                                                          |                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Policy SE 1: Safety in General&lt;br&gt;Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards&lt;br&gt;Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards&lt;br&gt;Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness&lt;br&gt;Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.9-8. Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding</strong></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With GPA: Does GPA increase impact? No</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas</td>
<td>Cumulatively Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With GPA:</th>
<th>Does GPA increase impact? No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Cumulatively Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 3.9-10. Cumulative Effects on Water Supply</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>GP/CLUP Policy and Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With GPA:</th>
<th>Does GPA increase impact? Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Cumulatively Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. The potential contribution to GHG emissions from GP/CLUP implementation were analyzed in the 2009 Supplemental EIR to the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
1.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following alternatives were selected for analysis in this SEIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Site Conversion Alternative
- Alternative 3: Girsh/Westen Alternative Site

1.6.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e) is “the existing conditions at the time of the notice of preparation is published...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” Existing conditions at the project site are described in each of the impact analyses in Chapter 4, “Environmental Setting and Impact Analysis.”

In this case, if the GPA is not approved, the Land Use Map change for the Shelby property would not occur, and the site would continue to be designated Agriculture in the GP/CLUP Land Use Element. Also, the Open Space Plan Map would not be changed and the site would continue to be identified as Open Space in the GP/CLUP Open Space Element. This scenario is part of the projected buildout of the GP/CLUP as currently adopted and is the “No Project Alternative.”

Under the No Project Alternative, only agricultural uses and ancillary residential uses (e.g., one dwelling unit for the entire Shelby property) as allowed by the Agriculture designation would be allowed. The Shelby property could not be developed for residential uses, other than for ancillary residential uses. The incremental increases to the GP/CLUP impacts associated with the GPA would not occur.

1.6.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Site Conversion Alternative

Alternative 2 would modify the GPA by minimizing the area of the Shelby property that would be converted. The land use designation on only a portion of the Shelby property would be changed to a residential use designation; the remaining portion would continue to be designated as Agriculture. To meet the project objective of developing a residential neighborhood for 60 families, a multi-family unit type would be required in order to accommodate the same number of units over a smaller area on the Shelby property. This would potentially reduce the area developed on the Shelby property by approximately 40%.

The incremental increases to GP/CLUP impacts identified for the proposed project would also occur under Alternative 2, which would still result in the development of vacant land not contemplated in the current GP/CLUP.

1.6.3 Alternative 3: Girsh/Westen Alternative Site

The Girsh/Westen site is located in the 7100 block of Hollister Avenue, west of Santa Felicia Drive. It is comprised of three parcels totaling approximately 10 acres in area (APN 073-003-005, -006, and -009). A church is located on the westernmost parcel; the remainder of the Girsh/Westen site is vacant. The site has a land use designation of Medium Density Residential
(R-MD) for its northern half and General Commercial (G-C) for its southern half. For the purposes of this analysis, the entire site would be developed for a 60-unit residential project.

Under Alternative 3, the Girsh/Westen site would be developed instead of the Shelby property. This alternative would still meet the project’s objective of developing a residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families. The Shelby property would continue to have a GP/CLUP land use designation of Agriculture, and would continue to be designated as open space in the Open Space Element of the GP/CLUP.

As the Girsh/Westen site is designated for residential and commercial development in the current GP/CLUP, the impacts of future development on this site were taken into account in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the incremental increases to GP/CLUP Final EIR impacts that were identified for the proposed project would not occur under Alternative 3.

**1.6.4  Additional Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration**

Other alternative sites for developing a project similar to the proposed project were considered but determined to be infeasible. Of the remaining vacant sites within the City that could accommodate development of similar scale to the proposed project, some are currently designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP and others have a non-agricultural land use designation. Development on vacant sites with an Agricultural designation would result in losses of agricultural lands that are larger or more severe than compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the development of one of these sites would not result in a reduction of impacts as compared to the proposed project.

The remaining vacant sites with non-agricultural designations all have pending applications for development with the City, and therefore were not further considered for analysis as alternatives to the proposed project.

**1.6.5  Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Based on this alternatives analysis, Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would be the environmentally superior alternative. Under Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, no lands designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP would be converted. The GPA’s incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would not occur.

CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(2) requires that if the No Project Alternative is found to be the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Of the two remaining alternatives, Alternative 3, the Girsh/Westen Alternative Site, would be the environmentally superior alternative. Under Alternative 2, Reduced Site Conversion Alternative, the incremental increases to GP/CLUP Final EIR impacts similar to those for the GPA would also occur. Under Alternative 3, no incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would occur.

**1.7  MINISTERIAL GP/CLUP AMENDMENT TO INCORPORATE CHANGES REQUIRED BY INITIATIVE**

*Original text in adopted GP/CLUP:*

**CE 11.2 Conversion of Agricultural Lands. [GP/CP] Conversion of agricultural lands designated on the Land Use Map (Figure 2-1) to other uses**
shall not be allowed. Lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary shall be preserved for agricultural use.

**Shelby’s proposed text:**

**CE 11.2 Conversion of Agricultural Lands. [GP/CP]** Conversion of agricultural lands designated on the Land use Map (Figure 2-1) to other uses shall only be processed consistent with Policy LU 7.5 (Goleta Agricultural Land Preservation Initiative). Lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary shall be preserved for agricultural use.

This proposed amendment to Policy CE 11.2 is necessary to make it consistent with the Initiative.

### 1.8 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

#### 1.8.1 Areas of Controversy

The primary areas/issues of controversy are associated with the GPA’s potential to reduce land designated as Agriculture within the City. Other issues relate to the population growth that would occur with the implementation of the GPA.

#### 1.8.2 Issues to be Resolved

CEQA Guidelines § 15123(b)(3) requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved. The major issues yet to be resolved by the Lead Agency include:

- Whether the Lead Agency will approve the GPA, based on this Supplemental EIR and public comments.

- Impacts related to development of the Shelby property, which would be addressed in site-specific CEQA analysis and documentation (the Shelby Project EIR).
CHAPTER 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

California state planning law, at Government Code §§ 65300 et seq., requires that cities and counties adopt a general plan as a guide to their physical development. The role of the general plan is to act as the City’s constitution for the physical use of resources, to express the community’s preservation and development goals, and to establish public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The City adopted its General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP, or Plan) in October 2006. The GP/CLUP is the primary means for guiding future changes in Goleta. Through the GP/CLUP, the City addresses decisions about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility/preservation, public facilities/services, and transportation. Prior to the adoption of the GP/CLUP, the City, acting as the lead agency, determined that the proposed GP/CLUP could result in significant adverse environmental effects, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.; CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000 et seq.). Therefore, the City required the preparation of a Program-Level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project, or implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The City released a draft GP/CLUP on May 20, 2006, and a draft EIR for the GP/CLUP was released on May 31, 2006 for public and agency comment. In response to public and agency comments, in October 2006, the City made revisions to both documents and adopted final versions of the GP/CLUP and EIR (2006 Final EIR).

2.1.1 City-Sponsored General Plan Amendments

Beginning in the summer of 2007, the City Council initiated the processing of a series of City-sponsored amendments to the GP/CLUP (General Plan Amendments), including Track 1, Housing Element Revisions; Track 2, Minor Revisions; Track 3, Substantive Revisions; Track 4, Project Specific Amendments; and Track 5, Sphere of Influence Revisions. Tracks 1, 2, and 4 were adopted by the City Council by resolution after adopting Addenda to the 2006 Final EIR.

For Track 3, a draft Supplemental EIR was prepared and released on January 29, 2009 to address potentially significant effects on the environment not discussed in the 2006 Final EIR. Following receipt of public comments, the Planning Commission gave direction for changes to be incorporated into the Track 3 revisions. These changes were determined to be subject to CEQA, but because the additional environmental analysis required only minor technical changes or additions to the draft Supplemental EIR, an Addendum to the Supplemental EIR was prepared. The Track 3 Supplemental EIR and Addendum were certified and the Track 3 Substantive Revisions were adopted on November 17, 2009 (2009 Supplemental EIR).

For Track 5, the City applied to the Santa Barbara County Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) to establish a Sphere of Influence for the City. On March 5, 2009, LAFCO established the City’s Sphere of Influence to be coterminal with the City’s existing boundaries, excluding any unincorporated areas bordering the City. No environmental review was required for the establishment of the Sphere of Influence.
2.1.2 Applicant-Initiated General Plan Amendments

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP, there have also been two applicant-initiated GP/CLUP amendments resulting in the preparation of and certification of an Addendum and an EIR. Case No. 03-050-GPA for the Villages at Los Carneros Project amended Policy CE 10.3 regarding stormwater runoff control and was adopted on February 19, 2008; this amendment was analyzed in the EIR for the Village at Los Carneros Project (City EIR 05-EIR-003). Case No. 07-102-GPA for the Haskell’s Landing Project amended Policy CE 2.2 regarding streamside protection areas and Policy HE 11.5 regarding inclusionary housing requirements. This amendment was adopted on May 19, 2009 based on an Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR.

The 2006 Final EIR, 2009 Supplemental EIR, and Addenda adopted to date are hereby collectively referred to as the “GP/CLUP Final EIR.”

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND

On October 11, 2005, Shelby Family Partnership LP (Shelby) submitted an application to the City for a residential development on a 14.38-acre property located at 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road (Shelby property). (Figure 2-1) The Shelby property currently has a land use designation of Agriculture under the GP/CLUP (Figure 2-2). The application included a request for approval of several amendments to the GP/CLUP that, among other things, would allow for the conversion of the property from the Agriculture land use designation to a non-agricultural land use designation that would allow residential development. The City Council initiated processing of the requested amendments to the GP/CLUP by Shelby on February 19, 2008.

2.3 OBJECTIVES

As summarized in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the fundamental objectives of the GP/CLUP are to:

1. Ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community’s cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources.
2. Provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for the current and future residents.
3. Maintain adequate service standards, including levels of service (LOS) on area highways.
4. Enable income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs.

These objectives are retained as part of this Supplemental EIR. In addition, Shelby’s objectives for the GPA are to:

1. Develop a residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families.

2.4 GENERAL PLAN / COASTAL LAND USE PLAN COMPONENTS

The GP/CLUP contains nine elements, including:

- Land Use
- Open Space
- Conservation
- Safety
- Visual and Historical Resources
2.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As discussed in Chapter 1 “Executive Summary,” this SEIR will only analyze the environmental effects of (1) a land use designation change in the Land Use Plan Map (Land Use Element Figure 2-1) for the Shelby property from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential; and (2) a removal of the Shelby property from the Open Space Plan Map (Open Space Element Figure 2-3).

2.5.1 Land Use Element, Land Use Plan Map

The Shelby property is shown on the current Land Use Plan Map, Figure 2-1 in the Land Use Element of the GP/CLUP, with an existing land use designation of Agriculture (see Figure 2-2 of this document). Shelby proposes to change the land use designation on the Shelby property (APN 077-530-019) to Single-Family Residential, which would allow development of a single-family residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families.

2.5.2 Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map

The Shelby property is designated as Agriculture on the Open Space Plan Map, Figure 3-5, in the Open Space Element of the GP/CLUP (see Figure 2-3 of this SEIR). The Agriculture designation on the Open Space Plan Map is characterized as “Open Space for Managed Production of Resources.” Shelby proposes to remove the Shelby property from the Open Space Plan Map.

2.6 ASSOCIATED PROJECT EIR

The GPA’s environmental impacts can be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR to the GP/CLUP Final EIR because only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the GP/CLUP Final EIR apply to the GPA (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15163). The environmental impacts of the residential development requested on the Shelby property are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR (“Shelby Project EIR”; City EIR No. 12-EIR-005). The Shelby Project EIR was prepared at the same time and in coordination with this SEIR.
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CEQA Guidelines § 15130 requires EIRs to discuss cumulative impacts when the project’s incremental effects are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, current projects, and probable future projects. It further states that this discussion shall reflect the severity of the impacts and likelihood of occurrence, but not in as great a level of detail as is necessary for the impacts of the project alone. CEQA Guidelines § 15355 defines cumulative impacts to be “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”

CEQA Guidelines § 15130(b)(1) states that the information from one of the following two sources is necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

a. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or

b. A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program. Any such document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

The cumulative impact analysis contained in this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) uses a combination of both methods a. and b. Table 3-1 lists a summary of the local and regional planning documents evaluated to determine the conditions contributing to cumulative effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Issue Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Plan (all Elements) and EIR</td>
<td>All issue areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara Airport Facilities Plan</td>
<td>Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta Greenhouse Gas Inventory</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan and 2012 Draft Update</td>
<td>Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Clean Air Plan</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta Storm Water Management Plan</td>
<td>Biology, Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara Airport and Goleta Slough Local Coastal Program</td>
<td>Biology, Hydrology, Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>Biology, Hydrology, Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin</td>
<td>Biology, Hydrology, Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Water District: Groundwater Management Plan</td>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Water Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County Source Reduction and Recycling Element</td>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 CITY OF GOLETA

The list of past, present, and probable future projects within the City of Goleta producing related or cumulative impacts is presented in Table 3-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size / Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell’s Landing (The Hideaway) 07-102-GP, -TM, -DP</td>
<td>079-210-049 Hollister Avenue &amp; Las Armas Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>14.23 acres 101 residential units</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital 07-171-OA, -DP</td>
<td>065-090-022 606-090-028 351 S. Patterson at Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>18.38 acres Hospital: 93,090 SF Existing: 152,658 SF Approved: 59,568 SF net new</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo Business Park 37-SB-DP 08-107-DP AM</td>
<td>073-450-005 6767 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>91.4 acres Business Park: new structures total 683,100 SF (R&amp;D, self storage, service uses; 241,682 SF existing; 934,782 SF total)</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson LLA- related lots 99-LA-024; 77-SB-LLA</td>
<td>077-141-053 077-141-070 et al. Baker, Violet and Daffodil Lanes</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.23-0.26 each lot 13 units</td>
<td>Approved; 9 units completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westar 08-143-GPA, -VTM, -DP</td>
<td>073-030-020; -021 Hollister Ave N/E corner of Glen Annie Rd and Hollister</td>
<td>Residential / Commercial</td>
<td>23.55 acres 279 residential units 90,054 SF retail</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIR Addition to Cabrillo Business Park 12-028-DP AM</td>
<td>073-610-001; -002 6769/6775 Hollister Ave.</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11.43 acres 11,827 SF (net new) office building addition (demo 4,348 SF; new building is 16,175 SF)</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Commercial Center 01-SB-DP; CUP</td>
<td>073-080-019 151 S. Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.8 acre 16,885 SF mixed use building (9,250 SF retail space, 6,110 SF office space and 2 units)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Village 04-226-TM, -DP</td>
<td>077-490-043 7388 Calle Real</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.02 acres 10 residential units</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Size / Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renco Encoders 07-103-DP</td>
<td>073-150-013 26 Coromar Drive</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3.57 acres Existing M-RP Bldg (33,600 SF); Add 8,800 SF manuf. Space; Add 10,400 SF office</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa at Ellwood Shores 07-217-DP</td>
<td>079-210-057 7760 Hollister Ave.</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.95 acres 62,481 SF Assisted Living (90 residents)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwann Self Storage 07-229-DP</td>
<td>071-090-082 10 S. Kellogg Ave.</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2.06 acres 111,730 SF self-storage facility</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVCH Medical Office Building Reconstruction 08-185-DP</td>
<td>065-090-023 5333 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.17 acres Medical Office Building Demo existing 41,224 SF; 52,000 SF proposed; 10,776 SF net new</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh and Easy Market 11-032-DP</td>
<td>069-110-018 5955 Calle Real</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1.98 acres 3,754 SF net new grocery market (demo 9,939 SF; new structure is 13,693 SF)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Real Marketplace Skating Facilities 95-DP-026 05-118-SCD</td>
<td>073-440-022 Santa Felicia Drive</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.8 acres 46,479 SF ice rink 17,000 SF roller rink</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Palms Hotel 11-083-DP RV</td>
<td>073-140-004 6868/6878 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3.05 acres 87,929 SF hotel; 138 rooms</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Society of SB 03-051-RZ; DP; CUP</td>
<td>077-160-035 N/E Corner of Los Carneros and Calle Real</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.59 acres 6,183 SF building for religious organization &amp; 1 caretaker unit</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somera Medical Office Building 12-091-DP</td>
<td>065-090-013 454 S. Patterson Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>8 acres 20,000 SF net new medical office building</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pending Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Parcel Map 03-053-PM</td>
<td>069-100-003 590 N. Kellogg Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.6 acres 3 new units</td>
<td>Pending (on hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby 05-154-GPA, -RZ, - VTM; -DP</td>
<td>077-530-019 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>13.92 acres 60 residential units</td>
<td>Pending (on hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Building 06-180-RZ; DP</td>
<td>077-160-040 S/E Corner of Los Carneros and Calle Real</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.53 acres 6,046 SF retail/medical office</td>
<td>Pending (on hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Village 08-205-GPA, -RZ, - VTM; -DP</td>
<td>077-130-006; -019; 077-141-049 Calle Real w/o Calaveras Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10 acres 60 residential units</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott Residence Inn 09-075-TPM, -DP and 09-079-DP AM</td>
<td>073-050-020 6300 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10.57 acres 80,989 SF hotel (118 rooms)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size / Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villages at Los Carneros I and II</td>
<td>073-330-024, -026, -027, -028, -029 Adjacent to 71 S. Los Carneros Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>43.14 acres Villages at Los Carneros I approved with 275 units on 16.11 acres; Proposed Villages at Los Carneros II to replace LC-I approval with 465 units on 43.14 acres</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortona Apts 09-140-DP</td>
<td>073-140-016 6830 Cortona Drive</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8.82 acres 176 residential units</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Store 11-125-GPA</td>
<td>073-070-034; -035; 073-330-030 6466 &amp; 3470 Hollister Avenue &amp; 170 Los Carneros Way</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11.35 acres 120,690 SF net new grocery market (demo 44,110 SF; new bldg is 164,800 SF)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Hill Ranch 12-086-RZ, -VTM</td>
<td>069-620-044 880 Cambridge Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4.73 acres Seven lot subdivision with net of 6 homes</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taco Bell 13-106-DPAM, -CUP</td>
<td>073-440-001, -002, -003, -012 7127 Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>9.31 acres 1,686 SF new restaurant building with drive-thru facility</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 The Shelby GPA is the “project” for this SEIR; the zone change, zoning ordinance text amendment, vesting tract map, and development plan comprise a separate project under CEQA and analyzed in the Shelby Project EIR (City EIR No. 12-EIR-005).

### 3.2 COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

The list of past, present, and probable future projects within the County of Santa Barbara producing related or cumulative impacts is presented in Table 3-3.

#### TABLE 3-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size / Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01CUP-00152; 09TEX-00004</td>
<td>300 Sumida Gardens Ln.</td>
<td>St. Athanasius Orthodox Church campus</td>
<td>26,921 SF</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08DVP-00040</td>
<td>870 Camino del Sur, Isla Vista</td>
<td>St. George: 56 apartments</td>
<td>56 units</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03DVP-00000-00041</td>
<td>Gaviota Coast, Dos Pueblos Canyon</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Ranch: 21 SFDs; 13,421 SF equestrian facilities &amp; 6,347 SF ag buildings</td>
<td>21 units +19,798 SF ag space</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08DVP-00008; VTM,14,755</td>
<td>Gaviota Coast, Dos Pueblos Canyon</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Ranch (Inland): 49 SFDs</td>
<td>49 units</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08DVP-00012</td>
<td>560 Merida Dr.</td>
<td>Cavaletto Noel Tree Farm: Demolition of 3 units &amp; construction of</td>
<td>132 units</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 3. Related Projects

#### 3.3 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA (UCSB)

Planning efforts associated with the University of California at Santa Barbara are outlined in the Vision 2025 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) that includes the following:

1. The LRDP details campus plans to the year 2025.
2. The LRDP anticipates a growth rate of 1 percent per year in student enrollment or roughly 250 students per year to a maximum enrollment of 25,000 in 2025.
3. The LRDP includes the development of housing needed to accommodate all additional students.
4. The LRDP, when fully implemented, anticipates providing housing for more than 1,600 faculty and staff members. Currently, the University provides 65 units of faculty housing.
5. The LRDP reflects the University’s commitment to environmental issues and includes numerous policies regarding green building, sustainability, coastal protection, and others.
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ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This chapter examines the environmental setting, evaluates the potential significant environmental impacts, and identifies appropriate mitigation measures for each environmental element discussed in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). The scope of this SEIR is based on the project description outlined in Chapter 2, as well as comments received during the scoping process, focusing on environmental issues that could result in potentially significant impacts. This chapter of the SEIR addresses two major components of the GPA.

This SEIR analyzes how impacts and mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would change if the GPA were adopted. To determine this, the GPA was evaluated in terms of two questions:

1. Does the GPA result in any increases to the severity of impacts previously identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR (e.g., from Class III to Class II or from Class II to Class I)?
2. Does the GPA have the potential to result in additional potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the potentially significant impact to an insignificant level?

In summary, the GPA would result in incremental increases to some of the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR but would not result in any new significant impacts. The GPA would not result in any new impacts that were not identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The environmental setting section describes the physical environmental conditions in the project area as they relate to the issue in question. CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a) states that “the environmental setting normally constitutes the baseline physical conditions by which the lead agency determines whether or not an impact is significant.” In most cases, the environmental setting for each resource area is the same as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Changes in the environmental setting since adoption of the GP/CLUP Final EIR are noted, where applicable.

4.2 CHANGES IN REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This section summarizes the applicable regulations, plans, and standards that apply to the GP/CLUP and relate to the specific issue area in question. In most cases, the regulatory framework for each resource area is the same as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Changes in federal, state, or local regulations since adoption of the GP/CLUP Final EIR are noted, where applicable.

4.3 PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This section discusses the thresholds of significance, the environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures that may be necessary to reduce environmental impacts, and the residual impacts following the implementation of recommended mitigation measures to be incorporated. It also contains a discussion of relevant GP/CLUP policies. The discussion presented in this SEIR will focus on changes in impact determinations associated with the GPA.
Thresholds of Significance. This section identifies the significance criteria, or where applicable, thresholds of significance, that will be used to evaluate the GP/CLUP’s impacts. The criterion or threshold for a given environmental effect is the level at which the City finds the effect to be significant.

Environmental Impact Analysis. The environmental analysis considers the potential impacts resulting from the GPA. Specifically, the analysis will examine whether the GPA:

- would increase impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR and whether the increase results in a change in classification of an impact (e.g. Class III to Class II or Class II to Class I) so as to require mitigation beyond that identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR; or
- would result in new impacts not identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR and whether the new impacts would require mitigation beyond that identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR;

While the criteria for determining the significance of impacts are unique to each issue area, the analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on the following definitions:

- A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- A less-than-significant impact would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact that is less than significant with mitigation incorporated avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A significant and unavoidable impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the above criteria, the environmental impact analysis assesses each issue area to determine the significance level. These impacts are categorized using the City’s guidance for classifying project-related impacts, as follows:

- Class I impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided. If the Shelby GPA SEIR is approved, decision makers are required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, explaining why project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by these significant environmental impact or impacts.
- Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies, or by other recommended mitigation. If the Shelby GPA SEIR is approved, decision makers are required to make findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091 that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the recommended mitigation measures.
- Class III impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant. These impacts do not require that CEQA findings be made.
- Class IV impacts include changes to the environment as a result of GP/CLUP and GPA implementation that would be beneficial.

Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures are identified for potential impacts related to buildout of the GP/CLUP and GPA that are considered significant based on the significance criteria or thresholds of significance. These measures would reduce or avoid each impact, as appropriate.
Residual Impacts. This section provides the final conclusion on the level of significance of the impact after all mitigation is considered and incorporated into the GP/CLUP.

Cumulative Impacts. This section summarizes the cumulative impacts of the GP/CLUP.
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4.4 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Section 3.1 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary and its immediate environs:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for aesthetics and visual resources relating to the buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with aesthetics and visual resources that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.4.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the descriptions of visual character, visual resources, and key public viewpoints.

4.4.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.4.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual


Based on the guidelines in the Thresholds Manual, a proposed project would result in a potentially significant visual impact if it would result in one or more of the following conditions:

1a. The project site has significant visual resources by virtue of surface waters, vegetation, elevation, slope, or other natural or man-made features which are publicly visible.

1b. The proposed project has the potential to degrade or significantly interfere with the public’s enjoyment of the site’s existing visual resources.

2a. The project has the potential to impact visual resources of the Coastal Zone or other visually important area (i.e., mountainous area, public park, urban fringe, or scenic travel corridor).

2b. The project has the potential to conflict with the policies set forth in the Local Coastal Plan, the General Plan or any applicable community plan to protect the identified views.

3. The project has the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact though obstruction of public views, incompatibility with surrounding uses, structures, or intensity
of development, removal of significant amounts of vegetation, loss of important open space, substantial alteration of natural character, lack of adequate landscaping, or extensive grading visible from public areas.

**CEQA Thresholds**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the following four circumstances that can lead to a determination that a project has a significant visual impact:

1. The project has a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
2. The project substantially damages scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within view of a state scenic highway.
3. The project substantially degrades the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
4. The project creates a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

**4.4.3.2 Project Impacts**

**Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to aesthetics and visual resources.

**Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City, Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways**

The GPA would not affect views along Hollister Avenue or at a City gateway. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-1 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

**Impact 3.1-2. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified four types of Class I impacts outlined below related to Citywide visual character. Policies VH 1 (Scenic Views), VH 3 (Community Character), and VH 4 (Design Review), were identified as methods to preserve overall community character in the City. The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that these would reduce impacts to visual character resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP, but not to a less-than-significant level. As discussed below, the GPA would incrementally add to some of the Class I impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

**Impact 3.1-2a. Impacts to the Visual Character of City Subareas**

The Shelby property is not located in a residential subarea identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR as being subject to Class I impacts related to commercial development that would be incompatible with existing residential uses (the Old Town and Northeast Community Center Subareas). Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-2a as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
Impact 3.1-2b. Impacts to the Visual Character of Natural Open Space and Agricultural Areas

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a Class I visual/aesthetics impact related to the potential conversion of 55.7 acres of agricultural lands to urban uses. The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified Policy VH 1, “Scenic Views,” as a measure to protect and preserve scenic resources, including agricultural areas, but ultimately concluded that a significant impact could still occur. The GPA would convert 13.9 acres of agricultural lands to urban uses, increasing the severity of this impact identified by the GP/CLUP Final EIR by approximately 25%. Policy VH 1 would limit but not reduce the severity of this impact. (Note: The City is currently evaluating the Shelby residential development in a project-specific EIR, which will address aesthetics and visual resources impacts related to loss of open space.)

Impact 3.1-2c. Impacts to the Visual Character of the Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a Class I visual/aesthetics impact related to potential conversion of vacant properties to urban uses. It did not identify the Shelby property as a vacant property because the Shelby property was designated as “Agriculture.”. However, the GP/CLUP Final EIR identified as a Class I impact for similar vacant parcels that were designated for urban uses because of the potential for development to adversely impact the visual character of views of the mountains and foothills. The GPA would increase the severity of this impact because residential development of the Shelby property would block views of the mountains and foothills. (Note: The City is currently evaluating the Shelby residential development in a project-specific EIR, which will address aesthetics and visual resources impacts related to views of the mountains and foothills.)

Impact 3.1-2d. Impacts to Views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road North of US-101, and Fairview Avenue

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a Class I visual/aesthetics impact related to development along Cathedral Oaks Road, a designated scenic corridor, and other scenic corridors. The Shelby property is located along Cathedral Oaks Road, and the GPA would increase impacts on the Cathedral Oaks scenic corridor. (Note: The City is currently evaluating the Shelby residential development in a project-specific EIR, which will address aesthetics and visual resources impacts related to scenic corridors.)

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to aesthetics and visual resources.

Impact 3.1-3. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Public Viewpoints

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified five types of Class II impacts discussed below related to scenic corridors and public viewpoints. Policies VH 1 (Scenic Views), VH 2 (Local Scenic Corridors), and VH 4 (Design Review) were identified as methods to preserve and enhance the visual character and public views within and from Goleta’s scenic corridors. The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that these policies would reduce impacts to visual character resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP to a less-than-significant level. As discussed below, the GPA would incrementally
add to the Class II impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, but not enough to result in an identified Class II impact to rise to a Class I impact.

*Impact 3.1-3a. Impacts to Views from US-101*

The Shelby property is not located on or near US-101 and is not visible from US-101; therefore the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-3a due to development of the Shelby property.

*Impact 3.1-3b. Impacts to Views from SR-217*

The Shelby property is not located on or near SR-217 and is not visible from SR-217; therefore the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-3b due to development of the Shelby property.

*Impact 3.1-3c. Impacts to Views from Public Viewing Areas within the City*

The Shelby property is not visible from the public view areas identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the GPA would not affect views from these public view areas and therefore would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-3c.

*Impact 3.1-3d. Impacts to Views from Areas within the Coastal Zone*

The Shelby property is not within the Coastal Zone and is not visible from areas within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-3d.

*Impact 3.1-3e. Light and Glare*

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts related to the increase of light and glare resulting from development of vacant land visible from US-101 and other areas. The Shelby property is not located on or near US-101; therefore the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.1-3e.

**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to aesthetics and visual resources.

*Impact 3.1-4. Impacts from Light and Glare*

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to the increase of light and glare visible from public view locations outside the City’s boundaries because the most intense development would be adjacent to urbanized uses. The Shelby property is near the City boundary, but there are no public view locations outside the City’s boundaries in this area. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase this impact but would not change the classification of this impact as Class III (less than significant). (Note: The City is currently evaluating the Shelby residential development in a project-specific EIR, which will address light and glare impacts.)
Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified Class IV (beneficial) impacts related to improvements to the visual quality at City Gateways and creation of well-defined public spaces. The GPA would not result in changes to the Class IV impacts.

4.4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact (Class III) to the visual character or quality of the City for the following reasons. Future development would continue to be guided by local General Plans and local design review procedures, which would continue to protect the visual character of the area represented by architectural features and elements, visual compatibility, view corridors, and scenic resources and vistas. Also, most development would occur on vacant or underutilized lands, which comprise approximately 6% of the land within City boundaries. Because implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in development of a minimal amount of vacant land, such development would result in a visual extension of existing residential neighborhoods and commercial areas, which would not pose a significant change to the overall visual character of the City. Similarly, the GPA would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to these cumulative impacts to visual character of the City because development on the Shelby property would also occur as an extension of existing urban neighborhood.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that the implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts (Class III) related to increased light and glare associated with development of vacant and underutilized land because most of this development would occur in areas that already have development and nighttime lighting. Also, new development would be subject to design review processes that would control the effects of new lighting. Similarly, the GPA would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to these cumulative impacts associated with light and glare because the changes would affect only properties already surrounded by urban uses and would be subject to similar design review processes.

4.4.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

4.4.3.5 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the GPA would increase significant visual character impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, including conversion of open space/agricultural land, views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and foothills, and views from scenic corridors. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

(Note: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”].)
4.5 AGRICULTURE AND FARM LAND

Section 3.2 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for agriculture and farmland relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with agriculture and farmland that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.5.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the descriptions of farmland in California, Santa Barbara County, and Goleta. The farmland description for the Shelby property is identified as “Site 2 (Couvillon)” by the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Located in northwestern Goleta and bordered by the Glen Annie Golf Course to the east and north, a drainage/riparian area to the west, and Cathedral Oaks Road to the south, this site was previously a large avocado orchard. The 13.9-acre agricultural property contains a house and several outbuildings and is not currently being farmed (fallow). The Shelby property is currently zoned AG-II-40 (Agriculture II, minimum lot size 40 acres).

Around 2006 when the GP/CLUP Final EIR was completed, the California Department of Conservation (DOC), described the property as 11.3 acres of Prime Farmland and 2.6 acres of Developed/Urban and Built-Up Land. Soils on the site include: 1.4 acres of Ayar Clay – Class VI (AhF2), 11.9 acres of Diablo Clay (2-9% slopes) – Class II (DaC), 0.5 acre of Diablo Clay (9-15% slopes) – Class III (DaD), and 0.1 acre of Gullied Land – Class VIII (GU).

Currently, the designation of Prime Farmland has been removed from this property and the entire site is now characterized as Urban and Built-up Land (California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland Finder, http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html, accessed April 11, 2004).

4.5.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations, except as supplemented below.

As discussed in Chapter 1 Executive Summary, the conversion of any lands designated as Agriculture and are 10 acres or more would be required to comply with the provisions of the Initiative. However, the GPA is exempt and, therefore, the Initiative does not apply. (See Chapter 1, Executive Summary.)

4.5.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.5.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

1 Although the GP/CLUP Final EIR identified “Site 1” as 13.9 acres, the actual size of the parcel is 14.38 acres.
City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2003) incorporates the significance thresholds of CEQA Appendix G, as discussed below.

CEQA Thresholds

As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to Agricultural Resources if it will:

- convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to nonagricultural use;
- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or
- involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

4.5.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to agriculture and farmland.

Impact 3.2-1. Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified that buildout of the GP/CLUP would convert 55.7 acres of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses. It also identified the conversion of approximately 6.5 acres of Prime Farmland and 22 acres of Unique Farmland, and the conversion of approximately 6 acres of Class I soils and 37 acres of Class II soils. The conversion of this agricultural land to nonagricultural uses was found to be a significant impact in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Since the GP/CLUP Final EIR’s certification in 2006, the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program maps published by the DOC have been revised, and the Shelby property is no longer designated as important farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance). As noted above in Section 4.2.1, “Existing Conditions,” the Shelby property is now classified as Urban and Built-up Land (Site 2, Couvillion/Shelby). Due to the DOC’s reclassification of the Shelby property, no additional Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance would be converted as a result of the GPA. Therefore, the GPA would not result in an increase in Impact 3.2-1.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to agriculture and farmland.
Impact 3.2-2. Incompatible Land Uses and Structures

The Shelby property is not adjacent to agricultural land uses or agricultural operations. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.2-2 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GPA would not affect Class III (less-than-significant) impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. The only Class III impacts identified were the impacts of construction activities on adjacent agricultural lands. The Shelby property is not adjacent to agricultural areas.

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

**Impact 3.2-3. Preservation of Agricultural Land**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that a Class IV (beneficial) impact would result from implementation of the GP/CLUP because the remaining existing agricultural lands within the City would be preserved as agricultural uses (approximately 353.1 acres). The GPA would allow 13.9 acres to be converted to nonagricultural uses, thereby reducing this beneficial impact by approximately 3.9%.

4.5.3.3 **Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact 3.2-4. Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a significant and unavoidable (Class I) contribution to cumulative impacts on agricultural resources because implementation would convert important farmland (defined as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as designated by the DOC) that was in active agricultural production. When combined with other development that is converting agricultural lands, the cumulative impact on agricultural land is significant. The conversion of the Shelby property as a result of the GPA would not increase the severity of Impact 3.2-4 because the Shelby property is not considered important farmland by the DOC.

4.5.3.4 **Mitigation**

**Modifications to General Plan Policies**

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

4.5.3.5 **Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the GPA would not increase significant impacts to agriculture and farmlands identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Impact 3.2-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.
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4.6 AIR QUALITY

Section 3.3 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for air quality relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with air quality that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

In addition, this section describes the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation measures associated with greenhouse gas emissions.

Because of the changes in the air quality existing conditions and regulatory requirements since the GP/CLUP Final EIR, and the additional requirement under CEQA to address greenhouse gas emissions, this section has been updated to reflect the changes.

4.6.1 Existing Conditions

4.6.1.1 Air Quality

This section provides an overview of air quality regulations, existing air quality, and meteorology for the Goleta area. The City of Goleta planning area lies within the South Central Coast Air Basin (Air Basin), which encompasses all of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties. The analysis of existing conditions discusses the environmental setting within the County of Santa Barbara, which also includes the City of Goleta. The majority of the information in this section was obtained from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2011).

Climate and Meteorology

The climate in and around the City of Goleta, as well as most of Southern California, is controlled largely by the strength and position of the subtropical high-pressure cell over the Pacific Ocean. This high-pressure cell typically produces a Mediterranean climate with warm summers, mild winters, and moderate rainfall. This pattern is periodically interrupted by periods of extremely hot weather brought in by Santa Ana winds. Almost all precipitation occurs between November and April, although during these months, the weather is sunny or partly sunny a majority of the time. Cyclic land and sea breezes are the primary factors affecting the region’s mild climate. The daytime winds are normally sea breezes, predominantly from the west, that flow at relatively low velocities.

Santa Barbara County’s air quality is influenced by both local topography and meteorological conditions. Surface and upper-level wind flow varies both seasonally and geographically in the County, and inversion conditions common to the area can affect the vertical mixing and dispersion of pollutants. The prevailing wind-flow patterns in the County are not necessarily those that cause high ozone values. In fact, high ozone values are often associated with atypical wind flow patterns. Meteorological and topographical influences that are important to air quality in the County are as follows.
Semi-permanent high pressure that lies off the Pacific Coast leads to limited rainfall (around 18 inches per year), with warm, dry summers and relatively damp winters. Maximum summer temperatures average about 70 degrees Fahrenheit near the coast and in the high 80s to 90s inland. During winter, average minimum temperatures range from the 40s along the coast to the 30s inland. Additionally, cool, humid marine air causes frequent fog and low clouds along the coast, generally during the night and morning hours in the late spring and early summer. The fog and low clouds can persist for several days until broken up by a change in the weather pattern.

In the northern portion of Santa Barbara County (north of the ridgeline of the Santa Ynez Mountains), the sea breeze is typically from the southwest. During summer, these winds are stronger and persist later into the night. At night, the sea breeze weakens and is replaced by light land breezes (from land to sea). The alternation of the land-sea breeze cycle can sometimes produce a “sloshing” effect, where pollutants are swept offshore at night and subsequently carried back onshore during the day. This effect is exacerbated during periods when wind speeds are low.

The terrain around Point Conception, combined with the change in orientation of the coastline from the north-south to east-west, can cause counterclockwise-circulation (eddies) to form east of the Point. These eddies fluctuate temporally and spatially, often leading to highly variable winds along the southern coastal strip. Point Conception also marks the change in the prevailing surface winds from northwesterly to southwesterly.

Santa Ana winds are northeasterly winds that occur primarily during fall and winter, but occasionally in spring. These are warm, dry winds blown from the high inland desert that descend down the slopes of a mountain range. Wind speeds associated with Santa Anas are generally 15 to 20 mph, though they can sometimes reach speeds in excess of 60 mph. During Santa Ana conditions, pollutants emitted in Santa Barbara, Ventura County, and the South Coast Air Basin (the Los Angeles region) are moved out to sea. These pollutants can then be moved back onshore into Santa Barbara County in what is called a post-Santa Ana condition. The effects of the post-Santa Ana condition can be experienced throughout the County. Not all post-Santa Ana conditions, however, lead to high pollutant concentrations in Santa Barbara County.

Upper-level winds (measured at Vandenberg Air Force Base once each morning and afternoon) are generally from the north or northwest throughout the year, but occurrences of southerly and easterly winds do occur in winter, especially during the morning. Upper-level winds from the south and east are infrequent during the summer. When they do occur, they are usually associated with periods of high ozone levels. Surface and upper-level winds can move pollutants that originate in other areas into the County.

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1,000 to 2,000 feet) are most frequent during the summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and are directly related to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or within them, and ozone concentrations are often higher directly below the base of elevated inversions than they are at the earth’s surface. For this reason, elevated monitoring sites will occasionally record higher ozone concentrations than sites at lower elevations. Generally, the lower the inversion base height and the greater the rate of temperature increase from the base to the top, the more pronounced effect the inversion will have on inhibiting vertical dispersion. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation.
Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect a higher frequency of pollution events in the southern portion of the County, where light winds are frequently observed, as opposed to the northern part of the County, where the prevailing winds are usually strong and persistent.

**Background Air Quality**

The region generally has good air quality, as it attains most ambient air quality standards. The SBCAPCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that federal and state air quality standards are being met. Air quality measurements indicate that Santa Barbara County is in attainment area for all other federal and state air quality standards, with the exception of the state standards for ozone (1-hour and 8-hour) and particulate matter smaller than 10 microns ($\text{PM}_{10}$) (California Air Resources Board 2012a and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2012).

**Ozone**

Ozone has been monitored in the County for more than 30 years. Data collected at monitoring stations, in conjunction with the various air quality studies performed in the region, provide valuable insight into the County’s ozone problem.

Ozone is formed in the atmosphere through a series of chemical reactions involving nitrogen oxides ($\text{NO}_x$), reactive organic gasses (ROGs), and sunlight occurring over a period of several hours. The major source of $\text{NO}_x$ in the County is combustion of fossil fuels for transportation, energy, and heat. ROG sources include natural seeps of oil and gas, solvents in paints, consumer and industrial products, mobile sources, natural vegetation, and processes in the petroleum industry. Since ozone is not emitted directly into the atmosphere, but is formed as a result of chemical reactions in the atmosphere, it is classified as a secondary pollutant and is considered regional because it occurs over a wider area than that in which the pollutants are emitted. Because ozone-forming photochemical reactions take time, peak ozone levels are often found several miles or more downwind of major source areas. This is particularly true when winds are persistent from one direction.

Elevated ozone concentrations aggravate asthma, bronchitis, and other respiratory disorders. Eye irritation, nausea, headache, coughing, and dizziness are other symptoms of ozone exposure. Ozone also interferes with photosynthesis, thereby damaging natural and ornamental vegetation and agricultural crops. Ozone concentrations are highest during the warmer months and coincide with the seasons of maximum solar radiation.

Ozone studies prepared by the SBCAPCD have shown that ozone exceedances can occur under a wide variety of meteorological conditions. Additionally, based on analyses of ozone episodes, there is an indication that state exceedances may be related to meteorological conditions that are conducive to high ozone formed locally combined with the transport of pollutants from outside the County.

**Carbon Monoxide**

Carbon monoxide (CO), a colorless and odorless gas, interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain. It can cause dizziness and fatigue and can impair central nervous system functions. CO is emitted almost exclusively from the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels. In urban areas, motor vehicles, power plants, refineries, industrial boilers, ships, aircraft, and trains emit CO. Automobile exhaust releases most of the CO in urban areas. CO is a nonreactive air pollutant
that dissipates relatively quickly, so ambient CO concentrations generally follow the spatial and
temporal distributions of vehicular traffic. CO concentrations are influenced by local
meteorological conditions—primarily wind speed, topography, and atmospheric stability. CO
from motor-vehicle exhaust can become locally concentrated when surface-based temperature
inversions are combined with calm atmospheric conditions, a typical situation at dusk in urban
areas between November and February. Because motor vehicles are the dominant source of
CO emissions, CO hotspots are normally located near roads and freeways with high traffic
volume.

**PM$_{10}$**

PM$_{10}$ is generated by a wide variety of natural and manmade sources. Particulate matter is a
respiratory irritant. Large particles are effectively filtered in the upper respiratory tract, but
particles smaller than 10 microns can cause serious health effects. The chemical makeup of the
particles is an important factor in determining the health effect.

PM$_{10}$ is produced either by direct emissions of particulates from a source (primary PM$_{10}$), or by
the formation of aerosols as a result of chemical reactions in the atmosphere involving precursor
pollutants (secondary PM$_{10}$). Based on emission data, the largest single source of PM$_{10}$
emissions in the County is entrained paved road dust. Other major sources include dust from
construction, demolition, agricultural tilling, entrained road dust from unpaved roads, natural
dust and sea salt, and particulate matter released during fuel combustion. The County violates
the state PM$_{10}$ 24-hour standard and, as a result, the County is currently designated
nonattainment for the state PM$_{10}$ standard. The County does not exceed the federal PM$_{10}$
standards.

As discussed in the County’s 2001 Clean Air Plan, the SBCAPCD started a specialized
sampling and analysis study in 1989 called the Santa Barbara County Particulate Matter
Emission Reduction Study to investigate the County’s PM$_{10}$ problem. The study collected and
analyzed ambient samples of PM$_{10}$ at sites throughout the County to identify chemical
constituents, identified potential source characteristics, and assessed control strategies for
reducing PM$_{10}$ concentrations. The major findings of the study include: (1) background sources
(primarily sea salt) are major contributors to PM$_{10}$ concentrations; (2) on average, 70% of the
locally generated primary PM$_{10}$ and locally generated geological dust and motor vehicle exhaust
are the most significant sources of primary PM$_{10}$ in the County; and (3) potential control
measures should concentrate on these primary sources of PM$_{10}$. Current sources of PM$_{10}$ are
anticipated to be similar to the sources described above and are discussed in the County’s 2001
Clean Air Plan (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County
Association of Governments 2002).

**PM$_{2.5}$**

Particulate matter that is 2.5 microns or less in diameter, roughly 1/28th the diameter of a human
hair, is referred to as PM$_{2.5}$. PM$_{2.5}$ results from fuel combustion (from motor vehicles, power
generation, and industrial facilities), residential fireplaces, and wood stoves. PM$_{2.5}$ particles are
both directly emitted into the atmosphere (i.e., primary particles) and formed through
atmospheric chemical reactions from precursor gases (i.e., secondary particles). Primary PM$_{2.5}$
includes diesel soot, combustion products, road dust, and other fine particles. Secondary PM$_{2.5}$,
which includes products such as sulfates, nitrates, and complex carbon compounds, are formed
from reactions with directly emitted NO$_X$, sulfur oxides (SO$_X$), volatile organic compounds
(VOCs), and ammonia.
Santa Barbara County Emissions

Table 4.6-1 summarizes the estimated stationary, area-wide, and mobile source daily air emissions for Santa Barbara County in the year 2008. The County emissions inventory is periodically updated for planning purposes to: (1) forecast future emissions inventories; (2) analyze emission control measures; and (3) use as input data for regional air quality modeling. CARB’s almanac emission projection data represent the most recent estimate of daily emissions for the County. The data in Table 4.6-1 show that the largest contributors to air pollutants are on-road vehicles and other mobile sources such as aircraft, trains, sea vessels, off-road vehicles, and farm equipment. The mobile source category account for approximately 18% of ROG, 73% of CO, 89% of NOX, 87% of SOX, 20% of PM10, and 37% of PM2.5 emitted in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>SOX</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stationary Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Combustion</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and Surface Coating</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Production &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Processes</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Stationary Sources</strong></td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-wide Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent Evaporation</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Processes</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area-wide Sources</strong></td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road Vehicles</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>93.88</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mobile Sources</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>42.70</td>
<td>64.85</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mobile Sources</strong></td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>136.58</td>
<td>80.59</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Natural Sources</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara County Total</strong></td>
<td>99.81</td>
<td>187.53</td>
<td>90.35</td>
<td>33.71</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Air Resources Board 2009

Attainment Status of Santa Barbara County

The federal Clean Air Act established air quality standards for the following “criteria” air pollutants: 1-hour ozone, nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), CO, particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and lead. State standards also exist for each of these criteria pollutants. In addition, state standards are in place for visibility-reducing particles, sulfates (SO4), hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride. With the exception of the state 1-hour and 8-hour ozone and PM10 standards, the County is in attainment for all other state and federal air quality pollutant standards. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has designated Santa Barbara County as a moderate nonattainment area for 1-hour ozone, a nonattainment area for 8-hour ozone, and a nonattainment area for PM10 (California Air Resources Board 2012a and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2012).
Air Monitoring Data

The SBCAPCD has a network of 13 air quality monitoring stations. The nearest station to the City of Goleta is the Goleta-Fairview station. Table 4.6-2 presents the maximum pollutant levels monitored at the Goleta-Fairview station during the period from 2008 to 2012. As shown in Table 4.6-2, the state 8-hour ozone standard was exceeded one time in 2009 and in 2011. The federal 8-hour ozone standard was exceeded one time in 2009 (California Air Resources Board 2012a and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2012).

Sensitive Receptors

Ambient air quality standards have been established to represent the levels of air quality considered sufficient, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health and welfare. Some people are particularly sensitive to some pollutants. These sensitive individuals include persons with respiratory illnesses or impaired lung function because of other illnesses, the elderly, and children. Facilities and structures where these sensitive people live or spend considerable amounts of time are known as sensitive receptors. The SBCAPCD defines land uses considered to be sensitive receptors as long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities.

| TABLE 4.6-2 |
| SUMMARY OF AIR QUALITY DATA AT GOLETA MONITORING STATION |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant Standards</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 1-hr concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 8-hr concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days standard exceeded:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 1-hour (&gt;0.09 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS 8-hour (&gt;0.075 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 8-hour (&gt;0.070 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 8-hr concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 1-hr concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days standard exceeded:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS 8-hour (&gt;9 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 8-hour (&gt;9.0 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS 1-hour (&gt;35 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 1-hour (&gt;20 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State maximum 1-hr. concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2nd-highest 1-hr. concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual average concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days standard exceeded:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 1-hour (0.18 ppm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulates (PM₁₀)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State maximum 24-hr. concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2nd highest 24-hr. concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National maximum 24-hr. concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National 2nd highest 24-hr. concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pollutant Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant Standards</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State annual average concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National annual average concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days standard exceeded:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS 24-hour (&gt;50 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS 24-hour (&gt;150 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulates (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State maximum 24-hr. concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2nd highest 24-hr. concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National maximum 24-hr. concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National 2nd highest 24-hr. concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State annual average concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National annual average concentration (μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days standard exceeded:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS 24-hour (&gt;35 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards
- CAAQS = California Ambient Air Quality Standards
- ppm = parts per million
- μg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter
- Sources: California Air Resources Board 2012b & U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2013a.

### Pre-Existing Odor Issues in the Area

There have been a number of historical odor sources in the vicinity of the City of Goleta, which are summarily listed below.

Offshore seeps are naturally occurring sources of mercaptans and hydrocarbons along the University and Ellwood Mesa coastline. There is nothing practical that can be done to control these odors; however, these odors are not constant and are not overly strong.

Venoco’s Platform Holly has been a source of H₂S emissions in the region. However, according to the SBCAPCD, the frequency of H₂S releases has been reduced dramatically due to the installation of a gas flare stack and an assortment of other system improvements in 1999 through 2000.

Venoco’s Ellwood processing plant has been a source of mercaptan release over the years. However, similar to Platform Holly, these odorous emissions have been greatly reduced by the installation of a thermal oxidizer, which replaced a much less efficient control system of carbon canisters.

Water wells on the Ellwood Mesa properties have been a source of odor from sour water emanating from sewer pipes and water released in a gulley. According to some sources, this water was stored and released in order for the current landowners to establish a history of water use on this site. Due to numerous complaints, improved piping was established, and water is no longer released in the gulley.

Water wells with sour water on Goleta Valley/Winchester Canyon agricultural properties continue to be an issue on an inconsistent basis. The SBCAPCD is working with the agricultural community to reduce these sources of odor.
The Ellwood Marine Terminal at Coal Oil Point has historically been a source of two different sources of odors: (1) fugitive emissions/odors from oil storage tanks, and (2) odors released during the loading of barges (barges now have odor control systems).

With the exception of natural seeps, the SBCAPCD has previously or is currently addressing the sources of all these odors.

In addition to the historical odor sources listed above, current odor sources in the County include agricultural uses in the northern portion of Santa Barbara County, oil and gas facilities, and waste processing facilities (Gage, SBCAPCD, pers. comm.).

4.6.1.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Physical Scientific Basis of Climate Change

The phenomenon known as the greenhouse effect keeps the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface warm enough for the successful habitation of humans and other life forms. Present in the Earth’s lower atmosphere, greenhouse gases (GHGs) play a critical role in maintaining the Earth’s temperature; GHGs trap some of the long-wave infrared radiation emitted from the Earth’s surface that would otherwise escape to space. According to Assembly Bill (AB) 32, California’s Global Warming Solutions Act, GHGs encompass the following gases: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), perfluorinated carbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). The CEQA Guidelines (§15364.5) also identify these six gases as GHGs.

Visible sunlight passes through the atmosphere without being absorbed. Some of the sunlight striking the earth is absorbed and converted to heat, which warms the surface. The surface emits infrared radiation to the atmosphere, where some of it is absorbed by GHGs and re-emitted toward the surface; some of the heat is not trapped by GHGs and escapes into space. Human activities that emit additional GHGs to the atmosphere increase the amount of infrared radiation that gets absorbed before escaping into space, thus enhancing the greenhouse effect and amplifying the warming of the earth (Center for Climate and Energy Solutions 2012).

Increases in fossil fuel combustion and deforestation have exponentially increased concentrations of GHGs in the atmosphere since the Industrial Revolution. Rising atmospheric concentrations of GHGs in excess of natural levels enhance the greenhouse effect, which contributes to global warming of the Earth’s lower atmosphere and induces large-scale changes in ocean circulation patterns, precipitation patterns, global ice cover, biological distributions, and other changes to the Earth’s system that are collectively referred to as climate change.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has been established by the World Meteorological Organization and United Nations Environment Programme to assess scientific, technical, and socioeconomic information relevant to the understanding of climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation. The IPCC estimates that the average global temperature rise between the years 2000 and 2100 could range from 1.1 degrees Celsius, with no increase in GHG emissions above year 2000 levels, to 6.4 degrees Celsius, with substantial increase in GHG emissions (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007a:97–115). Large increases in global temperatures could have substantial adverse effects on the natural and human environments on the planet and in California.
Impacts of Climate Change

Climate change is a complex phenomenon that has the potential to alter local climatic patterns and meteorology. Although modeling indicates that climate change will result globally and regionally in sea level rise as well as in changes in climate and rainfall, among other effects, there remains uncertainty with regard to characterizing the precise local climate characteristics and predicting precisely how various ecological and social systems will react to any changes in the existing climate at the local level. Regardless of this uncertainty in precise predictions, it is widely understood that substantial climate change is expected to occur in the future, although the specific extent will take further research to define.

Consequently, the Shelby site will be impacted by changing climatic conditions. Research efforts coordinated through the CARB, California Energy Commission (CEC), California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), the University of California system, and others are examining the specific changes to California’s climate that will occur as the Earth’s surface warms. Climate change could impact the natural environment in California in the following ways, among others.

- Rising sea levels along the California coastline, particularly in San Francisco and the San Joaquin Delta, due to ocean expansion.
- Extreme-heat conditions, such as heat waves and very high temperatures, which could last longer and become more frequent.
- An increase in heat-related human deaths and infectious diseases, and a higher risk of respiratory problems caused by deteriorating air quality.
- Reduced snow pack and stream flow in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, affecting winter recreation and water supplies.
- Potential increase in the severity of winter storms, affecting peak stream flows and flooding.
- Changes in growing season conditions that could affect California agriculture, causing variations in crop quality and yield.
- Changes in distribution of plant and wildlife species due to changes in temperature, competition from colonizing species, changes in hydrologic cycles, changes in sea levels, and other climate-related effects.

Greenhouse Gas Emission Sources

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the transportation, industrial/manufacturing, electric utility, residential, commercial, and agricultural sectors. Combustion of fossil fuel in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California’s GHG emissions in 2010, accounting for 38% of total GHG emissions in the state. This sector was followed by the electric power sector (including generation sources both in-state and out-of-state that supply electricity to California) (21%) and the industrial sector (19%) (California Air Resources Board 2013b). Emissions of CO₂ are primarily byproducts of fuel combustion. CH₄, a highly potent GHG, typically results from fugitive emission sources such as agricultural activities and landfills. N₂O is also largely attributable to agricultural activities and soil management. Smaller amounts of CH₄ and N₂O emissions occur as a byproduct of fuel combustion. CO₂ sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, and absorb CO₂ through sequestration and dissolution, respectively.
California is one of the larger emitters of GHGs in the world. In 2010, California released 451.6 million metric tons (MMT) of CO$_2$ equivalent (CO$_2$e) (California Air Resources Board 2013b). If California were a country, it would be the 14th highest emitter of total CO$_2$ emissions worldwide, and the 19th highest per capita emitter of CO$_2$ emissions worldwide (California Air Resources Board 2011). The 2010 Clean Air Plan indicates that Santa Barbara emitted 4.3 MMT of CO$_2$e in 2007 (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2011).

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories**

A GHG inventory is a quantification of all GHG emissions and sinks within a selected physical and/or economic boundary. GHG inventories can be performed on a large scale (e.g., for global and national entities) or on a small scale (e.g., for a particular building or person). Although many processes are difficult to evaluate, several agencies have developed tools to quantify emissions from certain sources.

Table 4.6-3 outlines the most recent global, national, statewide, and local GHG inventories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.6-3</th>
<th>GLOBAL, NATIONAL, AND STATE GHG EMISSIONS INVENTORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas</strong></td>
<td><strong>CO$_2$e (metric tons)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 IPCC Global GHG Emissions Inventory</td>
<td>49,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 EPA National GHG Emissions Inventory</td>
<td>6,708,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 CARB State GHG Emissions Inventory</td>
<td>451,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Santa Barbara County GHG Emissions</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 City of Goleta GHG Emissions Inventory</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007a; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2013b; California Air Resources Board 2013b; Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2011

CO$_2$e is a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential (GWP), is a measure of the heat-trapping ability of a given GHG over a 100-year period relative to the heat trapping ability of CO$_2$, as described below in Table 4.6-4. The GWP of CO$_2$ is defined to equal 1. The GWP values used in this report are based on the IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR) and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reporting guidelines, and are defined in Table 4.6-4. Although the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) presents different GWP estimates, the current inventory standard relies on SAR GWPs to comply with reporting standards and consistency with regional and national inventories (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007a). The SAR GWPs are used in CARB’s California inventory and the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) Scoping Plan estimates. (For more information about AB 32, see Section 4.3.2.2.)
TABLE 4.6-4
LIFETIMES, GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIALS, AND ABUNDANCES OF SEVERAL SIGNIFICANT GREENHOUSE GASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Global Warming Potential (100 years)</th>
<th>Lifetime (years)¹</th>
<th>Atmospheric Abundance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50–200</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄ (ppb)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O (ppb)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-23 (ppt)</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a (ppt)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-152a (ppt)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF₄ (ppt)²</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂F₆ (ppt)²</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆ (ppt)</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Defined as the half-life of the gas.
² Carbon tetrafluoride (CF₄) and hexafluoroethane (C₂F₆) are PFCs.
Definitions: ppm = parts per million; ppb = parts per billion; ppt = parts per trillion

Expressing individual GHG emissions as CO₂e converts the heat-trapping ability and longevity of the individual GHGs to a common basis that is equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

4.6.2 Regulatory Framework

4.6.2.1 Air Quality

Federal Regulations

Clean Air Act and National Ambient Air Quality Standards

The federal Clean Air Act (42 United States Code, §§ 7401 et seq.; CAA), promulgated in 1963 and amended several times thereafter, including the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments (CAA), establishes the framework for modern air pollution control. The CAA directs the EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the six criteria pollutants (discussed in Section 4.3.1.1, “Air Quality”). The NAAQS are divided into primary and secondary standards; the former are set to protect human health within an adequate margin of safety, and the latter to protect environmental values, such as plant and animal life. Table 4.6-5 summarizes the NAAQS.

The CAA requires states to submit a state implementation plan (SIP) for areas in nonattainment for federal standards. The SIP, which is reviewed and approved by the EPA, must demonstrate how the federal standards would be achieved. Failing to submit a plan or secure approval can lead to denial of federal funding and permits. In cases where the SIP is submitted by the state but fails to demonstrate achievement of the standards, the EPA is directed to prepare a federal implementation plan.


### TABLE 4.6-5

**AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Pollutant</th>
<th>State Standard</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
<th>Health Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone ((O_3))</td>
<td>0.09 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>No 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>No 1-hr. avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.070 ppm, 8-hr. avg.</td>
<td>0.075 ppm, 8-hr. avg.</td>
<td>0.075 ppm, 8-hr. avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide ((CO))</td>
<td>9.0 ppm, 8-hr. avg.</td>
<td>9 ppm, 8-hr. avg.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>35 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide ((NO_2))</td>
<td>0.030 ppm, AAM</td>
<td>0.053 ppm, AAM</td>
<td>0.053 ppm, AAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>0.100 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>No 1-hr. avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide ((SO_2))</td>
<td>0.25 ppm 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>75 ppb, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04 ppm, 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>0.14 ppm, 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>0.030 ppm, AAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter ((PM_{10}))</td>
<td>50 (\mu g/m^3), 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>150 (\mu g/m^3), 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>No AAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (\mu g/m^3) AAM</td>
<td>No AAM</td>
<td>No AAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter ((PM_{2.5}))</td>
<td>No 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>35 (\mu g/m^3), 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>35 (\mu g/m^3), 24-hr. avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (\mu g/m^3) AAM</td>
<td>15 (\mu g/m^3) AAM</td>
<td>15 (\mu g/m^3) AAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates ((SO_4))</td>
<td>25 (\mu g/m^3), 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead ((Pb))</td>
<td>1.5 (\mu g/m^3), monthly avg.</td>
<td>1.5 (\mu g/m^3), calendar quarter 0.15 (\mu g/m^3), 3-month avg.</td>
<td>1.5 (\mu g/m^3), calendar quarter 0.15 (\mu g/m^3), 3-month avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide ((H_2S))</td>
<td>0.03 ppm, 1-hr. avg.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td>0.01 ppm, 24-hr. avg.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- ppm = parts per million by volume
- \(\mu g/m^3\) = micrograms per cubic meter
- ppb = parts per billion by volume
- AAM = annual arithmetic mean
- For readers’ convenience in picking out standards quickly, concentrations appears first; e.g., "0.12 ppm, 1 hr. avg." means 1-hr. avg >0.12 ppm
- California Air Resources Board 2013a

## State Regulations

**California Clean Air Act and California Ambient Air Quality Standards**

The California Clean Air Act (Health and Safety Code, §§ 40910 et seq.; CCAA) establishes a statewide air pollution control program. The CCAA requires all air districts in the state to endeavor to meet the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) by the earliest practical date. Unlike the federal CAA, the CCAA does not set precise attainment deadlines. Clean Air Plans, discussed further in the discussion of local regulations, are specifically designed to attain these standards and must be designed to achieve an annual 5% reduction in district-wide emissions of each nonattainment pollutant or its precursors. Where an air district is
unable to achieve a 5% annual reduction in district-wide emissions of each nonattainment pollutant or its precursors, the adoption of “all feasible measures” on an expeditious schedule is acceptable as an alternative strategy (Health and Safety Code § 40914(b)(2)). The CAAQS are generally more stringent than the NAAQS and incorporate additional standards for SO$_4$, H$_2$S, vinyl chloride (C$_2$H$_3$Cl), and visibility-reducing particles. The CAAQS and NAAQS are listed together in Table 4.6-5.

CARB and local air districts bear responsibility for achieving California’s air quality standards, which are to be achieved through district-level air quality management plans that would be incorporated into the SIP. In California, the EPA has delegated authority to prepare SIPs to CARB, which, in turn, has delegated that authority to individual air districts. CARB traditionally has established state air quality standards, maintaining oversight authority in air quality planning, developing programs for reducing emissions from motor vehicles, developing air emission inventories, collecting air quality and meteorological data, and approving SIPs.

The CCAA substantially adds to the authority and responsibilities of air districts. The CCAA designates air districts as lead air quality planning agencies, requires air districts to prepare air quality plans, and grants air districts authority to implement transportation control measures. The CCAA also emphasizes the control of “indirect and area-wide sources” of air pollutant emissions. The CCAA gives local air pollution control districts explicit authority to regulate indirect sources of air pollution and to establish traffic control measures (TCMs).

**State Implementation Plan (SIP)**

The EPA required that each state prepare a SIP that describes how the state will achieve compliance with the NAAQS. A SIP is a compilation of goals, strategies, schedules, and enforcement actions that will lead the state (including the South Central Coast Air Basin) into compliance with all federal air quality standards. Every change in a compliance schedule or plan must be incorporated into the SIP. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 established new deadlines for achievement of the NAAQS depending on the severity of nonattainment. Santa Barbara County is considered in attainment of the federal 8-hour ozone standard.

The SBCAPCD adopted previous Clean Air Plans (CAPs) in 1989 to meet national standards and in 1991 to meet state standards. The SBCAPCD revised these CAPs in 2001, 2004, 2007, and 2010. These CAPs collectively serve as the region’s SIP to describe how the region will attain and maintain the NAAQS.

**Local Regulations**

**Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Regulations**

The SBCAPCD regulates stationary sources of air pollution and has general air quality regulatory authority in the County. The SBCAPCD Rules and Regulations establish emission limitations and control requirements for various sources, based upon their source type and magnitude of emissions. The following are specific SBCAPCD rules that could apply to projects in Goleta.

- **SBCAPCD Rule 303—Nuisance.** This rule states that a person shall not discharge air contaminants from any source that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or that endangers the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or their business or property. The SBCAPCD considers emissions of air pollution to be a significant nuisance if five or more complaints are received from different
individuals/households within 24 hours or 10 such complaints are received within 10 days (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 1978).

- **SBCAPCD Rule 345—Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities.** This rule includes a number of fugitive dust mitigation strategies that must be followed by projects involving construction and demolition activities. These strategies include using water to minimize material loss from wind and securing material with tarps (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 2010).

### 4.6.2.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

#### Federal Regulations

**EPA Endangerment and Cause and Contribute Findings (2009)**

Under the Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases issued pursuant to Section 202(a) of the CAA, the EPA finds that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed GHGs—CO$_2$, CH$_4$, N$_2$O, PFCs, SF$_6$, and HFCs—in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. Under this finding, the EPA finds that the combined emissions of these well-mixed GHGs from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the GHG pollution that threatens public health and welfare.

These findings do not themselves impose any requirements on industry or other entities. However, this action was a prerequisite to finalizing the EPA’s new corporate average fuel economy standards for light-duty vehicles, which the EPA and Department of Transportation adopted on December 14, 2012 (40 CFR Parts 85, 86, and 600; 49 CFR Parts 523, 531, 533, 536, 537, 600).

**EPA Regulation of GHG Emissions under the Clean Air Act (2010–2013, ongoing)**

Under the authority of the CAA, the EPA is beginning to regulate GHG emissions starting with large stationary sources. In 2010, the EPA set GHG thresholds to define when permits under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V Operating Permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities. In 2013, the EPA proposed a carbon pollution standard for new power plants.

#### State Regulations

**Executive Order S-3-05 (2005)**

Signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on June 1, 2005, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 asserts that California is vulnerable to the effects of climate change. To combat this concern, EO S-3-05 established the following GHG emission reduction targets for state agencies.

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels.
- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels.
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels.

Executive orders are binding only on state agencies. Accordingly, EO S-03-05 will guide state agencies’ efforts to control and regulate GHG emissions but will have no direct binding effect on local government or private actions. The Secretary of the CalEPA is required to report to the
Governor and state legislature biannually on the impacts of global warming on California, mitigation and adaptation plans, and progress made toward reducing GHG emissions to meet the targets established in this executive order.


Senate Bills (SB) 1078 and 107, California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), obligates investor-owned utilities (IOUs), energy service providers (ESPs), and Community Choice Aggregations (CCAs) to procure an additional 1% of retail sales per year from eligible renewable sources until 20% is reached, no later than 2010. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and CEC are jointly responsible for implementing the program. EO S-14-08 set forth a longer-range target of procuring 33% of retail sales by 2020. SB X1-2 (2011) requires a RPS of 33% by 2020.


Known as “Pavley I,” AB 1493 standards are the nation’s first GHG standards for automobiles. AB 1493 requires CARB to adopt vehicle standards that will lower GHG emissions from new light-duty autos to the maximum extent feasible beginning in 2009. Additional strengthening of the Pavley standards (referred to previously as “Pavley II,” now referred to as the “Advanced Clean Cars” measure, codified at 13 CCR § 1962) has been proposed for vehicle model years 2017–2020. Together, the two standards are expected to increase average fuel economy to roughly 43 miles per gallon by 2020 and reduce GHG emissions from the transportation sector in California by approximately 14%. In June 2009, the EPA granted California’s waiver request enabling the state to enforce its GHG emissions standards for new motor vehicles beginning with the current model year.


AB 32 codified the State’s GHG emissions target by requiring that the State’s global warming emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Since its adoption, CARB, the CEC, the CPUC, and the Building Standards Commission have been developing regulations that will help meet the goals of AB 32 and EO S-03-05. The Scoping Plan for AB 32 identifies specific measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and requires CARB and other state agencies to develop and enforce regulations and other initiatives for reducing GHGs. Specifically, the Scoping Plan articulates a key role for local governments, recommending they establish GHG reduction goals for both their municipal operations and the community consistent with those of the state (i.e., approximately 15% below current levels).


CARB established a low carbon fuel standard (LCFS), which reduces the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10% by 2020.


In 2007, the Governor directed the California Building Standards Commission to work with specified state agencies on the adoption of green building standards for residential, commercial,
and public building construction for the 2010 Code adoption process. That process resulted in the adoption of the 2010 California Green Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11; CALGreen). Specific elements of CALGreen include:

- 20% mandatory reduction in indoor water use, with voluntary goal standards for 30, 35, and 40% reductions.
- Separate water meters for nonresidential buildings’ indoor and outdoor water use, with a requirement for moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscape projects.
- Requirement for diversion of 50% of construction waste from landfills, increasing voluntarily to 65 and 75% for new homes and 80% for commercial projects.
- Mandatory inspections of energy systems (i.e., heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies.
- Requirement for low-pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring, and particle board.

The City adopted CALGreen, which is codified in Title 15, Chapter 15.12 of the Goleta Municipal Code. CALGreen mandates new requirements for planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, environmental quality, and installer and special inspector qualifications.

**Local Regulations**


The City also adopted an ordinance implementing a local building energy efficiency standard that includes a “reach” goal of an additional 15% reduction in GHGs when compared to the Title 24 (2008) California Building Standards Code. The increased energy efficiency standards apply to new buildings or structures of any size.

### 4.6.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

#### 4.6.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

**Air Quality**

Thresholds of significance are provided by the SBCAPCD’s adopted Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 2011) and threshold standards from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Specific thresholds relating to air quality impacts are discussed below.

**CEQA Thresholds**

Per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would pose a significant air quality impact if any of the following were to occur as a result of the project:

a. conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
b. violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;

c. result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in a state of non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);

d. expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

e. create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

SBCAPCD Thresholds

According to the CEQA Guidelines, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make significance determinations for items a–e above. The following criteria pollutant significance thresholds have been established by the SBCAPCD (Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 2011). Although the City has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these SBCAPCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for impact analyses.

Operational Impacts Thresholds

A project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

1. Emit 240 pounds/day or more of ROG; same as reactive organic compounds [ROC]) from all sources (both stationary and mobile).
2. Emit 240 pounds/day or more of NO\textsubscript{X} from all sources (both stationary and mobile).
3. Emit 25 pounds/day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicles trips only.
4. Emit 25 pounds/day or more of unmitigated NO\textsubscript{X} from any motor vehicle trips only.
5. Emit 80 pounds/day or more of PM\textsubscript{10}.
6. Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone).
7. Exceed the SBCAPCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the SBCAPCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk).
8. Be inconsistent with federal or state air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent CAP. Due to the County’s nonattainment status for O\textsubscript{3} and the regional nature of O\textsubscript{3} as a pollutant, if a project’s emissions of either of the O\textsubscript{3} precursors (NO\textsubscript{X} or ROC) exceed the operational thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant.

For projects that do not have significant O\textsubscript{3} precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2010 CAP growth projections\textsuperscript{2} (i.e., if growth associated with the project exceeds the growth assumptions in the air quality plan), regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

\textsuperscript{2} While the SBCAPCD has prepared the 2013 CAP, it has not been approved by the SBCAPCD, CARB, or the EPA. Consequently, the analysis of consistency with the most recently adopted and approved CAP uses the 2010 CAP.
Construction Impacts Thresholds

Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions. However, short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading must be discussed. The SBCAPCD recommends that construction-related NO\textsubscript{X}, ROC, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions from diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, paving, and other activities be quantified. The SBCAPCD uses 25 tons per year for NO\textsubscript{X} and ROC as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

Under SBCAPCD Rule 202 D.16, if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source that requires an Authority to Construct permit have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant except CO in a 12-month period, the permittee must provide offsets under the provisions of Rule 804 and demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard will be violated. SBCAPCD Rule 345 regulates generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites. In addition, implementation of the SBCAPCD’s required standard dust control measures would result in less-than-significant fugitive dust emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

CEQA Thresholds

Per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would be considered significant if the project were to:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The adopted CEQA amendments require a Lead Agency to make a good-faith effort based, to the extent possible, on scientific and factual data to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the Lead Agency whether to:

- Use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; and/or
- Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

In addition, a Lead Agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
- Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the Lead Agency determines applies to the project.
- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The CEQA Guidelines allow Lead Agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions.
Currently, neither the State of California, nor the SBCAPCD\(^3\), nor the City of Goleta has established CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions. Indeed, many regulatory agencies are sorting through suggested thresholds and/or making project-by-project analyses. This approach is consistent with the approach suggested by the California Air Pollution Control Officer’s Association (CAPCOA) in its technical advisory entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act Review” (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2008):

...In the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other specific data to clearly define what constitutes a “significant project,” individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.

In June 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) became the first regulatory agency in the nation to approve guidelines that establish thresholds of significance for GHG emissions (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2011). These thresholds are summarized in Table 4.6-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Source Category</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other than Stationary Sources</td>
<td>1,100 MT CO(_2)eq/year OR 4.6 MT CO(_2)eq/SP*/year (residents + employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO(_2)eq/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>6.6 MT CO(_2)eq/SP/year (residents + employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)MT = metric ton  
\(^*\)SP = service population

The BAAQMD threshold is a promulgated CEQA threshold that has undergone full public review and comment, with approval by the BAAQMD governing board, and technical support by BAAQMD staff. The BAAQMD GHG threshold applies to a nine-county area of very diverse population and land use. The BAAQMD’s adoption of GHG thresholds is subject to ongoing litigation, but that litigation does not concern the legitimacy of the thresholds so much as the process used in their adoption.\(^4\)

For purposes of this project, the City determines that the BAAQMD’s GHG significance threshold has a strong regulatory and technical underpinning. It is based on substantial data and is intended as a regulatory threshold. In addition, the climatic regime in the Goleta-Santa Barbara area that governs energy demand for space heating and cooling is also very similar to that occurring in the BAAQMD. Further, in June 2010, the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department produced a memorandum, Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards, providing evidentiary support for

\(^3\) While the SBCAPCD has not adopted thresholds by which to evaluate climate change impacts, it has proposed a stationary source threshold of 10,000 MT CO\(_2\)eq per year.

\(^4\) In March 2012, an Alameda County Superior Court (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (March 5, 2012) Alameda Super. Ct. Case No. RG10-548693) ruled that the BAAQMD needed to comply with CEQA prior to adopting their 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines, which included significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and GHGs. On August 13, 2013, the Court of Appeal (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 1171, rev. granted) reversed the lower court’s writ of mandate invalidating the BAAQMD’s Guidelines. That decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted review on November 26, 2013. The matter is currently pending before the California Supreme Court.
reliance on the proposed BAAQMD standards as interim thresholds of significance in Santa Barbara County (County of Santa Barbara 2010). The memorandum notes that certain counties in the Bay Area are similar to Santa Barbara County in terms of population growth, land use patterns, general plan policies, and average commute patterns and times.

Given that the City does not have established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, and as the City is in Santa Barbara County, the rationale for applicability of the BAAQMD thresholds generally applies. Therefore, for projects in the City, the following two thresholds of significance would apply.\(^5\) Would the project:

1. Exceed the daily significance threshold adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, i.e., of 1,100 MT CO\(_2\)e/yr, for operational GHG emissions and/or result in significant GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis.

2. Employ reasonable and feasible means to minimize GHG emissions from a qualitative standpoint, in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of AB 32 (i.e., a reduction in GHG emissions of 20% for state-owned buildings by 2015).

### 4.6.3.2 Project Impacts

#### Class I Impacts

**Short-Term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that no short-term Class I air quality impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) would result from GP/CLUP implementation. Any short-term air quality or GHG impacts that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would be caused by construction emissions which can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Similarly, any short-term impacts resulting from construction-related activities allowed by the GPA would be less than significant with mitigation. The GPA would not result in any new or additional short-term Class I air quality or GHG impacts. (See discussion for Impact 3.3-1, below.)

**Long-Term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that no long-term Class I air quality impacts would result from GP/CLUP implementation. Any long-term air quality impacts that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would be less than significant and are classified as Class III, as described below. Similarly, any incremental increase in long-term air quality impacts resulting from the GPA would also be less than significant. The GPA would not result in any new or additional long-term Class I air quality or GHG impacts. (See discussion for Impact 3.3-2, 3.3-3, and 3.3-4, below.)

#### Class II Impacts

**Short-Term Impacts**

**Impact 3.3-1. Construction Emissions**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that significant short-term, construction-related impacts would occur due to the disturbance of friable asbestos during demolition of older structures during the buildout of the Plan. However, demolition activity involving asbestos is required to be conducted

---

\(^5\) Use of the BAAQMD threshold does not imply that it is a threshold that the City of Goleta has formally adopted, or should adopt, as a GHG significance threshold for all present or future project analyses.
in accordance with SBCAPCD Rule 1001, which requires SBCAPCD notification and use of licensed asbestos contractors to remove all asbestos prior to demolition. Compliance with Rule 1001 on all future demolition and construction activity with asbestos-containing materials would reduce impacts to less-than-significant level. SBCAPCD Rule 1001 implements the EPA’s National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for the reporting and removal of asbestos associated with demolition and renovation. This rule would also be applicable to the demolition of the existing single-family residence and barn on the Shelby property. Therefore, impacts related to asbestos disturbed during demolition for the Shelby property would also be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

The GP/CLUP also found that significant short-term, construction-related impacts could occur if such activities occurred near sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, and hospitals. The SBCAPCD’s Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents (updated December 2011) recommends various techniques to reduce construction-related emissions associated with individual developments. These include techniques to limit emissions of construction-related diesel exhaust emissions and are identified below.

- Diesel construction equipment meeting the CARB Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
- If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by the EPA or California.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer’s specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

The SBCAPCD’s Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents (updated December 2011) recommends various techniques to reduce construction-related dust emissions of PM$_{10}$. Prior implementation of all of the following measures, as necessary, is assumed to reduce fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level and is strongly recommended for all discretionary projects involving earthmoving.

- During construction, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for human consumption.
- Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.
If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.

Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.

After clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation is completed, treat the disturbed area by watering, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.

The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading of the structure.

Prior to land use clearance, the applicant shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with a map, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that use of these techniques during construction would reduce short-term impacts associated with construction-related dust emissions of PM$_{10}$ to sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels.

The GPA could also result in similar short-term, construction-related impacts if such construction activities resulted in diesel emissions and fugitive dust near sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, and hospitals. Use of the techniques listed above, as recommended by SBCAPCD, would also be applicable to the Shelby property. Therefore, the impact finding of the GP/CLUP Final EIR of less than significant with implementation of techniques related to construction impacts to sensitive receptors would remain unchanged with implementation of the GPA.

Long-Term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that no long-term Class II air quality impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) would result from GP/CLUP implementation. Any long-term air quality impacts that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would be less than significant and are classified as Class III, as described below. Similarly, any incremental increase in long-term air quality impacts resulting from the GPA would also be less than significant. The GPA would not result in any new or additional long-term Class I air quality or GHG impacts. (See discussion for Impact 3.3-2, 3.3-3, and 3.3-4, below.)

Class III Impacts

Short-Term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that no short-term Class III air quality impacts (less than significant impacts) would result from GP/CLUP implementation. Any short-term air quality or GHG impacts that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would be caused by construction emissions and are classified as Class II impacts. Similarly, any short-term impacts resulting from construction-related activities allowed by the GPA would also be classified as Class II.
impacts. The GPA would not result in any new or additional short-term Class III air quality or GHG impacts. (See discussion for Impact 3.3-1, above.)

Long-Term Impacts

Impact 3.3-2. GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Consistent with the Clean Air Plan

Vehicle use, energy consumption, and associated air pollutant emissions are directly related to households and population growth. SBCAPCD’s Clean Air Plan (CAP) relies on the most recent households/population estimates developed by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), which acts as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Santa Barbara County. The household/population forecasts upon which the Santa Barbara County CAP are based are then used to estimate future emissions, also known as emissions inventories, and devise appropriate strategies to attain state and federal air quality standards. When household/population growth exceeds those forecasts, emissions inventories could be surpassed, which could adversely affect attainment of air quality standards. The most recently adopted CAP is the 2010 CAP.

The emission planning inventory is used to forecast emissions for Santa Barbara County in order to determine whether the 2010 CAP will reduce emissions enough to attain the State 1-hour ozone standard while accounting for the growth that is expected in Santa Barbara County. To forecast future year emissions, estimates of the changes in the level of pollution-producing activities, known as activity indicators, are used. Examples of activity indicators include population, housing, employment, daily vehicle miles traveled, and daily vehicle hours.

SBCAG’s 2007 Regional Growth Forecast, which was used in the preparation of the 2010 CAP, projected the City’s population to be 37,300 for the year 2030. The GP/CLUP would add 7,421 persons at full buildout in 2030, and the GPA would increase the population by 193 persons, yielding a total of 7,614 additional persons at full GP/CLUP buildout. (See section 4.13 of this SEIR, Population and Housing, for additional information.)

According to the 2010 United States Census, the City’s population was 29,888 (U. S. Census Bureau 2010). Using this population figure as a baseline and adding the population increase resulting from GP/CLUP and GPA buildout (7,614), the City’s population at GP/CLUP buildout in 2030 would be 37,502. The population at buildout is approximately 0.7% higher than the forecasted population from the Regional Growth Forecast. The difference between the two estimates would not result in a significant increase in emissions forecasted within Santa Barbara County for the 2010 CAP. Therefore, the GP/CLUP and GPA population projections are consistent with the air quality planning assumptions of the 2010 CAP.

Furthermore, development of the Shelby property as a result of the GPA would not result in activities that would hinder the implementation of the CAP or the attainment of state or federal air quality standards. The Shelby project would be required to contribute to programs to offset its contribution to congestion within the City (such as the Goleta Transportation Improvement Program). The Shelby property is located within the City’s urban boundary and would add units to the City’s housing stock, providing additional housing near employment centers in the South Coast region of Santa Barbara County. This reduces long-distance commuting from outside the South Coast region and improves the City’s jobs-housing balance, which is a goal of SBCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan and a recommended strategy of the 2010 CAP.
Therefore, the GPA would not conflict with the 2010 CAP or obstruct its implementation. The GPA’s impacts with respect to consistency with the 2010 CAP would be less than significant (Class III).

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following plans and policies to further reduce impacts of GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Adherence to the requirements of the SIP.
- Adherence to the provisions of the CAP.
- Implementation of CARB-recommended techniques in Table 4.6-7.

### TABLE 4.6-7
RECOMMENDATIONS ON SITING NEW SENSITIVE LAND USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Advisory Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways and High-Traffic Roads</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000+ vehicles per day, or rural roads with 50,000+ vehicles per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Centers</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU units operations exceed 300 hours per week).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Yards</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard. Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impact zones. Consult with SBCAPCD or CARB on the status of pending analysis of health risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refineries</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with SBCAPCD to determine an appropriate separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrome Platers</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Cleaners using Perchloroethylene</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operation with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with three or more machines, consult with SBCAPCD. Do not site new sensitive land uses in the same building with dry cleaning operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Dispensing Facilities</td>
<td>Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50-foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all of these recommendations would be applicable to the GPA.

In addition, the GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would further reduce Impact 3.3.2:

- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards  
Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards  
Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards  
Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities  
Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness  
Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities  
Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System  
Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management  
Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation)  
Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation  
Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation  
Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan  
Policy TE 12: Transportation Systems Management  
Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development  
Policy TE 14: Financing Transportation Improvements  
Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

These requirements, provisions, and policies apply City-wide and therefore would also be applicable to the GPA, thereby ensuring impacts would remain less than significant with the implementation of the GPA.

Impact 3.3.3. The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled Is Greater than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that implementation of development under the GP/CLUP would result in an annual average vehicle miles traveled (VMT) growth rate of 1.15%, which was greater than the rate of population growth for the Goleta region as projected by the 2004 CAP. However, the GP/CLUP Final EIR concluded that buildout would be consistent with the 2004 CAP and other regional plan strategies, such as the SBCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan, to reduce the number of trips and the length of trips in the region and to improve the balance between jobs and housing at the subregional level. Because the GP/CLUP would facilitate the development of housing opportunities close to employment centers and transportation hubs, the GP/CLUP Final EIR found that the GP/CLUP was consistent with the goals and policies of the SBCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan and 2004 CAP. The GP/CLUP Final EIR found this to be an adverse but less-than-significant impact.

The GPA would result in an incremental increase in the growth rate of annual average VMT. However, the GPA would also facilitate housing opportunities close to employment centers and transportation hubs because the Shelby property is surrounded by existing urban development and the GPA seeks to convert the land use designation of the Shelby property to Residential. Therefore, the GPA would be consistent with the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan and 2010 CAP and would not change the finding made in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. The GPA would result in an incremental increase in Impact 3.3-3 but would not change its classification as Class III (less than significant).
The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that adherence to the requirements of the SIP, the provisions under the 2004 CAP, and the air quality policies addressed under the land use and conservation elements in the GP/CLUP would ensure impacts remain less than significant. These requirements, provisions, and policies apply City-wide and therefore would also be applicable to the GPA, thereby ensuring impacts would remain less than significant with the GPA.

**Impact 3.3-4. Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with operational emissions created by stationary sources including the use of natural gas, landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products such as aerosol sprays, and various industrial and commercial processes (e.g., dry cleaning) allowed under the GP/CLUP. They found these non-vehicular operational emissions would represent an adverse but less-than-significant impact to air quality and that such emissions would be regulated and permitted on a project-by-project basis.

The GPA would allow for a potential increase in development above the level considered in the GP/CLUP, which would result in an incremental increase in similar operational emissions related to the use of natural gas, landscape maintenance equipment, and consumer products (but not from industrial and commercial processes). The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.3-6, but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).

**Class IV Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short- or long-term beneficial (Class IV) impacts to air quality that would result from GP/CLUP implementation. Development resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP would not cause any short-term or long-term improvements to air quality. Similarly, the additional development resulting from the GPA would also not cause any short- or long-term Class IV impacts.

**4.6.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOₓ Emissions**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a significant contribution to cumulative increases in air emissions within the South Central Coast Air Basin that would adversely affect the ability of local agencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the 2004 CAP. Because Santa Barbara County is in nonattainment of state standards for ozone emissions, and any project-generated new O₃ precursor (ROG and NOₓ) emissions could exacerbate such nonattainment, the GP/CLUP buildout’s contribution to cumulative levels of O₃ emissions was considered significant and unavoidable (Class I).

The emissions associated with development related to the GPA would also exacerbate such nonattainment; Impact 3.3-5 would remain at Class I if the GPA were implemented.

**Impact 3.3-6. Cumulative PM₁₀ Emissions**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified an adverse but less-than-significant contribution to cumulative air quality impacts related to PM₁₀ emissions because implementation of standard City Grading Ordinance and SBCAPCD dust-control measures would ensure any project’s
contribution to cumulative levels of PM$_{10}$ emissions would be less than significant. (See Impact 3.3-1 above for a discussion of PM$_{10}$ emissions resulting from GP/CLUP buildout).

Projects associated with the GPA would incrementally increase potential PM$_{10}$ emissions. However, these projects would also be subject to standard City Grading Ordinance and SBCAPCD dust-control measures. Therefore, the GPA’s contributions to cumulative levels of PM$_{10}$ emissions would also be less than significant. The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.3-6, but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).

**Impact 3.3-7. Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not evaluate the potential contribution to GHG emissions from GP/CLUP implementation. The 2009 Supplemental EIR for the Track 3 GP/CLUP amendments did evaluate GHG emissions resulting from GP/CLUP implementation and identified Impact 3.3-7, as summarized below.

Cumulative GHG emissions associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP would result in a Class II air quality impact. Given the continued rapid evolution of climate change analyses, the City has not formalized GHG thresholds within its Thresholds Manual. As part of the Track 3 GP/CLUP amendments adopted on November 17, 2009, the City adopted Conservation Element Implementation Action Five (CE-IA-5), which requires the City to adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. This will implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1 identified in the 2009 Supplemental EIR for the Track 3 GP/CLUP amendments. The City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, which has not been adopted yet, will identify a GHG emissions reduction target for 2030 and methods to reduce GHG emissions to achieve the reduction target. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan is intended to address City-sponsored projects and operations as well as private development subject to ministerial and/or discretionary approval by the City.

Implementation of the GP/CLUP would contribute to GHG emissions as follows:

- **Transportation emissions:** new vehicle CO$_2$ emissions would result from new residential, commercial, industrial, and public service development.
- **Direct energy consumption emissions:** new buildings would consume natural gas for heating, cooking, and other processes and other area sources.
- **Indirect electricity emissions:** new buildings would consume electricity.
- **Industrial emissions:** new industries would also consume fossil fuels and other GHGs for industrial purposes.
- **Emissions associated with landfills:** development would result in increased generation of waste, which would require disposal in a landfill, which would increase methane emissions.
- **Agricultural emissions:** no net expansion in agricultural development would be expected so no new emissions from agricultural operations would occur.
- **Emissions associated with land use changes:** development would result in conversion of natural vegetation and agricultural lands that would result in the loss of carbon sinks.

The GPA would also result in a similar incremental contribution to GHG emissions, as listed above, especially related to transportation emissions, direct energy consumption emissions, indirect electricity emissions, emissions associated with landfills, and emissions associated with land use changes.
The 2009 Supplemental EIR identified the following policies and mitigation measures that would reduce Impact 3.3-7 to a less than significant level:

- Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation
- Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs
- Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation)
- Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation
- Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation
- Policy TE 11: Bikeway Plan
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation
- MM AQ-1: Add a Policy that Requires Development of a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan

These policies and measures would also reduce GHG impacts associated with the GPA to less than significant levels. The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.3-7 but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).

4.6.3.4 Mitigation Measures

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

4.6.3.5 Residual Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that all Class II air quality impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels, but that the residual cumulative contribution to O₃ emissions within the South Central Coast Air Basin and the resulting effect of such a contribution on the ability of the local government agencies within Santa Barbara County to achieve the goals and objectives of the SBCPACD’s 2004 CAP would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).

Implementation of the GPA would also result in Class II air quality impacts that would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. However, the GPA would add an incremental increase to the residual cumulative contribution of O₃ emissions identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the adverse effects on local government agencies within Santa Barbara County to achieve the goals and objectives of the SBCAPCD’s 2010 CAP would remain significant and unavoidable.

The 2009 Supplemental EIR found that all Class II GHG impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the GPA would also result in Class II GHG impacts that would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”]).
SECTION 4.7
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES
4.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Section 3.4 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for biological resources relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with biological resources that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.7.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including local and regional setting, habitats, wildlife and fish species, special-status habitats, special-status species, wildlife linkages, and existing preserves.

The 14.38-acre Shelby property currently contains a 2,015-square-foot residence, 726-square-foot garage, and 1,152-square-foot barn. El Encanto Creek borders the project site on its western side for approximately 630 feet, although the creek’s bed and banks are just to the west of the property. For this analysis, the project site and El Encanto Creek equal the study area (Figure 4-3-1). The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) mapped the creek as having intermittent flow. Pursuant to the GP/CLUP Conservation Element CE Subpolicy 2.2, a Streamside Protection Area (SPA) associated with El Encanto Creek extends 100 feet on either side of the creek.

East of the creek on the western side of the property is an area that is primarily bare ground used for storage of firewood and woodchips. Nonnative annual grassland dominates the center of the project site. The area containing nonnative grassland is periodically mowed to control weeds and prevent fires. Soils on site consist of Diablo clay, which is considered well-drained and formed from shale and mudstone. The property was a productive avocado orchard up until the late 1990s when the trees became diseased due in part to an El Niño event. The bulk of the avocado trees were removed between 1998 and 2002 by the property owner except for few trees in the northernmost corner of the property, which are no longer in production.

The project site slopes from north to south at an average grade of approximately 7.8 percent. The existing elevation on the property ranges from 145 feet above mean sea level along Cathedral Oaks Road northward to 252 feet above mean sea level at the northeast corner of the property.

For further description of the existing condition of biological resources on the Shelby Property, see Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Shelby Project EIR.

4.7.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations. (Note that since the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the California Department of Fish and Game [DFG] changed its name to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife [DFW]).
4.7.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.7.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

**City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual**

The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual provides environmental thresholds specific to biological resources. This manual primarily uses Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines for its criteria, which states that a project would have a significant impact on the environment if it exceeds the following thresholds:

- conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located;
- substantially affects a rare or endangered species of animal, plant, or the habitat of the species;
- interferes substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; or
- substantially diminishes habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

Determination of impacts is done on a project-by-project basis. Because of the complexity of biological resource issues, substantial variation can occur between projects. Impact assessment must account for both short-term and long-term impacts. Impacts are classified as significant or less than significant, depending on the size, type, and timing of the impact and the biological resources involved. Disturbance to habitats and/or species is considered significant if it affects significant biological resources in the following ways:

- substantially reduces or eliminates species diversity or abundance;
- substantially reduces or eliminates quantity or quality of nesting areas;
- substantially limits reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat;
- substantially fragments, eliminates, or otherwise disrupts foraging areas and/or access to food sources;
- substantially limits or fragments the geographic range or dispersal routes of species; or
- substantially interferes with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

Policy-related impacts to biological resources may be considered less than significant where there is little or no importance to a given habitat and where disturbance would not create a significant impact. For example, disturbance to cultivated agricultural fields or small acreages of nonnative, ruderal habitat would be considered less than significant.

**CEQA Thresholds**

The City also assesses impacts based on the CEQA Guidelines. As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on biological resources if it would:
- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the DFW or USFWS.

- Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Appendix G also identifies the following criteria for determining whether a project’s biological impacts would trigger mandatory findings of significance:

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

- Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

### 4.7.3.2 Project Impacts

#### Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to biological resources. Any short-term or long-term impacts to biological resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are categorized as either Class II or Class III, as described below. Similarly, no additional Class I impacts would result with the GPA. Any incremental increases in short-term or long-term impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would still be categorized as Class II or Class III.
Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to biological resources.

Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-status Habitats and Special-status Species

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with construction of planned land uses, which would have the potential to temporarily remove or degrade special-status habitats and temporarily affect special-status species. Development that would be allowed by the GPA could potentially impact the Santa Barbara honeysuckle, a special-status species on the Shelby property. Therefore, the GPA would result in a small incremental increase in construction-related impacts resulting from additional development above levels considered in the GP/CLUP.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-1 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-1 but would not change its
classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special-status Habitats

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with permanent loss of special-status habitats, including 40 acres of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-2 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the additional development allowed by the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-2 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)
**Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special-status Habitats**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with long-term degradation of special-status habitats, including increased occurrence of invasive nonnative species, changes in hydrology and water flow, or disturbances from unauthorized recreation activities. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-3 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the additional development allowed by the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-3 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 7, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

**Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special-status Habitats**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with fragmentation of existing areas of special-status habitats, especially in riparian corridors. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-4 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
• Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
• Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
• Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
• Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
• Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
• Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
• Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
• Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
• Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
• Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
• Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
• Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the additional development allowed by the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-4 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with harm to listed species, including vernal pool fairy shrimp (Branchinecta lynchi), Southern California steelhead (Southern California ESU) (Oncorhynchus mykiss tridentus), tidewater goby (Eucyclogobius newberryi), red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytonii), Belding’s savannah sparrow (Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi), brown pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis californicus), burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia), California least tern (Stern a antillarum browni), least Bell’s vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus), light-footed clapper rail (Rallus longirostris levipes), peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum), and western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus). The habitats of these species are subject to federal and State regulations as well local ordinances and policies that are designed to protect the species from impacts. However, it is possible other species may be proposed for listing and become listed during implementation of the GP/CLUP.

The GPA would also have the potential to result in this significant impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. This riparian ESHA provides potential habitat for the red-legged frog and least Bell’s vireo. The additional development allowed by the GPA would incrementally increase the potential exposure of these listed species to harm.
The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-5 to a less-than-significant level:

- **Policy CE 1**: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- **Policy CE 2**: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- **Policy CE 3**: Protection of Wetlands
- **Policy CE 4**: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- **Policy CE 5**: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- **Policy CE 6**: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- **Policy CE 7**: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- **Policy CE 8**: Protection of Special-Status Species
- **Policy CE 9**: Protection of Native Woodlands
- **Policy CE 10**: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- **Policy OS 1**: Lateral Shoreline Access
- **Policy OS 2**: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- **Policy OS 3**: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- **Policy OS 4**: Trails and Bikeways
- **Policy OS 5**: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- **Policy OS 6**: Public Park System Plan
- **Policy OS 7**: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- **Policy LU 1**: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- **Policy LU 6**: Park and Open Space Uses
- **Policy LU 9**: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-5 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

**Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with loss, reduction, or isolation of local populations of native species, primarily from habitat loss and degradation. The GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. The development of vacant land not previously considered in the GP/CLUP Final EIR as a result of the GPA would incrementally increase the potential for similar habitat loss and degradation.
The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-6 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-6 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special-status Species

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with reduction of the amount and/or quality of habitat available for special-status species. The GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Development of the Shelby property would incrementally increase the potential for similar reduction in the amount or quality of habitat for special-status species that could inhabit the riparian ESHA.
The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-7 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-7 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

**Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Functions of Existing Wildlife Linkages**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with breaking or impairing the functions of existing wildlife functions, specifically along riparian corridors. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-8 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-8 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with biological resources in areas of conserved habitat. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-9 to a less-than-significant level:
Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
• Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
• Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
• Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
• Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
• Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
• Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
• Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
• Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
• Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
• Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
• Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
• Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
• Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-9 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation plans and local conservation policies for special-status species. The GPA would also have the potential to result in this impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. The development of the Shelby property could incrementally increase the potential for similar conflicts with such conservation plans and policies for any special-status species that could inhabit the riparian ESHA.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.4-10 to a less-than-significant level:

• Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
• Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
• Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
• Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
• Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
• Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
• Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
• Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
• Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
• Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
• Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
• Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
• Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
• Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
• Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
• Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
• Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-10 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6, CE 7, OS 1, OS 2, OS 3, OS 5, and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast or the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to biological resources.

Impact 3.4-11. Impacts to Non-special-status Habitats and Species

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with activities that would remove or degrade non-special-status habitats or adversely affect non-special-status species. The GP/CLUP Final EIR determined that these activities would not substantially alter the non-special-status resources. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also cause similar impacts on non-special-status species such as removal of non-native vegetation or degradation in the quality of the riparian ESHA adjacent to the Shelby property. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-11 but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant). No mitigation is required.

Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class IV impacts (beneficial) related to biological resources.

Impact 3.4-12. Resources Not Affected by Maintenance/Management

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that the maintenance/management of roads, trails, parks, and public facilities within the City’s open space preserves would entail activities that would not fragment special status habitats or break existing wildlife linkages. The GPA would not affect the management and protection of these resources because the Shelby property is not located near these open space preserves. Therefore the GPA would not result in any change to this impact.
Impact 3.4-13. Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Space Areas

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that the protection of ESHAs and maintenance/management of regional and neighborhood open space areas have the potential to benefit special-status habitats and species by preserving lands with these resources, providing for ongoing management, and maintaining linkages to other habitats. Development that would be allowed by the GPA has the potential to reduce this beneficial impact because the Shelby property is adjacent to a riparian ESHA identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, which indirectly supports these habitats. However, because of policies identified for Impacts 3.4-1 through 3.4-8, impacts to ESHAs would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The GPA would not affect the management and protection of resources in these regional and neighborhood open space areas because the Shelby property is not located near these areas. Therefore, residual beneficial (Class IV) impacts would remain after implementation of the GPA.

4.7.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Impact 3.4-14. Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified potentially significant cumulative impacts in the region to biological resources, but found that contribution to these cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the GP/CLUP would be reduced to less-than-significant levels (Class III) by compliance with applicable federal and state regulations and the following GP/CLUP policies protecting biological resources:

- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use in Goleta’s Environs

The additional development allowed by the GPA would result in an incremental increase in similar cumulative impacts to biological resources in the region. Compliance with federal and state regulations and the listed GP/CLUP policies would reduce contributions to cumulative impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.4-14 but would not change its classification as a Class III cumulative impact (less than significant). (Note: Policies OS 5 and LU 9 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area or the coast.)

4.7.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.
4.7.3.5 **Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the GPA would result in significant impacts to biological resources similar to those identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR that would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the biological resource protection policies described under the GP/CLUP. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is required.

(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; "Shelby Project EIR"]).
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4.8  CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 3.5 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for cultural and paleontological resources relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with cultural, historic, and paleontological resources that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.8.1  Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including prehistorical background, ethnographic background, historical background, and paleontological background.

4.8.2  Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.8.3  Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.8.3.1  Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2003) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 8 of the Thresholds Manual, “Cultural Resources Guidelines: Archaeological, Historical, and Ethnic Elements Thresholds,” provides guidance for assessing the significance of cultural, archaeological, and historical impacts associated with a proposed project. The City’s adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

CEQA Thresholds

The following thresholds are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, which identifies the following circumstances that can lead to a determination of significant cultural, archaeological, paleontological, or historical impact:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic cultural site or affect a property of historic or cultural significance to the community or an ethnic or social group;
• Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
• Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

If, based on research, field surveys, and evaluation, a building, structure, site, or feature is determined to not be significant (i.e., not listed or eligible for listing on local, state, or federal register or landmarks lists), then a project would not adversely or significantly affect the resource.

4.8.3.2  Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to cultural resources. Any short-term or long-term impacts to cultural resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are categorized as Class II, as described below. Similarly, no additional Class I impacts would result with the GPA. Any incremental increases in short-term or long-term impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would still be categorized as Class II.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.5-1. Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance

The GP/CLUP Final EIR noted that damage to an archaeological site, Native American site, paleontological site, or historic building is, by definition, long-term, as described below in Impact 3.5-2. Exceptions to this might include a temporary impact to the setting, aesthetics, and integrity of a building or structure as the result of adjacent construction. In this instance, projects contiguous to historic buildings or structures could cause short-term, potentially significant but mitigable impacts (Class II). The additional development allowed by the GPA could also result in similar construction-related impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-1 to a less-than-significant level:
• Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
• Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
• Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.5-1 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).
Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.5-2. Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the potential for loss or destruction of an important historical building, archaeological site, or historical site. It also identified potential significant impact to paleontological resources in areas of western Goleta and a few other areas in the City. The additional development allowed by the GPA could incrementally increase the potential for loss or destruction of such historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-2 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

As stated in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, some projects within the GP/CLUP may require a mixed strategy to include inventory, excavation, and avoidance/preservation. Elements that comprise the built environment, such as buildings and structures, would typically require onsite preservation; archaeological sites may require data recovery excavation and/or preservation.

Similarly, these policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.5-2 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.5-3. Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Site

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with potential for loss or destruction of significant cultural, historical, or paleontological resources within the City as a whole. It also identified potential significant impact to paleontological resources in areas of western Goleta and a few other areas in the City. The additional development allowed by the GPA could incrementally increase the potential for similar impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.5-3 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes

As stated in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, mitigation measures within the policies noted above would serve to reduce the potential impacts of implementing the GP/CLUP to less-than-significant levels. Some projects may require a mixed strategy to include inventory, excavation, and avoidance/preservation. Elements that comprise the built environment, such as buildings and structures, would typically require onsite preservation; archaeological sites may require data recovery excavation and/or preservation.
Similarly, these policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less than significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.5-3 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).

**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to cultural resources. Any short-term or long-term impacts to cultural resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are categorized as Class II, as described above. Similarly, no additional Class III impacts would result with the GPA. Any incremental increases in short-term or long-term impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would still be categorized as Class II.

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the potential for Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to cultural resources if future projects and land uses are designed to preserve important cultural resources, to develop cultural landscapes, or to use the discovery and recordation resources in an educational manner that serves the community as a whole. Development projects allowed by the GPA would have similar potential for Class IV impacts.

**4.8.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that policies in the GP/CLUP to protect cultural resources would ensure that contributions to cumulative impacts on cultural, historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources resulting from GP/CLUP buildout would be less than significant. These policies would minimize the degradation of cultural resources on a project-by-project basis, thereby maintaining cumulative impacts within the City as a whole below significant levels.

The same policies in the GP/CLUP would also be applicable to development on the Shelby property. Therefore, the GPA’s incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural, historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources would also be less than significant.

**4.8.3.4 Mitigation**

**Modifications to General Plan Policies**

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are required.

**Other Suggested Mitigation**

No mitigation is identified.

**4.8.3.5 Residual Impacts**

Following implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures identified for Impacts 3.5-1, 3.5-2, and 3.5-3, cultural impacts of the GPA would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. (NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”]).
SECTION 4.9
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES
4.9 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

Section 3.6 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for geology, soils, and mineral resources relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;

- the impacts associated with geology, soils, and mineral resources that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and

- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.9.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including topography, geology, soils, and mineral resources.

4.9.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.9.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.9.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The Geologic Constraints Guidelines adopted by the City establish the following Threshold:

The purpose of these Guidelines is to provide preliminary criteria for determining whether a particular activity could have a potentially significant impact on the environment as described in Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines. Because geologic conditions are highly variable within Santa Barbara County, these guidelines are not fixed thresholds upon which a determination of significant impact would be made. They serve to point out when further study of site-specific conditions is required in order to assess geologic impacts. The level of project geologic impacts (i.e. potentially significant, potentially significant but subject to effective mitigation, or not significant) is made by City staff (in consultation with licensed geologists and engineers as necessary) upon review of project plans, proposed mitigation measures and site specific geologic information.

CEQA Thresholds

The City also assesses impacts based on the CEQA Guidelines. As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on geology, soils, or mineral resources if it would:

- expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects resulting from the rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, or liquefaction;
• be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed project;
• result in substantial accelerated soil erosion and/or the loss of a substantial amount of topsoil;
• be located on an expansive soil that would create substantial risks to life or property;
• have soils incapable of supporting the use of onsite wastewater disposal systems;
• result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or
• result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

4.9.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to geology, soils, and mineral resources. Any short-term or long-term impacts related to geology, soils, and mineral resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are categorized as Class II or Class III, as described below. Similarly, no additional Class I impacts would result with the GPA. Any incremental increases in short-term or long-term impacts resulting from development allowed by the GPA would still be Class II or Class III.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to geology, soils, and mineral resources.

Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.6-1. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with groundbreaking and vegetation removal during construction, resulting in soil exposure to rain and wind and potentially causing accelerated erosion and deposition of sediment into nearby drainages and/or waterways. Such erosion and sedimentation could result in a short-term increase in turbidity in these waterways, potentially causing water quality degradation.

The Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. §§ 1251, et seq.) and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code §§ 13000, et seq.) require that an approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be prepared for grading activities associated with development. A SWPPP specifies best management practices (BMPs) that prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater with the intent of keeping products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. In addition, construction projects need to adhere to the City’s grading ordinances. These ordinances and state/federal requirements set forth the procedures, standards, and enforcement used to manage soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation in order to sustain the goal of clean water. Accelerated erosion and loss of a substantial amount of topsoil resulting from buildout under the GP/CLUP would be a potentially significant impact.
The additional development allowed by the GPA could also result in similar construction-related impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.6-1 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.6-1 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policy SE 3 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not in beach or shoreline areas.)

**Long-term Impacts**

**Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with exposure to surface fault rupture, strong ground shaking, seismically induced landslides, and/or liquefaction. The additional development allowed by the GPA could increase the exposure to such seismic hazards and result in similar impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.6-2 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.6-2 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).

**Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Buildout on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with exposure to landslides in areas of steep slopes or unstable geologic units or soils, particularly in the northern and southern areas of the City. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also result in exposure to similar impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.6-3 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.6-3 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policy SE 3 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not in beach or shoreline areas.)

Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive and/or Compressible Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People and Structures

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with development in areas with expansive and/or compressible soils. The additional development allowed by the GPA could also result in exposure to similar impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.6-4 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards

Similarly, these policies would reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.6-4 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).

Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to geology, soils, and mineral resources.

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class III impacts related to geology, soils, and mineral resources. Any such short-term impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are categorized as Class II, as described above. Similarly, no additional Class III impacts would result with the GPA. Any incremental increases in short-term impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would still be considered Class II.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.6-5. Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with exposure to Rincon Formation areas capable of emanating radon gas, especially along the City’s northern border. The potential for such exposure is considered an adverse but less-than-significant impact. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also result in potential exposure to similar impacts. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.6-5 but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).
Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to geology, soils, and mineral resources. Buildout of the GP/CLUP is not expected to reduce any hazards related to geology and soils, nor will any mineral resources be preserved as a result of implementation of the GP/CLUP. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur as a result of additional development allowed by the GPA.

4.9.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, impacts related to geologic processes and/or exposure of people and structures to geologic hazards are generally site-specific and do not interact to constitute a cumulative impact. Therefore, no such cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of GP/CLUP implementation. Similarly, any such impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would also not interact to constitute a cumulative impact; therefore no cumulative impacts would result from the GPA.

4.9.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to GP/CLUP policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified Subpolicy SE 1.9 that addressed radon hazards as additional mitigation, which would also mitigate any incremental exposure to radon hazards resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA. No additional mitigation is identified for the GPA.

4.9.3.5 Residual Impacts

As described above, following implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures identified for Impacts 3.6-1 through 3.6-4, geology, soils, and mineral resources impacts of the GPA would be reduced to less-than-significant levels (Class II or Class III).

(Note: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”].)
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4.10 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Section 3.7 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for hazards and hazardous materials relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.10.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including urban and wildland fire hazards; oil and gas production, processing, and transport hazards; hazardous materials and wastes; hazardous materials disclosure program; hazardous materials incidence response; documented releases of hazardous materials and wastes; airport-related hazards; electromagnetic fields (EMFs); and emergency preparedness.

4.10.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.10.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2003) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 14, “Public Safety Thresholds,” and Section 9, “Electromagnetic Fields Thresholds,” provide guidance for assessing the significance of hazards impacts associated with a proposed project.

The City’s adopted thresholds address public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification of facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or nonhazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to occur if the proposed project (i.e., the GP/CLUP) resulted in an increase of public safety risks that exceed risk-based thresholds contained in the City’s Thresholds Manual. For the purposes of this analysis, an impact would be considered significant if it results in an unsafe exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed in Section 3.7.1 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR. For hazardous materials releases, determination of whether unsafe exposure levels exist is dependent upon the following: type of hazardous material released, media to which the hazardous material was released (e.g., to air, soil, or water), concentration of which such hazardous material exists in air, soil, or water, duration of the release, and persistence of the hazardous material in the
environment. Permissible exposure levels if such releases occur are estimated in the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Handbook.

According to the Thresholds Manual, there is potential of significant impact on public safety from a project if the following conditions within the proposed development exist:

- oil wells and gas wells and associated production;
- gas and hazardous liquid pipelines; or
- oil and/or gas processing and storage facilities.

Hazards and hazardous materials releases associated with these types of facilities, which may result in significant impacts, are discussed in Section 3.7.1.2 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The Thresholds Manual also includes a threshold for EMF exposure—in particular, radio frequency radiation (RFR). No specific threshold has been adopted in the City of Goleta for extremely low frequency (ELF); instead, ELF exposure should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis using the most current scientific data. For RFR, standards have been established for effects resulting from thermal heating of body tissue. The most widely used conservative standards are the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers-American National Standards Institute (IEEE-ANSI) C95.1-1992, which are based on power densities (see Figures 2 and 3 of Section 9, City of Goleta 2003). A significant impact to humans would occur if:

- humans are exposed to RFR in excess of the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992 standard, through the siting of new projects next to RFR sources or through the siting of new RFR sources adjacent to sensitive receptors (If the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] rulemaking committee adopts a revised standard, said standard shall apply).

**CEQA Thresholds**

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of this document, implementation of the GP/CLUP may have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials if it would result in any of the following:

- create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- include a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- create a safety hazard for people residing or working in an area within two miles of a public or public use airport;
- impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
• expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

4.10.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class I impacts involving the creation of a public safety hazard, exposure of people to hazardous materials, or conflicts with any emergency response or evacuation plan. Any such impacts are classified as long-term impacts as they are not of a transient nature. Similarly, no additional short-term Class I impacts would occur as a result of additional development allowed by the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities

The Shelby property is not located near the Venoco Facilities. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-1 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-2. Transport

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with exposure of populations following buildout of the GP/CLUP to the risks of transportation of hazardous materials on US-101, State Route 17 (SR-217), Hollister Avenue, and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. These hazards are considered significant. The Shelby site is not near these transportation routes and would not be subject to these risks. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-2.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) involving the creation of a public safety hazard, exposure of people to hazardous materials, or conflicts with any emergency response or evacuation plan. Any such impacts are classified as long-term impacts as they are not of a transient nature. Similarly, no additional short-term Class II impacts would occur as a result of additional development allowed by the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells

The Shelby property is not near the State Lands (S.L.) 421 wells. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-3 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
Impact 3.7-4.  Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal

The Shelby property is not near the Ellwood Marine Terminal. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-4 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-5.  Airport

The Shelby property is not within Airport Clear Zones or Airport one-mile markers. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-5 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-6. Wildland Fires

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with wildland fires in areas classified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) as wildland fire hazard areas. The Shelby property is not within a wildland fire hazard area. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-6 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials used during site grading and construction activities, such as fuels, solvents, paint, and other similar substances, that could adversely affect local surface water quality. These impacts are considered potentially significant. The additional development allowed by the GPA could potentially result in similar impacts during site grading and construction activities.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR stated that implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plans would reduce impact on the environment from such spills of hazardous materials, as required by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Board’s implementation of the Clean Water Act. In addition, it identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.7-7 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
  - CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
  - CE 1.3: Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs
  - CE 1.4: Illegal Destruction of ESHAs
  - CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs
  - CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs
  - CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to ESHAs
  - CE 1.8: ESHA Buffers
  - CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects
  - CE 1.10: Management of ESHAs
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
  - CE 2.1: Designation of Protected Creeks
  - CE 2.2: Streamside Protection Areas
• CE 2.3: Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas
• CE 2.4: Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests
• CE 2.5: Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems
• CE 2.6: Restoration of Degraded Creeks

• Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
  • CE 3.1: Definition of Wetlands
  • CE 3.2: Designation of Wetland ESHAs
  • CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations
  • CE 3.4: Protection of Wetlands
  • CE 3.5: Wetland Buffer Areas
  • CE 3.6: Mitigation of Wetland Fill
  • CE 3.7: Lagoon Protection
  • CE 3.8: Vernal Pool Protection

• Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
  • CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality
  • CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development
  • CE 10.4: New Facilities
  • CE 10.5: Beachfront and Blufftop Development
  • CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements
  • CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans
  • CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities
  • CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.7-7 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites

The Shelby property is not a listed/contaminated sites as defined by Government Code § 65962.5, and is not within 0.5 miles of such listed/contaminated sites. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-9 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soil

The Shelby property is not in an area with past oil development activities that may include contaminated soils. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-9 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class III impacts involving the exposure of people or the environment to hazards and hazardous materials. Any such impacts are classified as long-term impacts as they are not of a transient nature. Similarly, no additional short-term Class III impacts would occur as a result of additional development allowed by the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.7-10. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines

The Shelby property is not in an area with oil and gas pipelines. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-10 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-11. Ellwood Facility

The Shelby property is not near the Ellwood Facility. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-11 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-12. EMFs

The Shelby property is not in the vicinity of transmission corridors or substations. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.7-12 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.7-13. Upset and Accident Conditions

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with potential release of hazardous materials into the environment during the course of landscaping or building maintenance activities. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also have a similar potential for release of such hazardous materials and would potentially result in similar less-than-significant impacts. The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.7-13 but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).

Impact 3.7-14. Contaminated Groundwater

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with exposure of the community to contaminated groundwater associated with a federal National Priorities List (NPL) hazardous waste site or leaking underground storage tank (LUST) site. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also have a similar exposure to contaminated groundwater and would potentially result in similar less-than-significant impacts.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policy that would ensure that the community is protected from exposure to groundwater contamination:

- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
This policy would also ensure that the properties affected by the GPA would also be protected from exposure to groundwater contamination. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.7-14 but would not change its classification as a Class III impact (less than significant).

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to hazards and hazardous materials. Buildout of the GP/CLUP is not expected to reduce any exposure to public safety hazards or exposure of people to hazardous materials. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur with the GPA.

**4.10.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that, while the implementation of the GP/CLUP would increase the number of persons potentially exposed to hazards and hazardous materials, development of Emergency Preparedness Programs and implementation of GP/CLUP policies would provide adequate safety protection for the public and the environment. The GP/CLUP Final EIR also noted that risks resulting from exposure of people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials are usually site-specific and generally do not combine with similar effects that could occur with other projects throughout the cumulative study area. Therefore, any cumulative impacts resulting from such exposures are less than significant.

The GPA would also result in an increase in the number of persons potentially exposed to hazards and hazardous materials, but the same programs and policies identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would also adequately protect the public and environment. Such an incremental increase would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

**4.10.3.4 Mitigation**

**Modifications to General Plan Policies**

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

**Other Suggested Mitigation**

No mitigation is identified.

**4.10.3.5 Residual Impacts**

No changes to Impacts 3.7-1 and 3.7-2 would result with the GPA; these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I). As described above, following implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures identified for Impacts 3.7-3 through 3.7-14, the incremental increases to these impacts resulting from the GPA would be reduced to less-than-significant levels (Class II or Class III).

(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR)].
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4.11 LAND USE AND RECREATION

Section 3.10 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for land use and recreation relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with land use and recreation that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.11.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including land use, built environment, and recreation and open space.

4.11.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.11.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.11.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual does not provide environmental thresholds specific to land use and recreation; however, the Thresholds Manual does observe that quality of life should be considered when evaluating land uses proposed by a given project. Quality of life can be broadly defined as the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way in which those groups function. Where a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment is demonstrated, the project’s effect on quality of life shall be considered significant. Quality of life issues, while difficult to quantify, are often primary concerns to the community affected by a project. Examples of such issues that directly involve land use and planning include the loss of privacy and/or neighborhood incompatibility.

CEQA Thresholds

The City also assesses impacts based on the CEQA Guidelines. As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on land use and planning if it would:

a) physically divide an established community;

b) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan,
local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
c) conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to recreation if it would:
a) increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
b) include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

4.11.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any short- or long-term Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to land use or recreation. The GPA would be consistent with the GP/CLUP if the GPA is approved; therefore no additional Class I impacts would occur with implementation of the GPA.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to land use.

Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with construction-related activities that have the potential to result in temporary impacts due to conflicts with applicable land use policies and/or regulations. The additional development allowed by the GPA also has the potential to result in similar conflicts resulting from construction-related activities.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.10-1 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.10-1 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policy LU 10 is not applicable to this project because it is not an energy project. Policies CE 6 and CE 7 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast.)

Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities

The Shelby property is not near planned recreational facilities identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.10-2 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with potential conflicts with applicable environmental impact mitigation policies and/or regulations of other agencies that maintain full or partial jurisdictions within the City planning area. The additional development allowed by the GPA has the potential to result in similar conflicts with such land use policies and/or regulations.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.10-3 to a less-than-significant level:

- 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 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
• Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs
• Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
• Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
• Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
• Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta’s RHNA
• Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing
• Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
• Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
• Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
• Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. The GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.10-3 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies LU 8, OS 5, and SE 9 are not applicable to the Shelby property because it is not in or near the Central Hollister Residential Development Area, the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area, or the airport hazard areas. Policy LU 10 is not applicable to this project because it is not an energy project.)

Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with proposed activities that are inconsistent with approved conservation plans and local conservation policies. Development of the Shelby property would also have the potential to result in this impact because it is adjacent to or contain ESHAs identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR (Riparian/Marsh/Vernal Pool).

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.10-4 to a less-than-significant level:

• Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
• Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
• Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
• Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
• Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs
• Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
• Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
• Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
• Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
• Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
• Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
• Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
• Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
• Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
• Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
• Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
• Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
• Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
• Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
• Policy VH 3: Community Character
• Policy TE 9: Parking

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.10-4 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies LU 9, OS 2, OS 3, CE 6, CE 7, and SE 3 are not applicable to the Shelby property because it is not near the coast. Policy OS 5 is not applicable because the Shelby property is not in or near the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area.)

Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the loss of privacy or the creation of other conditions incompatible with existing neighborhoods. Development of the Shelby property would also have the potential to result in this impact because it is adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.10-5 to a less-than-significant level:
• 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 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
• Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs
• Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
• Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
• Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
• Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
• Policy VH 3: Community Character
• Policy VH 4: Design Review
• Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
• Policy PF 5: School Facilities
• Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
• Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.10-5 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies LU 8 and LU 9 are not applicable to the Shelby property because it is not near the Central Hollister Residential Area or the coast.)

Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities

The Shelby property is not near planned recreational facilities identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.10-6 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with greater wear and tear of existing recreational facilities due to the additional development/population. Development of the Shelby property would have the potential to result in a small incremental increase in this impact due to the incremental growth in residential population using such recreational facilities.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.10-7 to a less-than-significant level:
• Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
• Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
• Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
• Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
• Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
• Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
• Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta’s Environs
• Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
• Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
• Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
• Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Facilities
• Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
• Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
• Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
• Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
• Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
• Policy PF 5: School Facilities

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.10-7 but would not change its classification as a Class II impact (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies LU 8, LU 9, and OS 2 are not applicable to the Shelby property because it is not near the Central Hollister Residential Area or the coast. Policy LU 10 is not applicable because this project is not an energy project.)

**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

**Short-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to land use or recreation. Any short-term impacts related to land use or recreation are classified as Class II, as described above. The incremental increases in short-term impacts resulting from additional development allowed by the GPA would also be classified as Class II. No additional short-term Class III impacts would occur with the GPA.

**Long-term Impacts**

*Impact 3.10-8. Physical Division of an Established Community Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses*

Buildout of the GP/CLUP would generally result in more efficient growth and development, with vacant sites having land use designations similar to existing land uses surrounding those sites. Transportation improvements identified in the GP/CLUP would not result in the physical division of an established community. The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified impacts associated with division of established communities by projects and transportation improvements as less than significant.

Development of the Shelby property would occur on a vacant site that would also be surrounded by residential or similar uses. No new roads or right-of-ways that would physically divide an established community would be required to service development on the Shelby property. Therefore, the GPA would not result in any change to Impact 3.10-8.

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to land use and recreation. Increased development resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP is not expected to result in any beneficial impacts on land use and planning or recreation. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur with the additional development allowed by the GPA.

**4.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR anticipated that development of the identified related projects and general regional growth would be reviewed for consistency with adopted and applicable land use plans and policies, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Planning and Zoning Law (Government Code §§ 65000 et seq.), and the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code §§
66410 et seq.), all of which require findings of general plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. For this reason, the GP/CLU Final EIR deemed cumulative impacts associated with inconsistency of future development with adopted plans and policies to be less than significant.

Development that would result from the GPA would also be subject to these consistency reviews. Therefore, the GPA would result in an incremental contribution to these cumulative impacts, but not change their classification as less than significant.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR also identified a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative impacts related to recreational facilities due to future planned recreation, policies supporting maintenance of existing facilities in the GP/CLUP, and the requirement for in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland (pursuant to the Quimby Act (Government Code §66477)) required for individual projects. The incremental increase in population due to development associated with the GPA would not result in significant cumulative impacts to recreational facilities for the same reasons.

4.11.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

4.11.3.5 Residual Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR noted that implementation of the GP/CLUP land use policies would reduce all significant Class II land use impacts to a less-than-significant level. As noted above, the incremental increases in these impacts would also be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the same GP/CLUP land use policies.

(Note: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”].)
SECTION 4.12
NOISE
4.12 NOISE

Section 3.11 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for noise relating to the proposed project;
- the impacts associated with noise that would result from the proposed project; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.12.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including noise sensitive land uses, noise fundamentals and terminology, and existing noise levels.

4.12.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.12.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance that lead agencies can use to develop specific CEQA significance thresholds. The City’s adopted Thresholds Manual (City of Goleta 2003) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 12 of the Thresholds Manual, Noise Thresholds, provides guidance for assessing the significance of noise impacts associated with a proposed project.

The following are thresholds of significance for assisting in the determination of significant noise impacts. The thresholds are intended to be used with flexibility, as each project must be viewed in its specific circumstances.

a. A proposed development that would generate noise levels in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and could affect sensitive receptors would generally be presumed to have a significant impact.

b. Outdoor living areas of noise sensitive uses that are subject to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL would generally be presumed to be significantly impacted by ambient noise. A significant impact would also generally occur where interior noise levels cannot be reduced to 45 dBA CNEL or less.

c. A project would generally have a significant effect on the environment if it would increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise sensitive receptors adjoining areas. Per item a., this may generally be presumed when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are increased to 65 dBA CNEL or more. However, a significant effect may also occur when
ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dBA CNEL, as determined on a case-by-case level.

d. Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities, would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to the USEPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1,600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA. Construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors on weekdays outside of the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on weekends would generally be presumed to have a significant effect. Noise attenuation barriers and muffling of grading equipment may also be required. Construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dBA may require additional mitigation.

**CEQA Thresholds**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidelines for assessing the significance of noise impacts under CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a significant noise impact can occur if a project would result in:

- exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels;
- a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- for a project is located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or
- for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

All noise studies evaluating ambient noise levels and changes resulting from project development should be prepared by licensed acoustical engineers.

### 4.12.3.2 Project Impacts

**Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to noise.
Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to single-event and nuisance noise levels from construction. Development that would be allowed by the GPA would also have the potential to result in similar exposure to construction-related noise.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce construction-related noise impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP, but not to a less-than-significant level in all cases:

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA, but may not reduce them to a less-than-significant level in all cases. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.11-1, which would remain significant and unavoidable.

Long-term Impacts

Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with noise levels at sensitive receptors from increased vehicular traffic levels, in some cases enough for noise levels to exceed 65 dBA CNEL. The Shelby property is not within any noise contour for 2030 GP/CLUP buildout conditions that is 65 dBA CNEL or higher. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.11-2 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with new noise-sensitive receptors being constructed in areas with noise levels exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. The Shelby property is not within any noise contour for 2030 GP/CLUP buildout conditions that is 65 dBA CNEL or higher. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.11-3 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise

The Shelby property is not within the noise contour for railway sources of 65 dBA or higher, as identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.11-4 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Impact 3.11-5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources

The Shelby property is not near industrial or other point sources. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.11-5 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to noise. Any impacts related to noise are classified as Class I (above) or Class III (below). The additional development allowed by the GPA would result in incremental increases in these impacts, but would not change their classification as Class I or Class III. No additional Class II impacts will result with the GPA.

Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to noise. Any short-term noise impacts are classified as Class I (as discussed above). The incremental increase in short-term impacts resulting from the GPA would increase the severity of these Class I impacts. No additional short-term Class III impacts would result with the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class III impact related to noise.

Impact 3.11-6. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise

The Shelby property is not in areas affected by high aircraft noise levels. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.11-6 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to noise. Development resulting from buildout of the GPA would not cause any beneficial reduction in sources of noise within the City. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur with the additional development allowed by the GPA.

4.12.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a significant and unavoidable contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses along the following roadways in the City:

- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Patterson Avenue
- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Ribera Avenue
- Fairview Avenue north of Hollister Avenue
- Hollister Avenue west of Pacific Oaks Drive
- Storke Road north of Marketplace Drive
- Storke Road north of Phelps Road

The GPA would result in incremental increases to traffic and resulting traffic noise on at least one of these roadway segments, Storke Road north of Phelps Road. Therefore, the GPA would contribute to the significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impacts.
4.12.3.4  **Mitigation**

**Modifications to General Plan Policies**

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

**Other Suggested Mitigation**

No mitigation is identified.

4.12.3.5  **Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the GPA would result in additional impacts over what was identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, including exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to increased noise from construction. No modification of General Plan policies or mitigation is proposed. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”].)
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4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Section 3.8 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for population and housing relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- population and housing impacts associated with implementation of buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.13.1 Existing Conditions

4.13.1.1 Population

The population conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR and updated as follows.

The January 2013 population for the City of Goleta was 29,962, which was 7.0% of the Santa Barbara County population (429,200) (California Department of Finance 2013). The average population density for the City was 5.6 people per acre, or 3,563 per square mile. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments’ (SBCAG’s) Regional Growth Forecast 2010-2040 Report includes the population projections for the City and the County as listed in Table 4.13-1 and summarized below (SBCAG 2012).

The 2010 median age within the City was 36.5 years, compared to the County median of 33.6 years and the state median of 35.2 years. In 2010, approximately 25% of City residents were 19 years old or younger, 9.8% were between 20 and 24, and over 11% were senior citizens over 65 years old (American Fact Finder 2013).

In 2010, nearly 70% of the City’s population was considered white with no other race identified in their heritage. The largest single racial minority was Asian, making up 9.1% of the population. Approximately 4.6% of the population had a mixed racial heritage. Nearly one-third of the City’s population (32.9%) identified 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 as Hispanics may be of any race, and persons of Hispanic heritage are now reported separately (American Fact Finder 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>28,888</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>34,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>423,800</td>
<td>428,600</td>
<td>445,900</td>
<td>470,400</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>507,500</td>
<td>522,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCAG 2012.
* The SBCAG’s Regional Growth Forecast did not provide specific data for these years.
Household and Family Size

The estimated 2010 average household size for the City was 2.72, and the average family size was 3.23 (American Fact Finder 2013). The 2007 to 2011 median annual household income within the current City limits was $72,870, compared to the County median of $61,896 and state median of $61,632 (US Census 2013a, 2013b).

4.13.1.2 Employment

The employment conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR and updated as follows.

Government workers made up 21.5% of the civilian employed population over 15 years old in Goleta during the 2007 to 2011 time period. By industry, educational services/health care/social assistance was the largest industry type, with 31.9% of the civilian employed population over 15 years old. The next highest industry type, with 11.8%, was professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management services, followed by manufacturing (11.6%) and retail trade (11.2%) (US Census 2013c).

Jobs-Housing Ratio and Jobs-Employed Residents Ratio

The jobs-housing ratio and jobs-employed residents ratio discussions in the GP/CLUP Final EIR are incorporated by reference into this SEIR and updated as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Total Resident Population</th>
<th>Total Workers Working in Place</th>
<th>Total Workers Living in Place</th>
<th>Employment – Residence Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>29,962</td>
<td>21,764</td>
<td>14,832</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla Vista Census Designated Place</td>
<td>23,344</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>87,859</td>
<td>66,437</td>
<td>44,778</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>94,645</td>
<td>42,182</td>
<td>39,178</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>13,122</td>
<td>6,318</td>
<td>6,737</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>41,864</td>
<td>10,806</td>
<td>16,774</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>416,051</td>
<td>201,240</td>
<td>189,106</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.13.1.3 Housing Characteristics

The housing characteristics discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR and updated as follows.

As of January 2011, there were an estimated 11,472 housing units in the City, which represented 7.5% of the County’s housing units at that time (California Department of Finance 2011). Comparisons of housing units, vacancy rates, and persons per household for January 2011 are shown in Table 4.13-3.
TABLE 4.13-3  
(TYPE 3.8-3 IN THE GP/CLUP FINAL EIR)  
2011 HOUSING ESTIMATES  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Santa Barbara County Total</th>
<th>Percent of County</th>
<th>City of Goleta</th>
<th>Percent of City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>153,254</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached Units</td>
<td>90,095</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached Units</td>
<td>10,173</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family (2–4 Units)</td>
<td>14,757</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family (5+ Units)</td>
<td>30,323</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>7,906</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent Vacant                 | 7.0%                       | 5.0%              | -2.0%          |
| Persons per Household          | 2.8                        | 2.7               | -0.1           |

Source: California Department of Finance 2011.

Housing Affordability and Costs

According to the U.S. Census American Community Survey, 54.2% of housing in the City is owner occupied (Find the Data 2013).

Since the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the increase in Goleta Valley housing prices have slowed, but have not declined as has happened in other parts of the state.

4.13.1.4 Regional Housing Needs and Available Land

The regional housing needs and available land discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR and updated as follows.

Since the GP/CLUP Final EIR, SBCAG has updated the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) (SBCAG 2008). The City of Goleta was allocated a total of 1,641 units for the 2007 to 2014 planning period as shown in Table 4.13-4.

TABLE 4.13-4  
(TYPE 3.8-4 IN THE GP/CLUP FINAL EIR)  
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA) FOR GOLETA (2007–2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Category</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent of All 2010 Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-Income</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate-Income</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Low- and Very Low-Income (Defined as Total “Lower-income” Units)</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2008.

Production of new housing that is in the permitting process or has been completed since the beginning of the RHNA period (January 1, 2007) through December 2012 has met all of the City’s need for above-moderate income housing. Table 4.13-5 shows the City’s remaining need as of December 2012.
TABLE 4.13-5  
(TABLE 3.8-5 IN THE GP/CLUP FINAL EIR)  
SUMMARY OF REMAINING REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS (2007–2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Low-Income</th>
<th>Low-Income</th>
<th>Moderate-Income</th>
<th>Above Moderate-Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Completed (2007–2012)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Projects</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Residential Developments</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Need (2013–2014)</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>+824</td>
<td>+144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Affordable Housing Need</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Development Potential in Goleta

The housing development potential discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR.

4.13.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.13.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.13.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s Thresholds 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 § 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.

4.13.3.2 Project Impacts

Assessment of Impacts

Table 4.13-6 summarizes the changes in population, jobs, and the jobs-to-housing ratio as a result of build-out of the GP/CLUP, as identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, and the additional impacts resulting from the GPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.13-6</th>
<th>(TABLE 3.8-7 IN THE GP/CLUP FINAL EIR)</th>
<th>CITY OF GOLETA GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN POTENTIAL BUILDOUT1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP/CLUP Existing</td>
<td>GP/CLUP Change/Additional Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>30,679</td>
<td>7,421 (24% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>23,0002 19,7003</td>
<td>3,400 to 3,900 (15 to 18% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Units</td>
<td>11,615</td>
<td>3,880 (33% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs to Housing Ratio</td>
<td>2.32 1.70</td>
<td>0.87 to 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Residents in:</td>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>5,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta CDP</td>
<td>27,515</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs to Employed Residents Ratio in:</td>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>0.58-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta CDP5</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1 Assumes full buildout of the GP/CLUP would occur.
2 This estimate is based on SBCAG Regional Housing Needs for Santa Barbara County Report, which used the 2000 Census Journey to Work Place database (SBCAG 2002b).
3 This estimate is based on SBCAG Traffic Analysis Zone Data.
6 Housing unit totals are maximum buildout estimates allowed under the Land Use Plan to approximately 2030. These are not the same as the Housing Element, which does not include all potential unit for all mixed-use and redevelopment sites. Housing units on mixed use and redevelopment sites in the Housing Element are related to the 2001 – 2009 RHNA planning period.
The GPA would allow for the development of an additional 14.38 acres. If the highest density allowed within the City for residential properties was assumed for the Shelby property (30 units per acre), this could result in a maximum of 431 residential units.

However, actual density would likely be substantially less. For the Shelby property, the surrounding residential tracts are zoned Single-family Residential, with a maximum density of 5 units per acre (as proposed in the Land Use Plan Map changes for Shelby, discussed below). For this analysis a similar zoning is assumed for this 14.38-acre property, resulting in an estimated 72 residential units for this site. The current agricultural land use designation on the site allows for 1 dwelling unit, so the net increase would be 71 additional dwelling units (a net increase of 0.4% over the number projected at GP/CLUP buildout).

With an average household size in California of 2.72, the GPA would result in a net increase in population on this property of 193. This would be a net increase of 0.5% over the population projected at buildout of the GP/CLUP.

**Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that implementation of the GP/CLUP would not result in any short- or long-term Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to population and housing. Any impacts related to population and housing are classified as Class II or Class III (as discussed below). The incremental increases in these impacts due to additional development allowed by the GPA would not change their classification as Class II or Class III. No additional Class I impacts would occur with the GPA.

**Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to population and housing.

**Short-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 Land within the City*

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the secondary or indirect effects of population growth. The GPA would result in additional population growth if these parcels are developed in accordance with the assumptions discussed above. The population growth would be approximately 0.5% greater than that discussed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR and could lead to additional secondary or indirect effects.

The following sections of the GP/CLUP Final EIR, supplemented by this SEIR, address the indirect impacts and mitigation measures associated with population increase:

- Section 3.1, "Aesthetics and Visual Resources";
- Section 3.2, "Agriculture";
- Section 3.3, "Air Quality";
- Section 3.4, "Biological Resources";
- Section 3.5, "Cultural Resources";
- Section 3.6, “Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources”;
- Section 3.7, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”;
- Section 3.9, “Water Resources”;
- Section 3.10, “Land Use and Recreation”;
- Section 3.11, “Noise”;
- Section 3.12, “Public Services and Utilities”; and
- Section 3.13, “Transportation and Circulation.”

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policy that would reduce Impact 3.8-1 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management

Similarly, this policy would also reduce impacts associated with the population increase resulting from the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.8-1 but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**Long-term Impacts**


The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the 24% population growth that would result from full buildout of the GP/CLUP. The population growth itself over the 24 years assumed to GP/CLUP buildout was not considered significant, but the indirect impacts of the population increase would be considered potentially significant. The GPA would add 0.5% to the population increase identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, for a 24.5% population growth over 24 years.

The sections of the GP/CLUP Final EIR listed under Impact 3.8-1, supplemented by this SEIR, address the indirect impacts and mitigation measures associated with population increase.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policy that would reduce Impact 3.8-2 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management

Implementation of this policy is anticipated to reduce population growth and housing impacts resulting from both buildout of the GP/CLUP and GPA to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.8-2, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

*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.*

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts due to population growth associated with the addition of 3,880 residential units that could be constructed at full buildout of the GP/CLUP. The GPA could add another 71 residential units, for a total of 3,951 units over 24 years. These
totals are not the same as those in the City of Goleta Housing Element, which looks at buildout through 2014 (City of Goleta 2010).

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified programs in the City’s Housing Element that identify specific numerical targets for units and anticipated dates by which the RHNA targets are proposed to be accomplished. The GP/CLUP Final EIR also identified the following policies from the Housing Element related to the provision of adequate housing stock and meeting the RHNA targets:

- Policy HE 1: Equal Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
- Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta’s RHNA
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing
- Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development
- Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified several factors that may constrain the City’s ability to address housing needs, such as physical and environmental considerations, governmental regulations, and market factors. The Housing Element includes a constraints analysis to analyze potential and actual governmental and nongovernmental limitations to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for all persons of all income levels, including persons with disabilities. In addition, the Housing Element includes implementation programs that would address potential constraints to future housing construction.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that implementation of the Housing Element policies and implementation programs is anticipated to reduce potential impacts related to providing an adequate and serviceable housing stock to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA’s incremental addition to the City’s housing stock to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.8-3, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**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.**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR stated that the 3,880 additional housing units resulting from GP/CLUP buildout would help maintain an existing balance between jobs and housing, or between jobs and employed residents, within the City. The GP/CLUP Final EIR also stated that any increase in jobs resulting from the development of additional commercial/industrial space not coordinated

---

6 Policy HE 11 has been modified in the 2010 Housing Element (since the GP/CLUP Final EIR) to include extremely low-income housing.
with the construction of new residential development within the City could result in an imbalance in the current jobs-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 Highway 101. This imbalance was considered a potentially significant impact.

The GPA could result in additional residential units within the City, but not job-producing commercial or industrial uses. These additional units would improve the City’s jobs-to-housing balance but not to a significant degree.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.8-4 to a less-than-significant level:

- 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

The GPA would result in up to 71 additional residential units within the City, but not job-producing commercial or industrial uses. These additional units would improve the City’s jobs-to-housing balance but not to a significant degree. Therefore, the GPA would not result in any incremental increases to Impact 3.8-3, and would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

**Short-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to population and housing. Any short-term impacts related to population and housing are classified as Class II (as discussed above). The incremental increases in these short-term impacts due to additional development allowed by the GPA would not change their classification as Class II. No additional short-term Class III impacts would occur with the GPA.
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 GP/CLUP Final EIR found that the implementation of the GP/CLUP would not result in displacement of a substantial number of people or existing homes. Impacts on the City’s current population or existing homes are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required. The GPA would potentially result in only one residential displacement as a result of the loss of the existing house on the Shelby property; therefore, no additional significant impacts would occur and no additional mitigation is necessary.

Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to population and housing. The anticipated improvement in the City’s jobs-to-housing ratio from 2.3:1 to 1:1 at full GP/CLUP buildout was considered a long-term Class IV impact in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. As described above in “Assessment of Impacts,” the GPA would not substantially affect the anticipated jobs-to-housing ratio. Therefore, the GPA would not substantially change the level of this beneficial impact.

4.13.3.3  Cumulative Impacts

The GP/CLUP stated that cumulative development is anticipated to both accommodate and induce population growth, depending upon the type of development proposed. However, population growth has been forecast in local and regional planning documents, and appropriate plans, policies, and regulations are in place to accommodate this growth. The GP/CLUP was intended to address population and growth issues in Goleta and the region, including a substantial affordable housing shortage in the County. The residential use and associated population increases for the cumulative study area have been projected and considered in regional growth plans. Thus, the estimated population increase of 24% over the next 25 years due to GP/CLUP buildout is not considered in and of itself to be a significant impact. 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 cumulatively considerable and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

The GPA would result in an additional maximum population increase of 193 persons, or a 0.5% increase over what was projected in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. This incremental increase does not represent a significant change from the population projection at GP/CLUP buildout. Therefore the GPA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts associated with an inducement of substantial population growth in the area. The GPA would not change the classification of these impacts as less than significant.

4.13.3.4  Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.
4.13.3.5 **Residual Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would be no residual impacts related to population and housing. Implementation of the GPA would also result in no residual impacts related to population and housing.
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4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Section 3.12 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for public services and utilities relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with for public services and utilities that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.14.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including police protection, fire protection services, water supply, wastewater management services, solid waste, privately provided utilities, public schools, library services, parks and recreation facilities, and public services and utilities.

4.14.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.14.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.14.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The City’s Thresholds Manual provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 15, “School Thresholds,” and Section 17, “Solid Waste Thresholds,” provide guidance for assessing the significance of project impacts to area schools and the City’s solid waste generation based on landfill capacity.

Schools

The project would have a significant impact if it would:

- generate sufficient students to require an additional classroom (this assumes 29 students per classroom for elementary/junior high and 28 students per classroom for high school, based on the lowest student per classroom loading standards of the State school building program). This threshold is to be applied in those school districts which are currently approaching, at, or exceeding their current capacity.
Solid Waste

The project would have a significant impact if it would:

- generate 5% or more of the expected average annual increase in waste generation thereby using a significant portion of the remaining landfill capacity (the numerical value associated with this 5% is approximately 196 tons per year increase). If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year, after receiving a reduction and recycling credit of 50%, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. A typical single-family residential project of 68 units or less would not trigger the threshold of significance.

CEQA Thresholds

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the circumstances that can lead to a determination of significant public service impact. Significant impacts would occur with implementation of the GP/CLUP if results included substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- fire protection;
- police protection;
- schools;
- parks; or
- other public facilities.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the following circumstances that can lead to a determination of significant utility and service system impact:

- The project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB.
- The project requires or results in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- The project results in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand.
- The project is served by a landfill with inadequate capacity to meet the project’s solid waste disposal needs.
- The project does not comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.

Thresholds and impact analysis related to water supply are provided in Section 3.9, Water Resources, of this SEIR. Thresholds and impact analysis related to public parks and recreation are provided in Section 3.10, Land Use and Recreation.
4.14.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term or long-term Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to public services and utilities. Any impacts related to public services and utilities are classified as either Class II or Class III, as described below. The incremental increases in these impacts due to additional development allowed by the GPA would not change their classification as Class II or Class III. No additional Class I impacts would result with the GPA.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to public services and utilities. Impacts to the capacity of public services and utilities are not transient in nature and therefore are considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class II impacts would result with the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to public services and utilities.

Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand for law enforcement and police service in the City due to population growth, creating the need for an additional seven to ten police officers, additional equipment, and capital projects such as additions to existing facilities or new facilities.

The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand for such police services and would incrementally add to this Class II impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce impacts to police protection services associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-1, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand for fire protection services in the City due to population growth, creating the need for additional
personnel, equipment, and facilities or new facilities. The increased population would exacerbate existing deficiencies in fire protection in the City.

The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand for such fire protection services and would incrementally add to this Class II impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified multiple policies and objectives in the GP/CLUP intended to address fire protection service and to accommodate projected growth, including the addition of a new fire station, which has not yet been implemented. The following policies would reduce impacts to police protection services associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-2, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand on the City’s wastewater collection and service providers due to population growth. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand for such wastewater services and would incrementally add to this Class I impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce impacts to the City’s wastewater treatment facilities and service providers associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-3, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand for utilities such as electricity and natural gas due to population growth. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand for these utilities and would incrementally add to this Class II impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce impacts related to demand for utilities associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 6: Utilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development
- Policy CE 13: Energy Conservation

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-4, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand on local school districts due to population growth. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand on local school districts and would incrementally add to this Class II impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policy that would reduce impacts related to demand on school districts associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 5: School Facilities

Similarly, this policy would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-5, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand on Library Facilities**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with increased demand on library facilities due to population growth. The additional development allowed by the GPA would also increase demand on library facilities and would incrementally add to this Class II impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce impacts related to demand on library facilities associated with GP/CLUP buildout to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts resulting from the GPA to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-6, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).
**Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

**Short-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to public services and utilities. Impacts to the capacity of public services and utilities are not transient in nature and therefore are considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class III impacts would result with the GPA.

**Long-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class III impacts related to public services and utilities.

**Impact 3.12-7. Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant impacts associated with increases in solid waste generation due to population growth. Development of the Shelby property allowed by the GPA would also cause an incremental increase in solid waste generation and have the potential to result in this less-than-significant impact. No mitigation is required.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified Policy PF 9, Coordination of Facilities with Future Development, which would limit development in the event that landfill capacity is achieved and thus ensure these impacts would remain less than significant. This policy would also apply to additional development allowed by the GPA and similarly ensure impacts resulting from the GPA would remain less than significant. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.12-7, but would not change its classification as Class III (less than significant).

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to public facilities and services. Buildout of the GP/CLUP is not expected to result in additional capacity to public facilities and services that would exceed what would be required to accommodate levels of development projected by the GP/CLUP. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur with the GPA.

**4.14.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

**Police and Fire Protection**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified less-than-significant contributions to cumulative impacts for police and fire services due to the requirements for Goleta Development Impact Fees for new development. The Police Facility Development Impact Fee is required pursuant to Chapter 16.21 of the Goleta Municipal Code. The Fire Facility Development Impact Fee is required for properties within the City and unincorporated areas of the Goleta Valley pursuant to Section 15-79 of the Santa Barbara County Code.

Development resulting from the GPA would also be subject to these fees. Therefore, the GPA would result in a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative impacts on police and fire services. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.
Solid Waste

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal because there is adequate landfill capacity in the regional landfill to accommodate GP/CLUP buildout. The incremental increase in landfill demand that would result from development associated with the GPA would not cause demand to exceed the landfill capacity. Therefore, the GPA would result in a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

Water Supply

Cumulative water supply impacts are addressed in Section 4.9 (Water Resources).

Wastewater

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment because there is adequate capacity within the existing infrastructure to accommodate GP/CLUP buildout. The incremental increase in wastewater treatment resulting from development associated with the GPA would not exceed the wastewater treatment system capacity. Therefore, the GPA would result in a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

Schools

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on schools because new private development would be required to pay impact fees to the corresponding school district to help fund construction of additional facilities. Under current law, payment of these fees is deemed to constitute full mitigation per CEQA (Government Code § 65996(b)). The incremental increase in school population resulting from development associated with the GPA also would be mitigated by the payment of mandatory fees. Therefore, the GPA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on schools. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

Private Utility Services

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on private utility services because the utility companies have indicated that they could supply future demand without jeopardizing existing service. Adequate capacity would be available for the incremental increase in demand for private utility services resulting from development associated with the GPA. Therefore, the GPA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on private utility services. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

Libraries

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on libraries because implementation of GP/CLUP policies along with payment of applicable development impact fees would reduce impacts on libraries resulting from current and future demand to less-than-significant levels. These same policies and fees
would be applicable to development that would result from the GPA. Therefore, the GPA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on libraries. The GPA would not change the classification of these cumulative impacts as less than significant.

**Parks and Recreation**

Cumulative impacts on parks and recreation facilities are addressed in Section 4.10 (Land Use and Recreation).

4.14.3.4 **Mitigation**

**Modifications to General Plan Policies**

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

**Other Suggested Mitigation**

No mitigation is identified.

4.14.3.5 **Residual Impacts**

Following implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures identified for the Class II impacts on public services and facilities, the impacts of the GPA would be reduced to less than significant levels.

(NO: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”]).
SECTION 4.15
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4.15 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Section 3.13 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for transportation and circulation relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with transportation and circulation that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.15.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including roadways, public transit, passenger rail service, and non-motorized transportation.

4.15.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.15.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.15.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta LOS Standard

The City has adopted a standard of Level of Service (LOS) C. Based upon this standard, a significant impact was identified if:

- analysis showed that the 2030 buildout would result in violation of the standard, as compared to existing conditions; or
- analysis showed that the LOS standard would be violated under existing conditions, but that a higher congestion level would be expected to result from the 2030 buildout.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The threshold criteria and traffic report contents established by the City provide a basis for improved analysis of the potential traffic impacts of proposed projects. The criteria and report contents help to standardize traffic impact reports. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project will ordinarily have a significant effect on the environment if it will “cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.” The following threshold criteria assume that an increase in traffic that creates a need for road improvements is “substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.” It should be noted that the following criteria are guidelines for the majority of potential impacts. The list of criteria is not intended to be all-inclusive because the potential for impact may vary depending upon the environmental setting and the nature of the project.
Threshold Criteria—Significant Adverse Impact

- A significant traffic impact occurs when:

  - The addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity ratio (V/C) by the value provided in Table 4.15-1, or adds at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E, and D, respectively.

**TABLE 4.15-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS (including project)</th>
<th>Increase in V/C greater than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or the addition of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15 trips²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 trips²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 trips²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The adopted standard for City roadways and intersections is LOS C, with the exception of the intersection of Hollister Avenue/Storke Road, which has been built to its planned capacity, and thus under GP/CLUP policy subsection TE 4.2 has a standard of LOS D.

² For purposes of analysis of the 2030 buildout, it was conservatively assumed that any increase in V/C projected over existing conditions reflects an increase of at least the threshold number of trips defined in this table, indicating a significant impact.

- Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

- Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic (e.g., rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use) that will become potential safety problems with the addition of project or cumulative traffic. Exceedance of the roadway’s designated Transportation Element Capacity may indicate the potential for the occurrence of the above impacts.

- Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection’s capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable LOS (A through C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.80) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 V/C for intersections that would operate from 0.80 to 0.85 V/C and a change of 0.02 V/C for intersections that would operate from 0.86 to 0.90 V/C, and 0.01 V/C for intersections operating at anything lower.

If analysis of the 2030 buildout showed that these thresholds would be exceeded when compared to existing conditions, a significant impact was identified.

**CEQA Thresholds**

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to transportation are based upon criteria contained in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it would:

- cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic volumes and capacity of the roadway system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections);
• exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways;
• result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks;
• substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
• result in inadequate emergency access;
• result in inadequate parking capacity; or
• conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

Traffic projected as a result of the 2030 buildout was considered significant if, as compared to existing conditions, it is expected to result in violation of either the City’s adopted LOS standard or the LOS significance thresholds, as previously described.

4.15.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to transportation or circulation. Program-level impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are not transient in nature and are thus considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class I impacts would result with the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class I impacts related to transportation and circulation.

Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified one intersection where a significant and unavoidable transportation/circulation impact would occur, at Hollister Avenue and Storke Road. Development of the Shelby property that would be allowed by the GPA would not result in project-specific impacts to this intersection. During the PM peak hour, this intersection currently operates at LOS C, and is forecasted to operate at LOS E. (The City has adopted LOS D as the acceptable operating standard for this intersection.)

The Goleta Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP) has been established to collect funds from new development projects for public facilities needed to serve new development (City of Goleta 2004). The GTIP includes programmed improvements for the Storke Road corridor, which would return service levels to LOS D for the Hollister/Storke intersection.

If development of the Shelby property were to contribute 15 or more trips to the Hollister/Storke intersection, a significant contribution to a cumulative impact would occur, thereby incrementally increasing the identified significant and unavoidable impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Further analysis of these impacts and the requirement for mitigation (if any) would be analyzed at the project level in the Shelby Project EIR.
Therefore, the GPA could potentially result in an incremental increase to Impact 3.13-1 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, which would remain classified as significant and unavoidable (Class I).

**Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

**Short-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to transportation or circulation. Program-level impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are not transient in nature and are thus considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class II impacts would result with the GPA.

**Long-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class II impacts related to transportation and circulation.

*Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways*

**Intersections**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following intersections where significant transportation/circulation impacts would occur as a result of additional traffic from buildout of the GP/CLUP:

- Hollister Avenue/Canon Green Drive
- Hollister Avenue/Pacific Oaks Road
- Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road
- Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road
- Los Carneros Road/US-101 SB Ramp
- Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue
- Fairview Avenue/Stow Canyon Road
- Fairview Avenue/Calle Real
- Fairview Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp
- Hollister Avenue/Fairview Avenue
- Hollister Avenue/Kellogg Avenue
- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 SB Ramp
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 NB Ramp
- Patterson Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp
- Hollister Avenue/Patterson Avenue
- Fairview Avenue/US-101 SB-Ramp
The traffic from additional development allowed by the GPA could potentially increase the impacts incrementally at some of these intersections, including the following:

- Cathedral Oaks/Los Carneros Road
- Los Carneros Road/Calle Real Road
- Los Carneros Road/US-101 SB Ramp

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce intersection impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards
- Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development

Similarly, these policies would reduce intersection impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase the intersection impacts described in Impact 3.13-2 but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

**Roadway Segments**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following roadway segments where significant transportation/circulation impacts would occur because the projected average daily trips (ADT) associated with buildout by 2030 would exceed the LOS C threshold:

- Storke Road south of US-101
- Los Carneros Road south of Hollister Avenue
- Storke Road south of Whittier Drive

Development of the Shelby property that would be allowed by the GPA would not affect these roadway segments. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to the roadway segment impacts described in Impact 3.13-2.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce intersection and roadway segment impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards
- Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development

Development of the Shelby property that would be allowed by the GPA would not affect these roadway segments. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to the roadway segment impacts described in Impact 3.13-2, and would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).
Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to transportation or circulation. Program-level impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are not transient in nature and are thus considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class III impacts would result with the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class III impacts related to transportation and circulation.

Impact 3.13-3. Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways

Intersections

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following intersections where less-than-significant transportation/circulation impacts would occur:

- Hollister Avenue/Calle Real
- Hollister Avenue/Entrance Road
- Storke Road/Market Place Drive
- Storke Road/Phelps Road
- Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road
- Glen Annie Road/Del Norte Drive
- Glen Annie Road/Calle Real/US-101 NB Ramp
- Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramp
- Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue
- Los Carneros Road/US-101 NB Ramp
- Los Carneros Road/Calle Koral Road
- Los Carneros Road/Castilian Drive
- Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue
- Hollister Avenue/Aero Camino Road
- Hollister Avenue/La Patera Lane
- Cathedral Oaks/Fairview Avenue
- Fairview Avenue/Encina Lane
- Hollister Avenue/Pine Avenue
- Hollister Avenue/Rutherford Street
- Cathedral Oaks/Cambridge Drive
- Calle Real/Kellogg Avenue
- Hollister Avenue/SR-217 NB Ramp
- Patterson Avenue/Overpass Road
- Ellwood Station Road/Calle Real
- Hollister Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp
- Winchester Canyon Road/Calle Real
- Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Avenue

The GPA could potentially incrementally increase the impacts at some of these intersections, including the following:

- Hollister Avenue/Calle Real
- Cathedral Oaks/Glen Annie Road
- Glen Annie Road/Del Norte Drive
- Glen Annie Road/Calle Real/US-101 NB Ramp
- Storke Road/US-101 SB Ramp
- Cathedral Oaks/Alameda Avenue
- Ellwood Station Road/Calle Real
- Hollister Avenue/US-101 SB Ramp
- Winchester Canyon Road/Calle Real
- Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Avenue

**Roadway Segments**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following roadway segments where less-than-significant transportation/circulation impacts would occur because the projected ADT with the 2030 buildout would increase but would not exceed the LOS C threshold:

- Hollister Avenue west of Patterson Avenue
- Hollister Avenue west of Fairview Avenue
- Hollister Avenue east of Los Carneros Road
- Hollister Avenue east of Storke Road
- Hollister Avenue east of US-101 Interchange
- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Fairview Avenue
- Cathedral Oaks Road east of Los Carneros Road
- Cathedral Oaks Road west of Glen Annie Road
- Cathedral Oaks Road north of US-101 Interchange
- Calle Real east of Los Carneros
- Calle Real west of Glen Annie Road
- Storke Road north of US-101 Interchange
- Los Carneros Road north of US-101 Interchange
• Los Carneros Road south of US-101 Interchange
• Fairview Avenue north of Calle Real
• Fairview Avenue south of US-101 Interchange
• Patterson Avenue south of US-101 Interchange

The GPA could potentially increase the impacts incrementally at some of these roadway segments, including the following, but the impacts are not expected to exceed the LOS C threshold:
• Cathedral Oaks Road west of Glen Annie Road
• Cathedral Oaks Road north of US-101 Interchange
• Calle Real west of Glen Annie Road
• Storke Road north of US-101 Interchange

Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.13-3, but would not change its classification as Class III (less than significant).

Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any short-term Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to transportation or circulation. Program-level impacts resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are not transient in nature and are thus considered long-term impacts. Similarly, no additional short-term Class IV impacts would result with the GPA.

Long-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class IV impacts related to transportation and circulation.

Impact 3.13-4. LOS under 2030 Buildout Is Expected to Improve or Remain Unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified that the LOS at the intersections of Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real would remain unchanged or would improve under conditions at buildout of the GP/CLUP in 2030. The additional development allowed by the GPA could add traffic to these intersections, thereby reducing these beneficial impacts, but would not result in significant adverse impacts.

Impact 3.13-5. No Impacts to Air Traffic Patterns

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified that no adverse impacts to air traffic patterns would result from implementation of the Plan. Development that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP would not result in a change to local land use patterns that would require changes to air traffic patterns. Similarly, the additional development allowed by the GPA would not result in changes to air traffic patterns and also have no adverse impacts to air traffic patterns.
Impact 3.13-6. Increase Transit Ridership and Support Alternative Modes of Transportation

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified beneficial impacts associated with proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans and increased ridership as a result of GP/CLUP implementation. The GPA would not alter the development or implementation of these proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans. Also, the additional development allowed by the GPA would not significantly increase ridership on local public transit systems. Therefore, the GPA would not affect this impact.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would support and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as carpool, transit, rail, bicycle, and pedestrian travel:

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management
- Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character
- Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation)
- Policy TE 8: Rail Transportation
- Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation
- Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan
- Policy TE 12: Transportation Systems Management
- Policy TE 15: Regional Transportation

The GPA would not affect implementation of these policies.

4.15.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The analysis presented in this section reflects cumulative conditions.

4.15.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

4.15.3.5 Residual Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts at the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection. The GPA would not affect this finding. At other intersections and roadway segments where significant impacts were identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the implementation of GP/CLUP policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts of the GPA to less-than-significant levels.
(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”]).
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4.16 WATER RESOURCES

Section 3.9 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) water resources relating to buildout of the GP/CLUP;
- the impacts associated with water resources that would result from buildout of the GP/CLUP; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

4.16.1 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions discussion in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including surface water, groundwater, flooding, discharge controls, and water supply and demand.

4.16.2 Regulatory Framework

The discussion of the regulatory framework in the GP/CLUP Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this SEIR, including the discussions of federal, state, and local regulations.

4.16.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

4.16.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance were used for the GP/CLUP Final EIR and for this SEIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual

The following thresholds would be applicable to individual future projects that may occur in the City's boundaries. A significant water quality impact is presumed to occur if a project:

- is located within an urbanized area of the City and the project construction or redevelopment individually or as a part of a larger common plan of development or sale would disturb one (1) or more acres of land;
- increases the amount of impervious surfaces on a site by 25% or more;
- results in channelization or relocation of a natural drainage channel;
- results in removal or reduction of riparian vegetation or other vegetation (excluding nonnative vegetation removed for restoration projects) from the buffer zone of any streams, creeks, or wetlands;
- is an industrial facility that falls under one or more of categories of industrial activity regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase I industrial stormwater regulations (facilities with effluent limitation; manufacturing; mineral, metal, oil and gas, hazardous waste, treatment or disposal facilities; landfills; recycling facilities; steam electric plants; transportation facilities; treatment works; and light industrial activity);
- discharges pollutants that exceed the water quality standards set forth in the applicable NPDES permit, the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB's) Basin Plan, or otherwise impairs the beneficial uses of a receiving waterbody;
- results in a discharge of pollutants into an impaired waterbody that has been designated as such by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) or the RWQCB under Section 303 (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act (i.e., the Clean Water Act); or
- results in a discharge of pollutants of concern to a receiving water body, as identified by the RWQCB.

Projects that are outside of the “urbanized areas” may also have a project-specific stormwater quality impact. Stormwater quality impacts associated with these projects must be evaluated on a project-by-project basis for a determination of significance. The potential impacts of these projects should be determined in consultation with the Santa Barbara County Water Agency, Flood Control Division, and RWQCB. The issues that should be considered are:

- the size of the development;
- the location (proximity to sensitive waterbodies, location on hillsides, etc.);
- the timing and duration of the construction activity;
- the nature and extent of directly connected impervious areas;
- the extent to which the natural runoff patterns are altered;
- disturbance to riparian corridors or other native vegetation on or off site;
- the type of stormwater pollutants expected; and
- the extent to which water quality best management practices are included in the project design.

**CEQA Thresholds**

The following thresholds, based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, provide that a project may have a significant impact on water resources if it would result in:

- alteration of an existing drainage pattern or creek, which would result in erosion, siltation, or increased surface runoff;
- increased exposure of residents to storm flooding due to increased runoff in the local drainage system;
- degraded water quality as a result of sediments and other pollutants transported in stormwater runoff;
- depleted groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge;
- insufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources;
- placement of structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area;
- placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area;
• exposure of people or structures to a risk of loss, death, or injury involving flooding, including as a result of dam failure; or
• risk of inundation by a tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

4.16.3.2 Project Impacts

Class I Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify any Class I impacts (significant and unavoidable impacts) related to water resources. Any short-term or long-term impacts related to water resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are classified as either Class II or Class III. (as described below). The incremental increases in these impacts due to additional development allowed by the GPA would not change their classification as Class II or Class III. No additional Class I impacts would result with the GPA.

Class II Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following Class II impacts (significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation) related to water resources.

Short-term Impacts

Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with construction-related earth disturbing activities for future development and infrastructure projects associated with buildout of the GP/CLUP. Impacts may include soil erosion, sedimentation to local waterways, and hazardous materials leaks. The GPA could result in a small incremental increase in construction-related impacts due to earth-disturbing activities on the additional lands made available for development by the GPA.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-1 to a less-than-significant level:

• Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
• Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
• Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
• Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with additional development allowed by the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-1, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: The City is currently evaluating the Shelby Residential Project in a project-specific EIR, which will address water quality impacts related to construction-related contaminants.)
Long-term Impacts


The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with inadequate water supplies during a critical dry year. The additional development allowed by the GPA could result in a small incremental increase in water demand and slightly increase the potential for inadequate water supplies during a critical dry year.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-2 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 12: Land Use in Goleta’s Environs
- Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-2, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the increased amounts of impervious surfaces and the decreased amount of rainfall reaching the groundwater basin. The development of the Shelby property allowed as a result of the GPA could result in an incremental increase in impervious surfaces and reduction in groundwater recharge.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-3 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy CE 15: Water Conservation and Materials Recycling
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less than significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-3, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).

Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the increased amounts of impervious surfaces causing increased drainage flows and earlier peak flows, with the potential to cause flooding or erosion impacts downstream. The development of the Shelby property allowed as a result of the GPA could result in a small incremental increase in impervious surfaces affecting drainage flows, peak flows, flooding, and erosion similar to those described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.
The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-4 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-4, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6 and CE 7 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast.)

**Impact 3.9-5. Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area**

The Shelby property is not within areas subject to a 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.9-5 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

**Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with tsunami run-up and mudslides. The Shelby property would not be susceptible to tsunami run-up because it is not in the potential tsunami run-up area identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, but would be within areas with slopes potentially subject to mudslides. A mudslide could cause significant damage to structures constructed on such slopes and also cause injury or death to people living in those structures.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-6 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 11: Emergency Preparedness
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-7, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation).
Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development

Point source water pollution results from a discernible, confined and discrete conveyance of pollutants, such as an industrial plant. Nonpoint source water pollution comes from many diffuse sources such as contaminants that are absorbed by rain and snowmelt conveyed to lakes, rivers, wetlands, coastal waters and ground waters. These contaminants include oils and volatile organic compounds from roadways and parking lots, and fertilizers and pesticides from lawn and landscape maintenance.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with nonpoint source pollution. It found that new development would increase the amount of nonpoint sources of wastewater generated, with corresponding increases in the volume of wastewater being discharged. It also identified potential point-source discharges associated with commercial or industrial uses that could adversely affect water quality.

The additional development allowed by the GPA could result in an incremental increase in nonpoint source contaminants similar to those described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. No point-source discharges would occur because the GPA would not involve commercial or industrial uses.

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following policies that would reduce Impact 3.9-7 to a less-than-significant level:

- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

Similarly, these policies would also reduce impacts associated with the GPA to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-7, but would not change its classification as Class II (less than significant with mitigation). (Note: Policies CE 6 and CE 7 would not be applicable to the Shelby property because it is not adjacent to the coast. Policies SE 8 and LU 10 would not be applicable to this project because they only address industrial and energy land uses.)

Class III Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR

Short-term Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify short-term Class III impacts (less-than-significant impacts) related to water resources. Any short-term related to water resources resulting from buildout of the GP/CLUP are classified as Class II (as described above). The incremental increases in these impacts due to additional development allowed by the GPA would not
change their classification as Class II. No additional short-term Class III impacts would occur with the GPA.

**Long-term Impacts**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified the following long-term Class III impact (less-than-significant impact) related to water resources.

**Impact 3.9-8. Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a less-than-significant impact associated with risk to new development from the unlikely failure of Bradbury Dam, located on Lake Cachuma just north of Goleta. The dam is situated facing west, and the drainage travels west down through the Santa Ynez Valley. In the unlikely scenario that the Bradbury Dam failed, resulting floodwaters would travel through the Santa Ynez Valley but not south through the Goleta planning area. The impact resulting from exposure to such a risk is less than significant.

The Shelby property is located in the Goleta planning area, and would similarly not be subject to inundation by waters due to the unlikely failure of Bradbury Dam. Therefore, the GPA would not result in changes to Impact 3.9-8 as described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

**Class IV Impacts Identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR did not identify Class IV impacts (beneficial impacts) related to water resources. Buildout of the GP/CLUP is not expected to result in any beneficial impacts to water quality or water supplies. Similarly, no additional Class IV impacts would occur with additional development allowed by the GPA.

**4.16.3.3 Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a significant and unavoidable (Class I) contribution to a significant impact to the water quality of Goleta Slough, which is listed as impaired under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The Shelby property is not tributary to the Goleta Slough. Therefore, the GPA would not increase or reduce this significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

**Impact 3.9-10. Cumulative Effects on Water Supply**

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified a less than significant (Class III) contribution to cumulative demand on the Goleta area’s water supply. The Goleta Groundwater Basin (Basin) is adjudicated. The adjudication process determines the safe yield of the Basin and distributes appropriate groundwater pumping allocations to various users (including the Goleta Water District) based on this safe yield. GWD would only pump its annual allocated quantity plus any banked groundwater supplies that are available and needed. Thus, the cumulative groundwater pumping would not exceed the safe yield and groundwater supplies would not be substantially depleted by development anticipated in the buildout of the GP/CLUP.
The GPA would allow up to 71 residential units to be constructed on the Shelby property. Based on the City’s Thresholds Manual, the estimated water demand for single-family development on the Shelby property would be a maximum of 0.33 acre-feet per year (AFY) per unit, or up to a total of 23.4 AFY for 71 units. This represents 0.76% of GWD’s current surplus of 3,070 AFY in water supply above current demand levels (GWD 2011). Accordingly, the GWD currently has a sufficient water supply to provide potable water for development of up to 71 units on the Shelby property. The GWD would issue a “Can and Will Serve” (CAWS) Letter to confirm that adequate water supplies are available at the time that a CAWS Letter is sought by a permittee. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase Impact 3.9-10, but would not change its classification as Class III (less than significant).

4.16.3.4 Mitigation

Modifications to General Plan Policies

No modifications to General Plan policies (except as proposed by the project) are proposed.

Other Suggested Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

4.16.3.5 Residual Impacts

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that there would be no residual impacts related to water resources. Implementation of the GPA would also result in no residual impacts related to water resources.

(NOTE: Impacts of the Shelby Residential Project are analyzed in a separate project-specific EIR [see City EIR No. 12-EIR-005; “Shelby Project EIR”].)
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5.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6 provides a framework for the formulation and analysis of alternatives in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This section states, “[a]n EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Project objectives are listed in Chapter 2, “Project Description.”

Key concepts pertaining to the discussion of alternatives are further specified in the CEQA Guidelines as follows. The range of alternatives required within an EIR is governed by the rule of reason, which requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Although there is no rule for the number of alternatives that must be discussed, the EIR must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation, but need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Furthermore, an EIR need not consider an alternative with an unlikely or speculative potential for implementation or an alternative that would result in effects that cannot be reasonably ascertained. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6.)

An EIR is not required to include alternatives that are not feasible. The term “feasible” is defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15364 as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors” (Public Resources Code § 21061.1). CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(f)(1) provides additional factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives. These factors include site suitability; economic viability; availability of infrastructure; general plan consistency; other plans or regulatory limitations; jurisdictional boundaries; and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to potential alternative sites.

Finally, the analysis of environmental effects of project alternatives need not be as thorough or detailed as the analysis of the project itself. Rather, CEQA Guidelines § 15126 states that the EIR shall include “sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.”

5.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS DRAFT SEIR

As described above, the primary purpose of the alternatives analysis is to identify changes to the project that would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the project as proposed. The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts (Class I impacts) and significant impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels (Class II impacts).

As described in Chapter 4, “Environmental Setting and Impact Analysis,” the GPA would result in incremental increases in severity to the impacts identified by the GP/CLUP EIR but would not change their classification. The Class I impacts would increase in severity and would remain significant and unavoidable. The Class II impacts would also increase in severity but would continue to be mitigated to less-than-significant levels and therefore remain classified as Class
II impacts. Similarly, the Class III impacts would increase in severity but would remain less than significant and therefore would continue to be classified as Class III impacts.

Table 5-1 lists all the Class I and Class II impacts that were identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR and in this Supplemental EIR. (Note: Class I and Class II impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR but not applicable to the GPA are not listed in this table.)

### TABLE 5-1
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED IN GP/CLUP FINAL EIR AND THIS DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Impact Identified in GP/CLUP Final EIR (No Project Alternative)</th>
<th>Impact Identified in this Draft Supplemental EIR (GPA or Proposed Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-2b, Impacts to the Visual Character of Natural Open Space and Agricultural Areas</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-2c, Impacts to the Visual Character of the Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1.2d, Impacts to Views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road North of US-101, and Fairview Avenue (proposed project would result in this impact at Cathedral Oaks Road only)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-3a, Impacts to Views from US-101</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.1-3e, Light and Giare</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Farmland</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-1, Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.3-1, Construction Emissions</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.3-5, Cumulative ROG and NOX Emissions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.3-7, Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-1, Temporary Impacts to Special-status Habitats and Special-status Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-2, Loss of Special-status Habitats</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-3, Long-term Degradation of Special-status Habitats</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4.4, Fragmentation of Special-status Habitats</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-5, Harm to Listed Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-6, Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Impact Identified in GP/CLUP Final EIR (No Project Alternative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-7, Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special-status Species</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-8, Break or Impairment of Functions of Existing Wildlife Linkages</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-9, Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-10, Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-1, Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-2, Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-3, Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Site</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-1, Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of Substantial Amount of Topsoil</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-2, Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landsliding, or Liquefaction</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-3, Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Buildout on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-4, Location of Development on Expansive and/or Compressible Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People and Structures</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.7-6, Wildland Fires</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.7-7, Surface Water (hazardous spills)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.7-8, Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.10-1, Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.10-3, Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout of</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
<td>Impact Identified in GP/CLUP Final EIR (No Project Alternative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.10-5, Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.11-1, Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.11-7, Cumulative Traffic Noise</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Land within the City</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-1, Increased Demand for Police Protection</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-2, Increased Demand for Fire Protection</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-3, Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-4, Increased Demand for Utility Services</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-5, Increased Demand on Local School Districts</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.12-6, Increased Demand on Library Facilities</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.13-1, Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.13-2, Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Water Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Level of Impact GP/CLUP Final EIR (No ProjectAlternative)</th>
<th>Level of Impact Draft Supplemental EIR (GPA or Proposed Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-1, Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-2, Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-3, Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-4, Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-6, Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche (the proposed project would result in impacts related to risks of mudslides only)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.9-7, Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Classification:**
- Class I = significant and unavoidable
- Class II = potentially significant, but mitigated to less than significant

**Note:**

1. Analysis of this impact was conducted as part of the 2009 Supplemental EIR.

---

#### 5.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS SEIR

##### 5.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e) is “the existing conditions at the time of the notice of preparation is published…as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” Existing conditions at the project site are described in each of the impact analyses in Chapter 4, “Environmental Setting and Impact Analysis.”

In this case, if the GPA is not approved, the Land Use Map change for the Shelby property would not occur, and the site would continue to be designated Agriculture in the GP/CLUP Land Use Element. Also, the Open Space Plan Map would not be changed and the site would continue to be identified as Open Space in the GP/CLUP Open Space Element. This scenario constitutes the projected buildout of the GP/CLUP as currently adopted and is the “No Project Alternative.”

Under Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, only agricultural uses and ancillary residential uses (e.g., one dwelling unit for the entire Shelby property) as allowed by the Agriculture designation would be allowed. The Shelby property would not be developed for residential uses,
other than ancillary residential uses. The GPA’s incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would not occur.

5.3.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Site Conversion Alternative

Alternative 2 would modify the GPA by minimizing the area of the Shelby property that would be converted. The land use designation on only a portion of the Shelby property would be changed to a residential use designation; the remaining portion would continue to be designated as Agriculture. To meet the project objective of developing a residential neighborhood for 60 families, a multi-family unit type (such as duplexes, triplexes, or other medium-density residential buildings) would be required in order to accommodate the same number of units over a smaller area on the Shelby property. This would potentially reduce the area developed on the Shelby property by approximately 40%. With a land use designation and zoning that supports such multi-family development, this alternative is potentially feasible as it would be possible to design a project of 60 multi-family units that meets current zoning standards for height, setback, and lot coverage.

The incremental increases to GP/CLUP impacts identified for the proposed project would also occur under Alternative 2, which would still result in the development of vacant land not contemplated in the current GP/CLUP. These impacts are listed above in Table 5-1. However these incremental increases may be up to 40% less than those for the proposed project.

5.3.3 Alternative 3: Girsh/Westen Alternative Site

The Girsh/Westen site is located on the 7100 block of Hollister Avenue, west of Santa Felicia Drive. It is comprised of three parcels totaling approximately 10 acres in area (APN 073-003-005, -006, and 009). A church is located on the westernmost parcel; the remainder of the Girsh/Westen site is vacant. The site has a land use designation of Medium Density Residential (R-MD) for its northern half and General Commercial (G-C) for its southern half. For the purposes of this analysis, the entire site would be developed for a 60-unit residential project. The site is smaller than the 14.38-acre Shelby property; therefore some clustering of units into duplexes or triplexes would likely be necessary to accommodate 60 units on this site.

Under Alternative 3, the Girsh/Westen site would be developed instead of the Shelby property. This alternative would still meet the project’s objective of developing a residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families. The Shelby property would continue to have a GP/CLUP land use designation of Agriculture, and would continue to be designated as open space in the Conservation Element of the GP/CLUP. This alternative is potentially feasible, as the Girsh/Westen site is designated for urban development and with proper land use designations and zoning could allow for the development of approximately 60 units.

As the Girsh/Westen site is designated for residential and commercial development in the GP/CLUP, the impacts of future development on this site were taken into account in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Therefore, residential development on the Girsh/Westen site would not increase the impacts identified by the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

5.4 ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Other alternative sites for developing a project similar to the proposed project were considered but determined to be infeasible. Of the remaining vacant sites within the City that could
accommodate development of similar scale to the proposed project, some are currently designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP and others have a non-agricultural land use designation. Development on vacant sites that are designated as Agriculture would result in losses of agricultural lands that are larger or more severe than compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the development of one of these sites would not result in a reduction of impacts as compared to the proposed project.

The remaining vacant sites with non-agricultural designations all have pending applications for development with the City, and therefore were not further considered for analysis as alternatives to the proposed project.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(2) requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative is defined as the alternative that would result in the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed project. If the No Project Alternative is found to be the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, no lands designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP would be converted. The GPA’s incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would not occur. Therefore, Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Of the alternatives remaining under consideration, Alternative 3, the Girsh/Westen Alternative Site would be the environmentally superior alternative, Under Alternative 2, the Reduced Site Conversion Alternative, incremental increases to GP/CLUP Final EIR impacts similar to those for the GPA would also occur. Under Alternative 3, no incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would occur.
CHAPTER 6
OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA Guidelines § 15126 requires that all aspects of a project must be considered when evaluating the project’s impact on the environment. As part of this analysis, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must identify the following:

- significant environmental effects of the proposed project;
- significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented;
- significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project;
- the project’s growth-inducing impacts;
- mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects; and
- alternatives to the proposed project (included in Chapter 5.0 of this EIR).

6.1 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Table ES-1, contained in the Executive Summary, and Sections 4.1 through 4.13 identify the environmental effects of the GPA, including the level of significance of each impact before and after mitigation is implemented.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED

CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(b) requires that an EIR describe potential environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Implementation of the GPA would result in incremental increases to the following significant and unavoidable impacts (both GPA-related and cumulative).

6.2.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

- **Impact 3.1-2b. Impacts to the Visual Character of Natural Open Space and Agricultural Areas.** The GPA would potentially result in the conversion of an additional 13.9 acres of agricultural uses to urban uses, increasing the impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR by approximately 25%.

- **Impact 3.1-2c. Impacts to the Visual Character of the Santa Ynez Mountains and Foothills.** The GPA would potentially result in development that would adversely impact the visual character of views of the mountains and foothills, increasing the impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

- **Impact 3.1-2d. Impacts to Views from Cathedral Oaks Road, Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road North of US-101, and Fairview Avenue.** The GPA would potentially result in development that would adversely impact views along Cathedral Oaks Road, increasing the impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

6.2.2 Air Quality

- **Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOx Emissions.** The additional emissions associated with development related to the GPA could exacerbate the impacts identified in the
GP/CLUP Final EIR related to the ability of local agencies to achieve the goals and objectives of the CAP to reach attainment levels for ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxides [ROG and NOₓ]).

### 6.2.3 Noise

- **Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources.** The GPA would potentially expose noise-sensitive land uses to single-event and nuisance noise levels from construction, increasing the potential significant noise impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

- **Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise.** The GPA would result in increases to traffic and resulting traffic noise on at least one roadway segment, Storke Road north of Phelps Road, incrementally increasing contributions to significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impact identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

### 6.2.4 Transportation and Circulation

- **Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways.** The GPA could potentially result in a significant contribution to cumulative impacts at the Hollister/Storke intersection if development of the Shelby property were to contribute 15 or more trips to this intersection.

### 6.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Pursuant CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(c), an EIR must consider any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed project should it be implemented. CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(c) reads as follows:

> Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Implementation of the GPA would allow future development on properties within the City previously identified as agriculture. Future development would also involve construction activities that would entail the commitment of nonrenewable and/or slowly renewable energy resources, human resources, and natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, lead, other metals, and water. An increased commitment of social services and public maintenance services (e.g., police, fire, schools, libraries, and sewer and water services) would also be required. The GPA would result in the irreversible commitment of energy and water to support new urban development. Where the development would involve substantial grading, excavation, or other alteration to existing topography, these effects would also be irreversible.

### 6.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(d), an EIR must address whether a project will directly or indirectly foster growth. CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(d) reads as follows:
An EIR shall discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of wastewater treatment plant, might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The following growth-inducing impact discussion is a qualitative analysis and evaluates whether the GPA would directly or indirectly induce economic, population, or housing growth in the surrounding environment.

6.4.1 Evaluation

As described in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, by its very nature, the adoption of a general plan is often growth-inducing. California planning law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and of any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency’s judgment bears relation to its planning. (Government Code § 65300.)

In adopting the GP/CLUP, the City set the ground rules for future growth and development within its City boundary. Therefore, the adoption of the GP/CLUP was growth-inducing; it directly involved new development and an increase in population, public services, and public infrastructure to accommodate future growth. Secondary growth-inducing impacts could also be expected in the surrounding cities and communities. Adoption of the GP/CLUP was found to have significant growth-inducing impacts on the areas. The GPA would incrementally increase these significant growth-inducing impacts, as discussed below.

6.4.1.1 Land Use, Housing, Population, and Employment

The GP/CLUP Final EIR identified that direct growth inducement would result from development of 3,880 new residential units with implementation of the GP/CLUP. This would result in a 24% increase in population in the City over 24 years.

While population growth would not itself create physical effects to the environment, it could result in secondary 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 in the City and surrounding communities and cities. Population growth would also place an increased demand on public services, utilities, and infrastructure in the City and surrounding areas.

The very purpose of the GP/CLUP is to accommodate the orderly development of Goleta. Therefore, by its nature, the GP/CLUP is intended to reduce the potential for uncontrolled growth and associated environmental impacts. The GP/CLUP Final EIR stated that extension of infrastructure to projected development would not be anticipated to expand the geography of the area that is already receiving City services.
The GPA could potentially result in up to 71 additional residential units (see Section 4.13, Population and Housing, of this SEIR). This would result in an additional 0.5% increase in the population projected at buildout of the GP/CLUP in 2030. The environmental effects related to the GPA are discussed in each section of Chapter 4 of this SEIR. The incremental increases in significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from the GPA are identified above in Section 6.2. The extension of infrastructure would not be required for the Shelby property because it is currently surrounded by urban land uses. Therefore, the GPA would incrementally increase the secondary impacts of growth identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

6.4.1.2 Transportation and Circulation

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that existing roads and future roads built to serve new development would provide access to the residential, commercial, and industrial areas identified in the GP/CLUP, in addition to the surrounding areas. Project-facilitated transportation improvements might also induce additional pressure to intensify use of underused lands in the surrounding cities and communities.

The Shelby property is along existing roadways surrounded by urban land uses. Therefore, no changes in the GP/CLUP Final EIR findings related to growth-inducing impacts on transportation are required.

6.4.1.3 Public Facilities and Services

The GP/CLUP Final EIR found that new public facilities and infrastructure improvements could be provided in order to accommodate proposed growth in the City, and the growth that is expected to occur in the region. CEQA associates the development of new utilities, infrastructure, and public services with growth inducement (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(d)). Where development has been constrained by infrastructure limitations, development of major new facilities has the potential to induce additional growth by facilitating development in areas that were once underused or vacant.

The GPA does not propose additional public facilities or infrastructure improvements. Therefore, no changes in the GP/CLUP Final EIR findings related to growth-inducing impacts from public facilities and services improvements would be required.

6.5 Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects

Table ES-1, contained in the Executive Summary, and Sections 4.1 through 4.13 identify the environmental effects of the proposed project and provide feasible mitigation measures that would minimize the effects of project-related impacts.
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7.2.2 Personal Communications

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

On October 11, 2005, the Shelby Trust submitted an application to the City of Goleta (City) for a residential development on the 14.38-acre property located at 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road (APN 077-530-019). That property currently has a land use designation of “Agriculture” under the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP). The application included a request for approval of several amendments to the GP/CLUP that, among other things, would allow for the conversion of the property from the Agriculture land use designation to a non-Agriculture land use designation allowing residential development. On February 19, 2008, the City Council granted the initiation of the processing of the Shelby Trust’s requested amendments to the GP/CLUP that would allow for the land use designation conversion.

On November 17, 2008, Kenwood Village LLC submitted an application to the City for a residential development on a 10.0-acre property located on the 7300 block of Calle Real between Baker Lane and Ellwood Station Road (APNs 077-130-066 and -019). The southerly 3.9 acres of that property currently has a land use designation of “Agriculture” and the northern 6.1 acres have a land use designation of “Single-Family Residential” under the GP/CLUP.

As the existing land use designation of the Kenwood Village LLC property would not allow for the proposed residential development, Kenwood Village LLC’s application also included a request for approval of amendments to the GP/CLUP. These amendments, among other things, would allow for the conversion of the property from the Agriculture and Single-Family Residential land use designations to a non-Agriculture land use designation allowing residential development on the entirety of the property. The initiation of processing the amendments to the GP/CLUP requested by Kenwood Village LLC was granted by the City Council on February 17, 2009.

It should be noted that the amendments to the GP/CLUP requested by the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC and initiated by the City Council were not identical and posed the potential for the City to evaluate competing amendments to the same GP/CLUP policies concurrently, which could become problematic. Therefore, and subsequent to both initiations, the two applicants agreed on one set of amendments to the GP/CLUP listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Proposed General Plan Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Shelby Trust (APN 077-530-019)</th>
<th>Kenwood Village LLC (APN 077-130-006 &amp; -019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Element – Land Use Plan Map, Figure 2-1</td>
<td>Change from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential (see Figure 1 for existing Figure 2-1)</td>
<td>Change from Agriculture (3.9 acres) and Single-Family Residential (6.1 acres) to Planned Residential (see Figure 1 for existing Figure 2-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Element – Subpolicy CE 11.2, Conversion of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>Revise text language (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Element – Open Space Plan Map, Fig. 3-5</td>
<td>Remove property from Open Space Plan Map (see Figure 2 below for existing Figure 3-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 Land Use Element, Current Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1 in the GP/CLUP)

The Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC properties are shown in Figure 1 with current land use designations under the GP/CLUP. Currently the properties have land use designations of Agriculture and Agriculture and Single-Family Residential, respectively, and are proposed to change to Single-Family Residential and Planned Residential, respectively.

![Figure 1: GP/CLUP Land Use Plan Map](image)

1.2 Conservation Element, Policy CE 11.2

**Existing: CE 11.2 Conversion of Agricultural Lands. [GP/CP]** Conversion of agricultural lands designated on the Land Use Map (Figure 2-1) to other uses shall not be allowed. Lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary shall be preserved for agricultural use.

**Applicants’ Proposed: CE 11.2 Conversion of Agricultural Lands. [GP/CP]** Conversion of lands designated for agricultural to urban or other nonagricultural uses shall only be permitted where:

a. The site is less than 20 acres and agricultural production is not viable as measured by relevant criteria including, but not limited to the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual or the State Department of Conservation’s Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model; AND

b. The land is surrounded by urban uses. For the purposes of this policy urban uses are defined as residential, commercial, office and industrial, public/quasi-public, or active
recreational uses (such as golf courses). Where a site has frontage on a road or highway, the adjacent use for that property boundary shall be established by the land use on the opposite side of such road or highway; AND

c. The conversion would result in a significant community benefit that meets and/or facilitates a public or community need or goal including, but not limited to senior affordable or other affordable housing, housing for local workers, recreational facilities or lands open to the public, nonprofit facilities that serve the public, preservation or restoration of a historic structure or resource, and/or preservation or restoration of biological resources.

1.3 Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map (Figure 3-5 in the GP/CLUP)

The Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC properties are shown in Figure 2 as “Agriculture,” which is categorized as “Open Space for Managed Production of Resources.” The identifications of the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC properties as “Agriculture” are proposed to be removed.

![GP/CLUP Open Space Plan Map](image)

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

The Final Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse #2005031151 (2006 GP/CLUP EIR) was certified in 2006 by Resolution No. 06-37 and the GP/CLUP was adopted by Resolution No. 06-38. Since adoption of the GP/CLUP, there have
been several City- and applicant-initiated GP/CLUP amendments resulting in the preparation and certification of several Addenda and a Supplemental EIR prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq. (CEQA) (see Table 2 below).

### Table 2

**2006 GP/CLUP Environmental Impact Report Addenda and SEIRs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Environmental Document</th>
<th>CC Resolution No.</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-050</td>
<td>Villages at Los Carneros</td>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>EIR – 08-02 GPA – 08-06</td>
<td>2-19-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-102</td>
<td>Haskell’s Landing</td>
<td>Addendum (EIR &amp; Supplemental EIR by County)</td>
<td>Addendum – 09-26 GPA – 09-30 &amp; -33</td>
<td>5-19-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-200</td>
<td>Track 1 - Housing Element Update</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 10-56 GPA – 10-57</td>
<td>11-16-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-201</td>
<td>Track 2 - Minor Amendments</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>08-30</td>
<td>6-17-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-202</td>
<td>Track 3 - Substantive Amendments</td>
<td>Supplemental EIR &amp; Addendum</td>
<td>09-59</td>
<td>11-17-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-196</td>
<td>Montecito Bank and Trust</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 11-07 GPA – 11-09</td>
<td>2-15-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-033</td>
<td>Track 2.5 - Building Intensity Standards</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>09-32/09-33</td>
<td>5-19-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-123</td>
<td>Housing Element Update</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 10-56 GPA – 10-57</td>
<td>8-18-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2006 GP/CLUP EIR and all CEQA documents prepared subsequent to the 2006 GP/CLUP EIR comprise the existing GP/CLUP EIR. The GP/CLUP EIR identifies numerous Class I (Significant and Unavoidable) and Class II (Significant but Mitigable) Impacts that would occur with full build out of the GP/CLUP in 2030. These impacts and mitigation measures are identified in Appendix 1.

### 2.2 Existing Setting

The following discussion is the environmental setting information for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC properties (APNs 077-530-019 and 077-130-006 and -019 respectively) where changes in land use designations are proposed.

**Surrounding Land Use/Development**

The Shelby Trust property is surrounded on its northern, northwestern, and eastern boundaries by the Glen Annie Golf Course, on its west side by El Encanto Creek, Northgate Drive, and multi-family residential development (8 units per acre), and on its south by Cathedral Oaks Road and single family residential development.

The Kenwood Village LLC property is bounded by El Encanto Creek and multi-family residential development on the west, single family residential development on the north and east, and Calle Real and U.S. Highway 101 to the South.

**Soils/Topography**

The Shelby Trust property is located in the Goleta Foothills north of Cathedral Oaks Road. Soils onsite consist of Diablo Clay that is considered well drained and formed from shale and mudstone.
Permeability is low and has high shrink-swell potential\(^1\). The property rises from a low of 145 feet above mean sea level (msl) along Cathedral Oaks Road northward to the north-east corner of the property at an elevation of 252’ above msl, or an average slope of 7.8%. The GP/CLUP EIR\(^2\) found that the site had 11.3 acres of Prime Farmland.

The Kenwood Village LLC property is at an elevation ranging from 55 feet above mean sea level (msl) to 94 feet above msl. The site is situated on a hill slope that dips down to the southwest at gradient of 6-to-1 (horizontal-to-vertical) and becomes generally level adjacent to Calle Real. Surface drainage follows the topography to the west and flows to the creek and eventually to the Pacific Ocean, located approximately one mile to the southwest. The GP/CLUP EIR\(^2\) found that the site had Class I and II soils including 3.1 acres of Prime Farmland and 5.3 acres of Unique Farmland.

**Flora/Fauna**

El Encanto Creek borders the Shelby Trust property on its western side for approximately 630 feet with but the creek’s bed and banks are just to the west of the subject property. The US Geological Survey (USGS) has mapped the creek as having intermittent flow. El Encanto Creek supports a riparian woodland intermixed with a eucalyptus grove with an olive tree understory and non-native annual grassland. East of the creek is an area onsite that is primarily bare ground used for storage of firewood and wood-chips. Non-native annual grassland dominates the center of the project site and along its northern boundary are the remnants of an avocado orchard that is no longer in production.

The same creek borders the entirety of the Kenwood Village LLC property’s western boundary (approximately 657 feet). In this area, El Encanto Creek supports an oak-riparian woodland with an overstory dominated by western sycamore, coast live oak and willow. In-stream, emergent vegetation includes southern cattail and watercress. Several non-native trees such as palm, tara, and pittosporum have also been established within the riparian corridor. The riparian understory consists of native and non-native species, including coyote brush, smilo grass, and Algerian ivy. Trees are lacking on the east bank along the lower third of the drainage. The vegetation here is dominated by California sagebrush and weedy species such as wild mustard, castor bean and prickly ox tongue. The majority of the site was cultivated in the past and is now covered in annual grassland.

**Cultural/Historical Resources**

The Shelby Trust property contains a small area (486 square meter) of low-density scatter of chipped stone waste and shellfish remains, which was recorded in the west-center of the property in 1972 and identified as CA-SBA-1735\(^3\). However, subsequent archaeological investigations of the site in 1999 by Santa Barbara County for the extension of Cathedral Oaks Road and in March 2001 by Dudek under contract to the applicant were not able to relocate any of the materials reported previously onsite\(^4\). There is an existing farm house, barn, and detached garage on the Shelby Trust property of an undisclosed age but none of these structures are designated as historically significant in the City’s GP/CLUP.

The Kenwood Village LLC property contains archaeological site CA-SBA-1093 "West" that was originally recorded in 1980 during a Phase 1 investigation of the site\(^5\). Remains were described as a "scatter of weathered shellfish." The Phase I Archaeological Survey prepared for the Kenwood

---

\(^1\) USDA Soil Conservation Service; *Soil Survey of Santa Barbara County, South Coastal Part*.

\(^2\) Table 3.2-2, Summary of City of Goleta Major Agricultural and Farmland Resources.

\(^3\) Lawrence Spanne, 1972.

\(^4\) David Stone, Dudek (formerly Dudek & Associates); *Extended Phase I Archaeological Investigation Shelby Residential Project, 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road*, dated March, 2011.

\(^5\) Steven Craig, 1980.
Village LLC project\textsuperscript{6} re-investigated the entirety of the project site, including the area where CA-SBA-1093 “West” was identified. The survey concludes that there is a very limited, though unexpected, potential for diagnostic (time-sensitive) artifacts to be present within the previously recorded CA-SBA-1093 “West” site boundary. Such artifacts, if present, would be capable of indicating when even limited prehistoric use of the area occurred.

3.0 SCOPE OF ANALYSIS IN SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

In addition to the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC sites, there are several other properties in the City that have a GP/CLUP land use designation of “Agriculture” (see Figure 1, Land Use Plan Map above and Table 3 below). Other than Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC, none of the owners of the other properties have filed applications for entitlements that involve conversion from the Agriculture land use designation to other land use designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm/Ranch Name</th>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Ranch</td>
<td>077-020-045</td>
<td>234.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>077-080-022</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>077-160-053</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couvillion (Shelby Trust)</td>
<td>077-530-019</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellwood Canyon</td>
<td>079-120-014</td>
<td>23.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>079-110-057</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>079-110-026</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Gardens</td>
<td>069-090-056</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Archbishops (Kenwood Village LLC)</td>
<td>077-130-006 &amp; -019</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>350.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two different aspects or parts to the proposed GP/CLUP amendments that must be analyzed in the Supplemental EIR as follows:

Part 1 – Changes to impacts and/or mitigation measures identified by the GP/CLUP EIR - The Supplemental EIR will assess any changes to impacts and/or mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP EIR resulting from the proposed GP/CLUP amendments. As a general plan, certain policies of the GP/CLUP are mitigation measures of impacts identified as resulting from other policies. The GP/CLUP EIR identifies numerous Class I (Significant and Unavoidable) and Class II (Significant but Mitigable) Impacts that would occur with full build out of the GP/CLUP in 2030 as shown in Appendix 1.

The applicants propose to amend Conservation Element, Policy CE 11, specifically Subpolicy CE 11.2, of the GP/CLUP. The GP/CLUP EIR cited Policy CE 11 as partial or full mitigation for several environmental impacts as shown in Table 4 below. As Policy CE 11 is proposed for amendment, the Supplemental EIR will need to analyze these impacts, and any other impacts that might be affected by the amendment to Policy CE 11. The purpose of the analysis is to determine any resulting changes to the existing impacts, new impacts and changes to the level of impact significance, and any resulting changes to the existing mitigation measures, including whether additional mitigation

\textsuperscript{6} Dudek, December 2009

\textsuperscript{7} Table 3.2-3, GP/CLUP EIR.
might be necessary. The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in the Supplemental EIR are the same as those contained in the certified GP/CLUP EIR.

### Table 4

**Policy CE 11 as mitigation in GP/CLUP EIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Impact #</th>
<th>Nature of impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I Impacts – Significant and Unavoidable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Farmland</td>
<td>3.2-1</td>
<td>Conversion of agricultural land and loss or impairment of agricultural productivity.</td>
<td>CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Farmland</td>
<td>3.2-4</td>
<td>Cumulative loss of agricultural lands.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II Impacts – Significant but Mitigable Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Farmland</td>
<td>3.2-2</td>
<td>Incompatible land uses and structures.</td>
<td>CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Recreation</td>
<td>3.10-1</td>
<td>Conflict with applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations due to buildout (construction) of GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities.</td>
<td>CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Recreation</td>
<td>3.10-2</td>
<td>Adverse physical effect on the environment due to construction of planned recreational facilities.</td>
<td>CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III Impacts – Less than Significant Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Farmland</td>
<td>No #</td>
<td>Agricultural areas could potentially be impacted by construction activities on adjacent parcels.</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class IV Impacts – Beneficial Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Farmland</td>
<td>3.2-3</td>
<td>Preservation of Agricultural land.</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed amendments to Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE 11.2 consist of several criteria under which parcels that have an Agriculture land use designation could convert to other land use designations. The criteria proposed include, among other criteria, a parcel size limitation, an agricultural production viability determination and the property being surrounded by urban land uses. Pursuant to CEQA, any amendment(s) to Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE 11.2 will require an analysis of whether the impacts and/or mitigation measures identified in the GP/CLUP EIR are changed as a result of the proposed amendment(s). This analysis will address any change to impacts and/or mitigation measures involving the language of Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE 11.2 or the parcels with a land use designation of Agriculture. This analysis will not include a detailed, site-specific analysis of the potential satisfaction of the criteria set forth in the proposed amendments to Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE 11.2 by each parcel with an Agriculture land use designation. Such analysis will be done when an application for a conversion of those parcels is filed and the City is able to undertake that detailed, site-specific analysis.
Part 2 - Land use designation change from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential for Shelby Trust property and Agriculture and Single-Family Residential to Planned Residential for Kenwood Village LLC property – Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC propose to change the GP/CLUP land use designation for their parcels from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential and Agriculture and Single-Family Residential to Planned Residential, respectively. This analysis will be at the site-specific level, i.e., will look at detailed site impacts based on the existing conditions (essentially vacant) as compared to the proposed land use designation. As required by CEQA, the analysis will address environmental impacts of the maximum potential development under the proposed GP/CLUP land use designations. The analysis must address the maximum potential development of the properties under the proposed GP/CLUP land use designations in order to account for all scenarios under which potential future development on the properties may occur that would not require a change to the proposed GP/CLUP land use designations. The maximum potential development of the properties encompasses the proposed residential developments for which the applicants have submitted applications.

4.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR explore alternatives that are designed to reduce or eliminate one or more of the significant impacts of the requested amendments to the GP/CLUP (GPAs). At this point, the City anticipates that a maximum of six alternatives will be analyzed in the Supplemental EIR as follows:

a. **No Project Alternative:** This alternative will summarize the environmental effects if the requested GPAs are not adopted by the City.

b. **Amendment to Subpolicy CE 11.2 initiated by City Council in February 2008:** On February 19, 2008, Shelby Trust requested that the City Council initiate amendments to the GP/CLUP relating to Subpolicy CE 11.2. On that date the Council initiated the processing of this amendment language:

   Conversion of Agricultural Lands. [GP/CP] Conversion of agricultural lands as designated on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) to other uses shall not be allowed. Lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary shall be preserved for agricultural use. Conversion of lands designated for agricultural to urban or other nonagricultural uses should only be permitted where site specific studies demonstrate that such conversion will not result in a significant loss of opportunity for local viable and economically feasible agricultural production. Conversion may be allowed when site specific analysis shows that conditions do not exist that would create, support or otherwise sustain viable and economically feasible agricultural production.

   The applicants (both Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC) have subsequently revised the proposed Subpolicy CE 11.2 amendment language. As this language was initiated for processing by the City Council, it is identified as an alternative to be analyzed in the Supplemental EIR.

c. **Environmentally Superior Alternative:** CEQA requires that if the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the “No Project Alternative,” the EIR must identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives.
d. Policy-based amendment language TBD: This GPA text will be developed early in the Supplemental EIR process in collaboration between City staff and the Supplemental EIR consultant.

e. Deletion of Policy CE 11.2 Alternative: To ensure that a full range of alternatives are analyzed in the Supplemental EIR, an alternative that assesses the impacts and mitigation measures associated with the deletion of Subpolicy CE 11.2 will be included in the document.

f. Alternative TBD: A sixth alternative will be developed in collaboration between City staff and the Supplemental EIR consultant.

Each alternative will be analyzed for the same set of environmental issues as the requested GPAs, along with any new issues the alternatives may raise.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The EIR will serve as a Supplemental EIR in accordance with CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15163) and will include an analysis of all aspects of the requested GPAs. The Supplemental EIR will include an analysis of the environmental issues discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR as they relate to the requested amendments to Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE 11.2 and the Land Use Plan Map and the Open Space Plan Map.

************************************************

The City of Goleta looks forward to receiving your comments and proposal.

Sincerely,

Patricia Saley, Acting Director
Planning and Environmental Services
### Appendix 1
General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR
(Class I and II Impacts and Mitigation Measures Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Impact #</th>
<th>Nature of impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I Impacts – Significant and Unavoidable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources      | 3.1-1    | Impacts on Visual Resources within the City including views from Hollister Ave. and City gateways. | • VH 1: Scenic Views  
• VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors  
• VH 4: Design Review |
|                                     | 3.1-2    | Impacts on Citywide visual character.                                            | • VH 1: Scenic Views  
• VH 3: Community Character  
• VH 4: Design Review |
| Agriculture and Farmland             | 3.2-1    | Conversion of agricultural land and loss or impairment of agricultural productivity. | • CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.                                |
|                                     | 3.2-4    | Cumulative loss of agricultural lands.                                          | • None.                                                                  |
| Air Quality                          | 3.3-5    | Cumulative ROG and NOx.                                                          | • None.                                                                  |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials      | 3.7-1    | Risk of upset at Venoco Facilities.                                             | • LU 10 and 10-4b: Energy-related uses and SLC Lease 421  
• SE 1 and 1.2: Safety in general and guidelines for uses and facilities  
• SE 7 and subpolicies: Oil and gas pipeline safety measures  
• SE 11 and subpolicies: Emergency preparedness, education and awareness programs  
• SE 8 and subpolicies: Oil and gas industry hazards  
• SE 10 and subpolicies: Hazardous materials and facilities  
• SE 11 and subpolicies: Emergency preparedness, education and awareness programs |
|                                     | 3.7-2    | Transport                                                                        | • SE 8 and subpolicies: Oil and gas industry hazards  
• SE 10 and subpolicies: Hazardous materials and facilities  
• SE 11 and subpolicies: Emergency preparedness, education and awareness programs |
| Water Quality                        | 3.9-9    | Water quality impacts from discharge to surface water bodies where water bodies are 303(d) listed. | • CE 2, 6, 7, and 10: Protection of creeks, watersheds, marine habitats and beaches  
• SE 8 and 10: Oil and gas industry hazards  
• LU 10: Energy-related on- and off-shore uses  
• TE 6: Street design and streetscape character |
| Noise                                | 3.11-1   | Exposure of noise sensitive land uses to noise from single-event and nuisance noise sources. | • NE 1: Noise and land use compatibility standards  
• NE 2: Traffic noise sources  
• NE 7: Design criteria to attenuate noise |
|                                     | 3.11-2   | Exposure of existing or planned noise sensitive receptors to increased noise.     | • NE 2: Traffic noise sources  
• NE 7: Design criteria to attenuate noise |
<p>|                                     | 3.11-3   | Exposure of proposed noise sensitive land uses to traffic noise.                 | Same as Impact NE 3.11-1                                                 |
|                                     | 3.11-4   | Exposure of proposed noise sensitive land uses to railroad noise.                | • NE 1: Noise and land use compatibility standards |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Impact #</th>
<th>Nature of impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 4: Railway noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 7: Design criteria to attenuate noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11-5</td>
<td>Exposure of proposed noise sensitive land uses to other point sources.</td>
<td>NE 1: Noise and land use compatibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 5: Industrial and other point sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 7: Design criteria to attenuate noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11-7</td>
<td>Cumulative traffic noise</td>
<td>Same as Impact NE 3.11-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and</td>
<td>3.13-1</td>
<td>Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by local</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways (Hollister/Storke).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class II Impacts – Significant but Mitigable Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Impact #</th>
<th>Nature of impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and Visual</td>
<td>3.1-4</td>
<td>Impacts on Visual Resources within the City including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints</td>
<td>VH 1: Scenic Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VH 4: Design Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and</td>
<td>3.2-2</td>
<td>Incompatible land uses and structures.</td>
<td>CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>3.3-1</td>
<td>Construction Emissions</td>
<td>See mitigation measures in GP EIR, p. ES-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3-6</td>
<td>Cumulative PM₁₀ emissions</td>
<td>Implementation of City Grading Ord. and SBCAPCD dust-control measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3-7</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas</td>
<td>CE 9, 12 and 13: Protection of woodlands, TSM, and energy conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE 3: Linkage of housing and jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 11: Nonresidential growth management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OS 7: Open Space Plan Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TE 7, 8, 10, 11 and 15: Public transit, rail, pedestrian circulation, bikeways and regional transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3.4-1</td>
<td>Temporary impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species</td>
<td>CE 1 through 10: Protection of habitats and species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OS 1 through 7: Access, trails, and open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 1: LU Plan Map and general policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 6: Park and open space uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and –Related uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-2</td>
<td>Loss of Special Status Habitats</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-3</td>
<td>Long-term degradation of Special Status Habitats</td>
<td>CE 1 through 7, 9 and 10: Protection of habitats and species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LU 1, 6 and 9: See Impact 3.4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-4</td>
<td>Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.4-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-5</td>
<td>Harm to listed species</td>
<td>Same as Impacts 3.4-1 and -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 8: protection of Special Status Spp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area</td>
<td>Impact #</td>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-6</td>
<td>Loss, reduction or isolation of local populations of native species</td>
<td>Same as Impacts 3.4-1, -2 and -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-7</td>
<td>Reduction in amount of quality of habitat for Special Status Species</td>
<td>Same as Impacts 3.4-1, -2 and -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-8</td>
<td>Break or impairment of function of existing wildlife linkages</td>
<td>Same as Impacts 3.4-1, -2 and -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-9</td>
<td>Loss or degradation of conserved habitat</td>
<td>See previous Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-10</td>
<td>Inconsistency with approved conservation program or local conservation policy</td>
<td>See previous Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>3.5-1</td>
<td>Damage to sites of cultural, historical, or paleontological significance</td>
<td>OS 8: protection of Native American and Paleontological Resources, VH 5: Historic Resources, VH 6: Historical and Cultural Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5-2</td>
<td>Loss or destruction of an important historical building, archaeological site, or Paleontological site</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5-3</td>
<td>Loss or destruction of significant cultural resources</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>3.6-1</td>
<td>Substantial accelerated soils erosion and/or loss of a substantial amount of topsoil</td>
<td>SE 1: Safety in general, SE 2: Bluff erosion and retreat, SE 3: Beach erosion and shoreline hazards, SE 5: Soil and slope stability hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6-2</td>
<td>Exposure of people or structures to substantial adverse effects resulting from the rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground shaking, seismically induced landsliding or liquefaction</td>
<td>SE 1: Safety in general, SE 4: Seismic and seismically induced hazards, SE 11: Emergency preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6-3</td>
<td>Exposure of people or structures to substantial adverse landslide effects resulting from development on unstable geologic units or soils or steep slopes</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6-4</td>
<td>Location of development on expansive soils that could lead to risks to people or structures</td>
<td>SE 1: Safety in general, SE 5: Soil and slope stability hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>3.7-3</td>
<td>Risk of upset at S.L. 421 wells</td>
<td>LU 10, 10-3a, 10-4a and b: Energy-related on- and off-shore uses, SE 8 and subpolicies: Oil and gas industry hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7-4</td>
<td>Risk of upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal</td>
<td>SE 8 and subpolicies: Oil and gas industry hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7-5</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>SE 9 and subpolicies: Airport-related hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7-6</td>
<td>Wildland fires</td>
<td>SE 1 and subpolicies: Safety in general, SE 7 and subpolicies: urban and wildland fire hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area</td>
<td>Impact #</td>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | 3.7-7    | Surface water   | • CE 1 and subpolicies: ESHA designations and policy  
|             |          |                 | • CE 2 and subpolicies: Protection of creeks and riparian areas  
|             |          |                 | • CE 3 and subpolicies: Protection of wetlands  
|             |          |                 | • CE 10 and subpolicies: Watershed management and water quality  |
|             | 3.7-8    | Exposure of population to listed/contaminated sites | • SE 10 and subpolicies: Hazardous materials and facilities  |
|             | 3.7-9    | Contaminated soil | • SE 10 and subpolicies: Hazardous materials and facilities  |
| Population and Housing | 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 land in the City. | • None.  |
|             | 3.8-2    | Population growth associated with implementation of the proposed GP/CLUP is anticipated to result in an increase in the population by 24% at full or ultimate buildout. | • LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management  |
|             | 3.8-3    | Ultimate buildout of the City in accordance with the GP/CLUP could result in the addition of 3,730 residential units to the City’s housing stock. | • HE 1, 2, 4 – 6, and 8-11: Housing Element policies re variety of housing types and affordability.  |
|             | 3.8-4    | Ultimate buildout of the City in accordance with the GP/CLUP would result in the addition of approximately 2,400 to 3,900 jobs. | • HE 3, 6 and 7: Housing Element policies re jobs:housing and RHNA  
|             |          |                 | • LU 1 – 4 and 8 – Residential, commercial and industrial development  
|             |          |                 | • TE 1, 2, 13 and 15: TDM, traffic mitigation and regional transportation  |
| Water Quality | 3.9-1 | Degradation of water quality from construction-related contaminants. | • CE 2, 3 and 6: Protection of creeks, wetlands and marine habitats.  
|             |          |                 | • CE 10: Watershed management and water quality  |
|             | 3.9-2    | Adequacy of water supplies to serve new development. | • LU 1 and 12: LU Map and general policies  |
|             | 3.9-3    | Changes in groundwater supply from new development | • CE 2, 10 and 15: Protection of creeks, watershed management and water conservation  
|             |          |                 | • PF 4: Water and sewer facilities  |
|             | 3.9-4    | Alterations in existing drainage patterns and downstream flooding and erosion. | • LU 1: LU Map and general policies  
|             |          |                 | • CE 2, 6, 7, and 10: Protection of creeks, watersheds, marine habitats & beaches  
|             |          |                 | • PF 8: General standards for public facilities  
|             |          |                 | • SE 1 and 6: Safety and flood hazards  
<p>|             |          |                 | • TE 6: Street design and streetscape character  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Impact #</th>
<th>Nature of impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9-5</td>
<td>Construction of structures of housing in a 100-year Flood Hazard Area</td>
<td>• SE 1, 6 and 11: Safety, flood hazards and emergency preparedness&lt;br&gt;• PF 8: Standards for public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9-6</td>
<td>Risk to new development from inundation by a tsunami, mudslide or seiche</td>
<td>• SE 1, 4 and 5: Safety, seismic-induced hazards and slope stability hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9-7</td>
<td>Increases in point source and nonpoint source pollution from new development</td>
<td>• CE 2, 6, 7, and 10: Protection of creeks, watersheds, marine habitats and beaches&lt;br&gt;• SE 8 and 10: Oil and gas industry hazards&lt;br&gt;• LU 10: Energy-related on- and off-shore uses&lt;br&gt;• PF 4: Water and sewer facilities&lt;br&gt;• TE 6: Street design and streetscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Recreation</td>
<td>3.10-1</td>
<td>Conflict with applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations due to buildout (construction) of GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities.</td>
<td>• LU 10: Energy-related on- and off-shore uses&lt;br&gt;• CE 1 – 12 and 14: Protection of creeks, butterfly habitats, special-status species, water-sheds, marine habitats and beaches&lt;br&gt;• CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural lands.&lt;br&gt;• SE 1, 5, 6 and 10: Slope stability and flood hazards and hazardous materials&lt;br&gt;• NE 6: Single-event and nuisance noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10-2</td>
<td>Adverse physical effect on the environment due to construction of planned recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Same as Impact 3.10-1&lt;br&gt;• OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10-3</td>
<td>Conflict with other applicable land use policies and/or regulations due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements and public facilities.</td>
<td>• LU 1 – 4, 8, 10 and 12: Land Use Plan map, residential, commercial and other uses&lt;br&gt;• OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area&lt;br&gt;• CE 12: Protection of air quality&lt;br&gt;• HE 5, 6 and 12: Special needs, RHNA and affordable housing&lt;br&gt;• SE 9: Airport-related hazards&lt;br&gt;• SE 10: Hazardous materials and facilities&lt;br&gt;• PF 7 and 9: Coordinating facilities with other agencies and future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10-4</td>
<td>Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or natural Community Conservation Plan due to buildout of GP/ CLUP land uses.</td>
<td>• LU 1, 2 6, 9 and 12: Land Use Map, residential, park, and coastal uses&lt;br&gt;• OS 2 – 8: Access, trails, public park system, protection of Native American sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10-5</td>
<td>Loss of privacy and/or neighborhood incompatibility due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses.</td>
<td>• LU 1 – 4, 8, 9 and 12: Land Use Plan map, residential, commercial and other uses&lt;br&gt;• HE 2, 8 and 9: Partnerships and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area</td>
<td>Impact #</td>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preservation of neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• VH 1, 3 and 4: Views, community charter and design review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TE 13: Mitigating traffic impacts of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 5 and 8: School and general facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NE 1: Noise and land use compatibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse physical effect on the environment due to buildout of planned recreational facilities.</td>
<td>LU 1, 2, 6 and 9: Land Use Plan map, residential, parks and coastal uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OS 2 – 8: Access, trails, public park system, protection of Native American sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CE 1 – 3 and 5 – 7: Access, trails, public park system, open space map and protection of Native American sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SE 2, 3, 6 and 7: Bluff erosion, shoreline and flood hazards and fire hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• VH 1: Scenic views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TE 9: Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NE 7: Design criteria to attenuate noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Substantial physical deterioration or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational facilities due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses.</td>
<td>LU 1, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 12: Land Use Plan map, open space, commercial, energy-related and other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OS 2, 6, 7 and 9: Access, public park system and open space map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CE 14: Preservation of Urban Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical division of an established community due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses.</td>
<td>LU 1, 2 and 8: Land Use Plan map, Central Hollister and residential land uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HE 8 and 9: Preservation of existing housing and excellence in new design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services and Utilities</strong></td>
<td>3.12-1</td>
<td>Increased demand for police protection.</td>
<td>PF 2: Other facilities of the City of Goleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 3: Public safety services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 9: Coordination of facilities with future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased demand for fire protection.</td>
<td>PF 3: Public safety services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 7: Urban and wildland fire hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 9: Coordination of facilities with future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased demand for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal.</td>
<td>PF 4: Water and sewer facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 7: Urban and wildland fire hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PF 9: Coordination of facilities with future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area</td>
<td>Impact #</td>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.12-4      | Increased demand for utility services. | • PF 6: Utilities  
• PF 7: Urban and wildland fire hazards  
• PF 8: General standards for public facilities  
• PF 9: Coordination of facilities with future development  
• PF 13: Energy conservation |
| 3.12-5      | Increased demand on local school districts. | • PF 5: School facilities |
| 3.12-6      | Increased demand on library facilities. | • PF 2: Other facilities of the City of Goleta  
• PF 7: Urban and wildland fire hazards  
• PF 8: General standards for public facilities  
• PF 9: Coordination of facilities with future development |
| **Transportation and Circulation** | 3.13-2 | Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by local jurisdictions for designated roadways or highways (numerous intersections). | • TE 1: Integrated multi-modal transportation system  
• TE 4: Target LOS standards  
• TE 5: Planned street and road improvements |
Notice of Preparation

July 23, 2012

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment
   SCH# 2012071071

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Pat Saley
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
SCH# 2012071071
Project Title Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment
Lead Agency Goleta, City of

Type NOP Notice of Preparation
Description The two applicants, Shelby and Kenwood Village, came to the City of Goleta with very similar General Plan Amendments requests. Both wanted to change the land use designation from Agriculture to a non-Agriculture land use as shown in the table below. The City requested that the applicants coordinate their requests so the one environmental document could be prepared on the GPA, rather than two documents addressing two similar requests. The two projects also involve amendments to the Conservation and Open Space Elements of the General Plan. The relevant maps are provided in the NOP.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Pat Saley
Agency City of Goleta
Phone 805 961 7541
Fax
email
Address 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
City Goleta State CA Zip 93117

Project Location
County Santa Barbara
City Goleta
Region
Cross Streets Cathedral Oaks Rd (Shelby) and Calle Real (Kenwood Village)
Lat / Long 34.442398° N / -119.886267° W
Parcel No. 077-530-019, 077-130-019, 077-141-049

Proximity to:
Highways US 101
Airports Santa Barbara Municipal
Railways SPRR
Waterways El Encanto Creek
Schools Dos Pueblos HS, Goleta Valley JHS, several ES
Land Use Various

Project Issues
Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 5; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3

Date Received 07/23/2012 Start of Review 07/23/2012 End of Review 08/21/2012

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 or P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613

SCH# 2012071071

Project Title: Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment

Lead Agency: City of Goleta
Contact Person: Pat Saley

Street Address: 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Phone: (805) 961-7541

City: Goleta Zip: 93117 County: Santa Barbara

PROJECT LOCATION: County: Santa Barbara City/Nearest Community: Goleta

Cross Streets: Cathedral Oaks Rd (Shelby) and Calle Real (Kenwood Village) Zip Code: 93117

Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes, and seconds): Shelby: 34.442398, -119.886267 and Kenwood Village 34.433744, -119.886234

Total Acres: 14.38 ac (Shelby) and 10 ac (Kenwood)

APN: 077-530-019 (Shelby) and 077-130-019 & 077-141-049 (Kenwood)

Section: __ Twp. __ Range: __ Base: __

Within 2 Miles (Highway): US 101 Waterways: El Encanto Creek

Airports: Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Railways: Southern Pacific Railroad Schools: Dos Pueblos HS, Goleta Valley JHS, several elementary schools

DOCUMENT TYPE

CEQA: □NOP □Draft EIR □Early Cons □Supplement/Subsequent EIR □Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) 2005031151 □Mit Neg Dec □Other: NEPA: □NOI □Draft EIS □EA □FONSI □Other: □Joint Document □Final Document □Other ______

LOCAL ACTION TYPE

□General Plan Update □Specific Plan (Rescinding) □Rezone □Annexation □General Plan Amendment □Master Plan □Prezone □Redevelopment □General Plan Element □Planned Unit Development □Use Permit □Coastal Permit □Community Plan □Site Plan □Land Division □Other:

DEVELOPMENT TYPE – Both projects propose 60 units (single family on Shelby and single family, duplexes and triplexes on Kenwood). The project-specific impacts are addressed in each project's EIR (which are being prepared at the same time as the GPA EIR).

□Residential: Units Acres □Transporation: Type □Office: Sq.ft Acres Employees □Mining: Type □Commercial: Sq.ft Acres Employees □Power: Type Watts □Industrial: Sq.ft Acres Employees □Waste Treatment: Type □Educational □Hazardous Waste: Type □Recreational □Other:

□Water Facilities: Type MGD □Other:

PROJECT ISSUES THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT OR POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

□Aesthetic/Visual □Flood Plain/Flooding □Schools/Universities □Water Quality
□Agriculture/Forest Resources □Forest Land/Fire Hazard □Septic Systems □Water Supply/ Groundwater
□Air Quality □Geologic/Seismic □Sewer Capacity □Wetland/Riparian
□Archaeological/Historical □Greenhouse Gases □Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading □Wildlife
□Biological Resources □Minerals □Solid Waste □Growth Inducement
□Coastal Zone □Noise □Toxic/Hazardous □Land Use
□Drainage/Absorption □Population/Housing Balance □Traffic/Circulation □Cumulative Effects
□Economic/Jobs □Public Services/Facilities □Vegetation □Other ______
□Fiscal □Recreation/Parks
PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

Starting Date  Monday, July 23, 2012
Date  July 20, 2012
Ending Date  August 22, 2012

Signature
Patricia Saley, Acting Planning & Env'tal Services Director
City of Goleta

LEAD AGENCY (Complete if applicable):
Consulting Firm:  N/A
Address:  
City/State/Zip:  
Contact:  
Phone:  

For SCH Use Only:
Date Received at SCH
Date Review Starts
Date to Agencies
Date to SCH
Clearance Date

APPLICANT  

Notes:
NOP Distribution List

Resources Agency
- Resources Agency
  - Nadia Gayou
- Dept. of Boating & Waterways
  - Nicole Wong
- California Coastal Commission
  - Elizabeth A. Fuchs
- Colorado River Board
  - Gerald R. Zimmerman
- Dept. of Conservation
  - Elizabeth Carpenter
- California Energy Commission
  - Eric Knight
- Cal Fire
  - Dan Foster
- Central Valley Flood Protection Board
  - James Herota
- Office of Historic Preservation
  - Ron Parsons
- Dept of Parks & Recreation
  - Environmental Stewardship Section
- California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery
  - Sue O'Leary
  - Steve McAdam
- Dept. of Water Resources Resources Agency
  - Nadia Gayou

Fish and Game
- Dept. of Fish & Game
  - Environmental Services Division
- Fish & Game Region 1
  - Donald Koch

Resources Agency
- Fish & Game Region 1
  - Laurie Harnsberger
- Fish & Game Region 2
  - Jeff Drongensen
- Fish & Game Region 3
  - Charles Armor
- Fish & Game Region 4
  - Julie Vance
- Fish & Game Region 5
  - Leslie Newton-Reed
  - Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Game Region 6
  - Gabrina Gatchel
  - Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Game Region 6 I/M
  - Brad Henderson
  - Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program
- Dept. of Fish & Game M
  - George Isaac
  - Marine Region

Other Departments
- Food & Agriculture
  - Sandra Schubert
  - Dept. of Food and Agriculture
- Dept. of General Services
  - Public School Construction
- Dept. of General Services
  - Anna Garbeff
  - Environmental Services Section
- Dept. of Public Health
  - Bridgette Binning
  - Dept. of Health/Drinking Water
- Delta Stewardship Council
  - Kevan Samsam

Independent Commissions, Boards
- Delta Protection Commission
  - Michael Machado
- Cal EMA (Emergency Management Agency)
  - Dennis Castrillo

County: Santa Barbara

- Native American Heritage Comm.
  - Debbie Treadway
- Public Utilities Commission
  - Leo Wong
- Santa Monica Bay Restoration
  - Guanyu Wang
- State Lands Commission
  - Jennifer Deleong
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
  - Cherry Jacques

Business, Trans & Housing
- Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
  - Philip Crimmins
- Caltrans - Planning
  - Terri Pencovic
- California Highway Patrol
  - Suzann Ikeuchi
  - Office of Special Projects
- Dept. of Fish & Game M
  - George Isaac
  - Marine Region
- Housing & Community Development
  - CEQA Coordinator
  - Housing Policy Division

Dept. of Transportation
- Caltrans, District 1
  - Rex Jackman
- Caltrans, District 2
  - Marcelino Gonzalez
- Caltrans, District 3
  - Gary Arnold
- Caltrans, District 4
  - Erik Alm
- Caltrans, District 5
  - David Murray
- Caltrans, District 6
  - Michael Navarro
- Caltrans, District 7
  - Dianna Watson
- Caltrans, District 8
  - Dan Kopulsky
- Caltrans, District 9
  - Gayle Rosander
- Caltrans, District 10
  - Tom Dumas
- Caltrans, District 11
  - Jacob Armstrong
- Caltrans, District 12
  - Marion Regisford

Cal EPA
- Air Resources Board
  - Jim Lerner
- Transportation Projects
  - Douglas Itto
- Industrial Projects
  - Mike Tollstrup
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Regional Programs Unit
  - Division of Financial Assistance
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit
  - Division of Water Quality
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Phil Grader
  - Division of Water Rights
- Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
  - CEQA Tracking Center
- Department of Pesticide Regulation
  - CEQA Coordinator

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- RWQCB 1
  - Cathleen Hudson
  - North Coast Region (1)
- RWQCB 2
  - Environmental Document Coordinator
  - San Francisco Bay Region (2)
- RWQCB 3
  - Central Coast Region (3)
- RWQCB 4
  - Teresa Rodgers
  - Los Angeles Region (4)
- RWQCB 5S
  - Central Valley Region (5)
- RWQCB 5F
  - Fresno Branch Office
- RWQCB 5R
  - Redding Branch Office
- RWQCB 6
  - Lahontan Region (6)
- RWQCB 6V
  - Victorville Branch Office
- RWQCB 7
  - Colorado River Basin Region (7)
- RWQCB 8
  - Santa Ana Region (8)
- RWQCB 9
  - San Diego Region (9)

Other
  - _______________________
  - _______________________

Conservancy

Last Updated 6/26/2012
July 26, 2012

Pat Saley, Acting Director of Planning & Environmental Services

City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Re: SCH#2012071071; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment Project; located in the City of Goleta; Santa Barbara County, California.

Dear Pat Saley:


This letter includes state and federal statutes relating to Native American historic properties or resources of religious and cultural significance to American Indian tribes and interested Native American individuals as ‘consulting parties’ under both state and federal law. State law also addresses the freedom of Native American Religious Expression in Public Resources Code §5097.9. This project is also subject to California Government Code Section 65352.3 et seq.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA — CA Public Resources Code 21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a ‘significant effect’ requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as ‘a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance.’ In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the ‘area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. The NAHC recommends that the lead agency request that the NAHC do a Sacred Lands File search as part of the careful planning for the proposed project.

The NAHC "Sacred Sites," as defined by the Native American Heritage Commission and the California Legislature in California Public Resources Code §§5097.94(a) and 5097.96. Items in the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory are confidential and exempt from the Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r).

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or burial sites once a project is underway. Culturally affiliated tribes and individuals may have knowledge of the religious and cultural
significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We strongly urge that you make contact with the list of Native American Contacts on the attached list of Native American contacts, to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources and to obtain their recommendations concerning the proposed project. Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code § 5097.95, the NAHC requests cooperation from other public agencies in order that the Native American consulting parties be provided pertinent project information. Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040.12(e). Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code §5097.95, the NAHC requests that pertinent project information be provided consulting tribal parties, including archaeological studies. The NAHC recommends avoidance as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and Section 2183.2 that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

Furthermore, the NAHC if the proposed project is under the jurisdiction of the statutes and regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (e.g. NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321-43351). Consultation with tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq), 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 et seq. and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1992 Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior’s Standards include recommendations for all ‘lead agencies’ to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to “research” the cultural landscape that might include the ‘area of potential effect’.

Confidentiality of “historic properties of religious and cultural significance” should also be considered as protected by California Government Code §6254( r) and may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APEs and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

Furthermore, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for inadvertent discovery of human remains mandate the processes to be followed in the event of a discovery of human remains in a project location other than a ‘dedicated cemetery’.

To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. Regarding tribal consultation, a relationship built around regular meetings and informal involvement with local tribes will lead to more qualitative consultation tribal input on specific projects.

Finally, when Native American cultural sites and/or Native American burial sites are prevalent within the project site, the NAHC recommends ‘avoidance’ of the site as referenced by CEQA Guidelines Section 15370(a).
If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contact List
Native American Contact
Santa Barbara County
July 26, 2012

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie, Chairwoman
365 North Poli Ave  Chumash
Ojai  ,  CA 93023
jtumamait@sbcglobal.net
(805) 646-6214

Beverly Salazar Folkes
1931 Shadybrook Drive Chumash
Thousand Oaks,  CA 91362 Tataviam
folkes@msn.com Ferrnandeño
805 492-7255
(805) 558-1154 - cell

Patrick Tumamait
992 El Camino Corto Chumash
Ojai  ,  CA 93023
(805) 640-0481
(805) 216-1253 Cell

Owl Clan
Dr. Kote & Lin A-Lul'Koy Lotah Chumash
48825 Sapaque Road Tataviam
Bradley,  CA 93426 Ferrnandeño
mupaka@gmail.com
(805) 472-9536

San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council
Chief Mark Steven Vigil  Chumash
1030 Ritchie Road
Grover Beach  CA 93433
(805) 481-2461
(805) 474-4729 - Fax

Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians
Vincent Armenta, Chairperson  Chumash
P.O. Box 517
Santa Ynez,  CA 93460
varmenta@santaynezchumash.
(805) 688-7997
(805) 686-9578 Fax

John Ruiz
1826 Stanwood Drive
Santa Barbara  CA 93103
(805) 965-8983

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2012071071; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment; located in the City of Goleta; Santa Barbara County, California.
Native American Contact
Santa Barbara County
July 26, 2012

Gilbert M. Unzueta Jr.
571 Citation Way
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320
uhuffle@aol.com
(805) 375-7229

Chumash

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
Toni Cordero, Chairwoman
P.O. Box 4464
Santa Barbara, CA 93140
cordero44@charter.net
805-964-3447

Stephen William Miller
189 Cartagena
Camarillo, CA 93010
(805) 484-2439

Chumash

Charles S. Parra
P.O. Box 6612
Oxnard, CA 93031
(805) 340-3134 (Cell)
(805) 488-0481 (Home)

Santa Ynez Tribal Elders Council
Adelina Alva-Padilla, Chair Woman
P.O. Box 365
Santa Ynez, CA 93460
elders@santaynezychumash.org
(805) 688-8446
(805) 693-1768 FAX

Chumash

Richard Angulo
P.O. Box 935
Salome, AZ 85348

Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians
Tribal Administrator
P.O. Box 517
Santa Ynez, CA 93460
info@santaynezychumash.
(805) 688-7997
(805) 686-9578 Fax

Randy Guzman - Folkes
6471 Cornell Circle
Moorpark, CA 93021
ndnRandy@yahoo.com
(805) 905-1675 - cell

Chumash
Fernandeño
Tataviam
Shoshone Paiute
Yaqui

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2012071071; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment; located in the City of Goleta; Santa Barbara County, California.
Native American Contact
Santa Barbara County
July 26, 2012

Carol A. Pulido
165 Mountainview Street  Chumash
Oak View  ,  CA  93022
805-649-2743 (Home)

Aylisha Diane Marie Garcia Napoleone
33054 Decker School Road  Chumash
Malibu  ,  CA  90265

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Kathleen Pappo
2762 Vista Mesa Drive  Chumash
Rancho Pales Verdes  CA  90275
310-831-5295

Melissa M. Parra-Hernandez
119 North Balsam Street  Chumash
Oxnard  ,  CA  93030
envyy36@yahoo.com
805-983-7964
(805) 248-8463 cell

Frank Arredondo
PO Box 161  Chumash
Santa Barbara  CA  93102
ksen_sku_mu@yahoo.com
805-617-6684
ksen_sku_mu@yahoo.com

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Rauld Joe Banuelos, Jr.
331 Mira Flores Court  Chumash
Camarillo  ,  CA  93012
805-987-5314

Santa Ynez Tribal Elders Council
Freddie Romero, Cultural Preservation Consintl
P.O. Box 365  Chumash
Santa Ynez  ,  CA  93460
freddyromero1959@yahoo.
805-688-7997, Ext 37

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2012071071; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment; located in the City of Goleta; Santa Barbara County, California.
Dear Ms. Salee,

Thank you for your notice regarding a scoping meeting to be held Aug. 8th. I'm in favor of changing the property designation from Agricultural to Planned Residential Development. However, the B and C amendments should be studied carefully. B-amendment may open the downzoned agricultural lands to be approved without our input. C says the property would be removed from our open space map. Why is this so necessary?

The environmental limitations include increased traffic on Calle Real. Another exit will be very necessary for the 60 units. Two story would be favored to blend in with our community.

I favor standing by the policy change which were certified in July 2009. Perhaps the impacts can be mitigated as the projects proceed through the reports on each project (Shelly, Rust, Kenwood)

Sincerely,

William and Amarylis

Bridges
California, CA 93117

M. Tricia, 93117
130 San Marcos Dr.

Colletta, 93117

36 San Marcos Dr.

Amarelli Bridges

July 30, 2012

William Armstrong

July 30, 2012

130 San Marcos Dr.

Colletta, CA 93117

36 San Marcos Dr.

Amarelli Bridges
August 6, 2012

City of Goleta
Attn: Patricia Saley, Interim Planning Director
Planning and Environmental Services
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Subject: Scoping Document for Shelby Trust Subdivision / Kenwood Village LLC Project General Plan Amendments (12-EIR-003)

Dear Mrs. Saley:

Please accept this letter as a formal request to evaluate and include the following information within the Scope of the General Plan Amendments EIR.

We request that the EIR include a summary of the zoning and agricultural history of the Shelby parcel, as this history is directly related to the application for the General Plan Amendments contained in 12-EIR-003 (perhaps within the Land Use and Planning Section). This summary would essentially contain the history of the land use designations and zoning of the property from the late 1960s to the present-day; and the current owner’s experiences, from working to create a successful agricultural operation, to the encroachment of urban type uses which have served as a significant detriment to the viability of agriculture on the current Shelby parcel.

A considerable amount of this history is provided for your review and use on a CD containing an Agricultural Compendium and supporting documents concerning the Shelby property. This Compendium comprises material from 1979 to 2011, on a variety of topics including soil characteristics, annual production quantities, and agricultural viability. Additionally, the maps of the State Farm Mapping and Monitoring Program for Santa Barbara County have been included for the most recent years of 2006, 2008 and 2010, and identify the subject property as "Urban and Built-up Lands".
The CD files are all PDFs and contain the following:

**Compendium – Shelby** (with the following attachments)
- Attachment A 08-93 Goleta Community Plan – Portion
- Attachment B 04-97 FGL Soil Survey
- Attachment C 07-97 Segment 3 EIR 96-EIR-06 - Portion
- Attachment D 1979 Conservation Element - Portion
- Attachment E 09-98 Westfield LLC Project 98-EIR-03 - Portion
- Attachment F 01-02 UCCE Avocados Cost vs Return Study
- Attachment G 08-02 Gol Val Urban Ag SB County
- Attachment H 05-04 GP Background Rpt17-Goleta
- Attachment I 04-06 Gostovich AG Report
- Attachment J 07-06 GolVal Ag Viability Analysis CH2m Hill
- Attachment K 09-08 Revised Storie Index for Digital Soil Info ; and
- Attachment L Web Soil Survey – Property Mapped with Rev Stoire Index

And these **State Maps**:
- FMMP SBA 2006
- FMMP SBA 2008; and
- FMMP SBA 2010

We appreciate your time and effort associated with this General Plan Amendment process, and look forward to our requested information being included within the GPA EIR. If you have any questions, or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at 962-4611.

Very Truly Yours,

Mark Lloyd
L & P Consultants
Agent for Shelby Family Partnership

CC: Shelby Family Partnership
    C.E. Wullbrandt
    L & P Files

g:\2001\01-023.01 westfield rr ranch\word\scope of eir august 8-12 gpa.doc
WEDNESDAY, August 8, 2012, 6:00 P.M.

GOLETA CITY HALL
130 CREMONA DRIVE, SUITE B, GOLETA, CALIFORNIA

Environmental Hearing Officer
Patricia Saley, Acting Director
Planning and Environmental Services

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 p.m. by Patricia Saley, Acting Director of Planning and Environmental Services, serving as the Environmental Hearing Officer.

Staff present:  Pat Saley, Acting Director of Planning and Environmental Services; Shine Ling, Associate Planner; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

Pat Saley, Acting Director of Planning and Environmental Services, announced that the purpose of this Scoping Hearing is to receive comments on three Notices of Preparation as described below. Please send comments c/o Patricia Saley, Acting Planning and Environmental Services Director at the City Hall address above or by email to psaley@cityofgoleta.org.

Change Order of Agenda:

Pat Saley, Environmental Hearing Officer, moved the order of the public hearings as follows:  Item B.3, Item B.2, and Item B.1.

B-1. Proposed Kenwood Village Project - Case 08-205-GPA, RZN, VTM, DP and DA; 12-EIR-004; APN 077-130-006, -019 and 077-141-049 - The proposed project includes a total of 60 units on a 10-acre undeveloped site on the 7300 block of Calle Real. The project includes 13 single-family residences, 20 duplexes and 27 triplexes, six units that will be affordable to moderate and upper moderate income households (3 units each). The applications include a Rezone, Vesting Tract Map, Development Plan and Development Agreement. Comments on this Notice of Preparation (NOP) are due by 5:00 pm, Thursday, September 6, 2012.

The public hearing was opened at 7:20 p.m.
Staff presentation:
Shine Ling, Associate Planner

Speakers:

Lisa Plowman, with Peikert Group, representing Ken Alker, commented:  a) A letter with more detailed comments will be submitted.  b) The scope needs to acknowledge that the zone district being considered is Planned Residential Development with a maximum of 60 units, which is 6 units per acre.  c) It will be important to acknowledge the benefit to the biological resources provided by the proposed restoration plan.  d) The Willow Flycatcher species should not be included in the scope because of a very low probability that it exists in southern Santa Barbara County.  e) A wetland delineation will not provide any additional information about the extent of the El Encanto Creek resource, and it is beyond what is required by CEQA.  f) Recommended that the agricultural viability analysis that was conducted for the 3.8 acres be provided to the EIR consultant for General Plan Amendment EIR.  g) The analysis under Alternative B should consider that the agricultural land to the south would be developed with some uses other than agriculture, for example, a single-family house, a barn, and a guest house.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, commented:  a) Air quality, geology, land use, planning, population, and impacts on public services should be included in the analysis.  b) When Dos Pueblos High School is in session, there are huge traffic impacts on the neighborhood, as well as traffic impacts from people going to work.  c) She expressed concern regarding overdevelopment in her neighborhood.  d) There are other projects that have been approved, or in the process, that have not yet been built.

Earl Lovelace, Goleta, commented:  a) The project is too dense for this site, citing the traffic concerns.  b) Consider how the project will affect the view corridor since Highway 101 is a view corridor.  c) He noted that historically pumpkins and tomatoes were raised on the property.

Rick Foster, Goleta, commented:  a) The project is located within the El Encanto Heights residential area, and on property already zoned for residential that could accommodate a smaller development.  b) When looking at density, consider that the private streets are counted as part of the common open space.  c) Consider the quality of the environment for the people who will be living near the freeway.  d) The project is too dense.  e) Traffic will need to be mitigated.

April Reid, Goleta, commented:  a) Pumpkins and tomatoes were grown in the area.  b) Expressed concern regarding the density and environmental impact of the project because the vast majority of the houses on Baker Lane, Violet, and Daffodil are single-family, single-story houses.  c) Consider privacy and shading issues with regard to adjacent homes.  d) Consider aesthetic and view issues.  e) A detailed letter will be submitted.

Larry Scarpacci, Goleta, commented:  a) Regarding aesthetics, he expressed concern that the project will block his view of the Santa Ynez Mountains and change the character of his neighborhood.  b) Traffic is a major concern, noting that the project will directly affect the commute for employees and students, especially in the morning. He suggested interviewing some school employees as part of the EIR process.  c)
Presently, he believes a stop light is needed at the intersections of Ellwood Station/Calle Real; Calaveras/Calle Real; Del Norte/Alameda.

Ken Alker, owner, Kenwood Village Project, commented:  a) His goal as a business owner in Goleta is to develop the property to provide the type of housing that is affordable for the local workforce. b) The plan includes the dedication of a walking path that would allow access to Ellwood Station Road, Dos Pueblos High School, and to the commercial center.

Rick Erickmann, representing Santa Barbara Urban Creeks Council, commented:  a) El Encanto Creek is an important biological asset. b) Requested that the open space alongside El Encanto Creek be designated open space and all development be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the top of bank.

Shirley Luna, Goleta, commented:  a) She expressed concern that the project will block her view of the ocean (along Tuolumne Drive). b) Two-story homes will be a problem if Calle Real is supposed to be a scenic route. c) The additional homes will result in more traffic daily. d) Consider the White-tailed Kite species. e) Traffic and parking are concerns that need to be considered.

Karen Kuyper, Goleta, commented:  a) The portion of the area zoned Agriculture should remain Agriculture, and be used possibly for some kind of tree farming. b) Consider only developing the commercial portion for lower density housing, without adverse impact to the neighbors.

The public hearing was closed at 8:15 p.m.

**B-2. Proposed Shelby Trust Project - Case 05-154-GPA, OA, RZN, VTM, DP; 12-EIR-005; APN 077-530-019** - The proposed project includes 60 market-rate single-family lots on a 14.38-acre lot located at 7500 Cathedral Oaks Road adjacent to Glen Annie Golf Course. The applications include a Rezone, Ordinance Amendment, Vesting Tract Map, Development Plan and Development Agreement. Comments on this NOP are due by 5:00 pm, Thursday, September 6, 2012.

The public hearing was opened at 7:00 p.m.

Staff presentation:
Shine Ling, Associate Planner

Speakers:

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, commented:  a) She observed that a large amount of dirt was moved onto the upper portion of the Shelby Ranch property, raising the grade considerably, which she believes should be looked at. b) Air Quality, geology, land use, planning, population, public services, and all impacts created by development should be considered. c) The property is viable agricultural property if people have the desire to grow something on it, and it should stay agricultural property.

Earl Lovelace, Goleta, commented:  a) The Shelby Ranch Project appears to be too dense. b) Currently, the Highway 101 northbound lanes back up at the Glen Annie exit. c) Also, the traffic flow at the intersection of Highway 101 and Glen Annie is very
congested. d) When school is in session, Cathedral Oaks is very congested when he is trying to access the Glen Annie intersection.

Richard Foster, Goleta, commented: a) It may be best to leave the property status quo. b) The project is not surrounded by residential at this time and it does not seem to be appropriate. c) Traffic impacts should consider people driving to services that are not provided nearby. d) It appears developers may be blaming developers for unviable agricultural land.

Mark Lloyd, applicant for the Shelby Trust Project, commented: a) The applicant is willing and able to provide any information necessary for the environmental review. b) The access for the Shelby Trust Project is designed to meet public residential street standards. c) Information is available with regard to the dirt fill which came from the Cathedral Oaks Segment Three Extension project. d) The density coincides with the standards of the least dense single-family residential zoning within the City. e) A letter was presented with detailed comments.

Chip Wullbrandt, representing the Shelby Trust Project, commented: a) The Development Agreement should also be looked in the project specific analysis. b) He noted that while the buildings and structures do not quality as historically significant, the applicant proposes to move them to a permanently protected agricultural property.

The public hearing was closed at 7:19 p.m. (Next Item: Item B.1).

B-3. General Plan Amendment for Kenwood Village and Shelby Trust Projects (12-EIR-003) – The two applicants (Kenwood Village and Shelby Trust) propose the following General Plan Amendment:

1. Kenwood Village - Amend the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) of the Land Use Element to change the property’s designation from Agriculture to Planned Residential Development;
2. Shelby Trust - Amend the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) of the Land Use Element to change the Shelby property’s designation from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential;
3. Amend the text of Conservation Element Subpolicy CE 11.2 relating to Conversion of Agricultural Lands; and
4. Amend the Open Space Map of the Open Space Element (Figure 3-5) to remove the property from the map.

Comments on this NOP are due by 5:00 pm, Thursday, August 23, 2012.

The public hearing was opened at 6:15 p.m.

Staff presentation:  
Shine Ling, Associate Planner

Speakers:

Earl Lovelace, Goleta resident, urged that the General Plan not be changed or amended, and that a future Goleta live up to the expectations of the people who live here.
Karen Lovelace, Goleta, urged that the General Plan not be amended to convert to non-agricultural uses and that a careful look be given to the timing of projects. She commented: a) Wait and see what the impacts are with the projects that are already approved or in the “pipeline”. b) Currently there are traffic problems at the Storke/Hollister intersection and also in the El Encanto Heights area, particularly when school is in session.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, commented: a) All three projects need to be reviewed with regard to air quality, noise (particularly Kenwood Village being located next to Highway 101), and hazards. b) Check to see if the Kenwood Village site is located within the hazards, per the updated Airport Land Use Plan. c) On the Notice of Preparations, Item 3A, Kenwood Village, needs to mention the proposed rezone. d) Written comments will be submitted.

Richard Foster, Goleta, urged that no changes be made to the General Plan. a) He proposed that the first environmental impact is considering the change and the impact associated with the EIR process. b) Consider increased impacts when there is more traffic traveling further for services because there is not enough money to build infrastructure to adequately support development. d) Wait for more response from the community.

Lisa Plowman, with the Peikert Group, representing Kenwood Village/applicant, commented: a) It would be valuable to prepare a cursory analysis to determine whether or not any of the other properties zoned Agriculture could potentially be converted under the proposed amendment. b) Requested that staff provide clarification in the document with regard to the upper portion of the property shown on the Open Space map per her discussion with staff. c) From her review of the updated Airport Land Use Plan, the Kenwood Village site is not near the hazards.

Mark Lloyd, representing the applicant for the Shelby Trust Property, requested that the applicant’s written comments and attachments with regard to relative agricultural-related issues, submitted in a letter dated August 6, 2012, be reviewed and considered as part of the EIR. He commented: a) The applicant is participating in the process that includes full participation by the public. b) He offered that Conservation Element CE ll.2 in the General Plan is flawed and needs to be corrected. c) He noted that there is a long history of residential zoning on the Shelby Ranch property, i.e., the Goleta Community Plan dated 1992 noted that when the Segment 3 Cathedral Oaks went though, portions of the property would be rezoned; and also noted that when there was an update of the plan, the northerly portion of the property should also be considered to be zoned residential. e) Over the past 15 years EIRs have been prepared for a number of projects in the area that have identified Class I impacts to this property, and he believes any objective analysis would see that the Class I impacts brought the property to a non-viable stage.

Chip Wullbrandt, representing the Shelby family, commented: a) When the current property owner bought the Shelby property it was zoned Residential. b) A residential subdivision was approved for the property in the past. c) The application for this project was submitted in 2005. d) There is a proposed Development Agreement along with the project that needs to be analyzed in the EIR. e) The Development Agreement will provide benefits that he believes will provide greater beneficial impact than the proposed changes to the General Plan. The benefits include donating structures and assisting with installation to provide farm worker housing that will help Fairview Gardens continue as an active viable agricultural use. A contribution of $1.5 million will made to the City for the
acquisition of property for open space, recreation or other public benefit. Also, significant on-site open space will be provided as well as a Class I riding and hiking trail along the Cathedral Oaks.

Karen Kuyper, Goleta resident in the area near the Shelby Ranch, expressed concern that there would be traffic, congestion and noise if the Shelby Ranch Project is developed.

Ken Alker, owner of the Kenwood Village Project, commented that the applicant is footing the bill for processing the project.

The public hearing was closed at 7:00 p.m. (Next item: Item B.2).

C. ADJOURNMENT: 8:15 P.M.
August 14, 2012

Pat Saley
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Ste. B
Goleta, CA 93117
Fax No.: (805) 961-7551

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC General Plan Amendment Project, SCH #2012071071, Santa Barbara County

Dear Ms. Saley:

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project, relative to impacts to biological resources. The proposed project involves amending the City of Goleta's (City) General Plan to change the land use designations on two separate City parcels. The parcels would change from Agriculture to a non-Agriculture land use to allow residential development. The Shelby parcel is 14.38 acres located at 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road. The Kenwood parcel is 10 acres located on Calle Real between Baker Lane and Ellwood Station Road.

The Department is California's trustee agency for fish and wildlife resources, holding these resources in trust for the People of State pursuant to various provisions of the California Fish and Game Code. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a), 1802). The Department submits these comments in that capacity under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (See generally Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21070; 21080.4).

The California Wildlife Action Plan, a recent Department guidance document, identified the following stressors affecting wildlife and habitats within the project area: 1) growth and development; 2) water management conflicts and degradation of aquatic ecosystems; 3) invasive species; 4) intensive agriculture; 5) excessive livestock grazing; and 6) recreational pressures. The Department looks forward to working with the City to minimize impacts to fish and wildlife resources with a focus on these stressors.

To enable Department staff to adequately review and comment on the proposed project we recommend the following information, where applicable, be included in the draft Environmental Impact Report:

1) A complete, recent assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats.

   a) A thorough recent assessment of rare plants and rare natural communities, following the Department’s Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/Protocols_for_Surveying_and_Evaluating_Impacts.pdf)).

Conserving California’s Wildlife Since 1870
b) A complete, recent assessment of sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed. Recent, focused, species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

c) Rare, threatened, and endangered species to be addressed should include all those which meet the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) definition (see CEQA Guidelines, § 15380).

d) The Department's Biogeographic Data Branch in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 (www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata) to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitats, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code. Also, any Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), Significant Natural Areas (SNAs), or Environmentally Sensitive Habitats (ESHs) or any areas that are considered sensitive by the local jurisdiction located in or adjacent to the project area must be addressed.

2) A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts.

a) CEQA Guidelines, § 15125(a), direct that knowledge of the regional setting is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on resources that are rare or unique to the region.

b) CEQA requires a lead agency to consider the whole of the action when analyzing a project's environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)(1), §15378). This includes activities that lead to reasonably foreseeable indirect effects which are actual or potential (CEQA Guidelines §15064(d)). The proposed changes in land use designation on the parcels are intended to allow for greater development than is currently allowed. An increase in development on the parcels would constitute a reasonably foreseeable indirect effect of the proposed project. The Draft Environmental Impact Report should therefore contain detailed descriptions of planned development on the parcels and the potential impacts to resources resulting from development.

c) Project impacts should also be analyzed relative to their effects on off-site habitats and populations. Specifically, this should include nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, and riparian ecosystems. Impacts to and maintenance of wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitat in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. The analysis should also include a discussion of the potential for impacts resulting from such effects as increased vehicle traffic and outdoor artificial night lighting.

d) A cumulative effects analysis should be developed as described under CEQA Guidelines, § 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.
e) Impacts to migratory wildlife affected by the project should be fully evaluated. This can include such elements as migratory butterfly roost sites and neo-tropical bird and waterfowl stop-over and staging sites. All migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of birds and their active nests, including raptors and other migratory nongame birds as listed under the MBTA.

f) Proposed project activities (including disturbances to vegetation) should take place outside of the breeding bird season (February 1–August 15) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If project activities cannot avoid the breeding bird season, nest surveys should be conducted and active nests should be avoided and provided with a minimum buffer as determined by a biological monitor (the Department recommends a minimum 500 foot buffer for all active raptor nests).

g) Impacts to all habitats from City or County required Fuel Modification Zones (FMZ) should be fully evaluated. Areas slated as mitigation for loss of habitat shall not occur within the FMZ.

3) An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts (CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1)). Mitigation measures for project impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats should emphasize evaluation and selection of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts. Compensation for unavoidable impacts through acquisition and protection of high quality habitat elsewhere should be addressed.

   a) The Department considers Rare Natural Communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Thus, these communities should be fully avoided and otherwise protected from project-related impacts. The List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities is available on request or may be viewed and downloaded online by visiting the Department's website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/vegcamp/pdfs/NaturalCommunitiesList_Oct07.pdf.

   b) The Department generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species. Department studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

4) A range of alternatives should be analyzed to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. A range of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources including wetlands/riparian habitats, alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, native woodlands, etc. should be included. Specific alternative locations should also be evaluated in areas with lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

5) An Incidental Take Permit (ITP) from the Department may be required if the project, project construction, or any project-related activity during the life of the project will result in "take" as defined by the Fish and Game Code of any species protected by CESA (Fish & G. Code, §§86, 2080, 2081, subd. (b), (c)). Early consultation with the Department regarding potential permitting obligations under CESA with respect to the project is encouraged (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 783.2, subd. (b)). It is imperative with these potential permitting obligations
that the draft environmental impact report prepared by the City in the present case includes a thorough and robust analysis of the potentially significant impacts to endangered, rare, and threatened species, and their habitat, that may occur as a result of the proposed project. For any such potentially significant impacts the City should also analyze and describe specific, potentially feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen any such impacts as required by CEQA and, if an ITP is necessary, as required by the relevant permitting criteria prescribed by Fish and Game Code section 2081, subdivisions (b) and (c). The failure to include this analysis in the project environmental impact report could preclude the Department from relying on the City’s analysis to issue an ITP without the Department first conducting its own, separate lead agency subsequent or supplemental analysis for the project (See, e.g., Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15096, subd. (f); Pub.Resources Code, § 21166). For these reasons, the following information is requested:

a) Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA Permit.

b) A Department-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.

6) The Department opposes the elimination of watercourses and/or their channelization or conversion to subsurface drains. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent, ephemeral, or perennial, must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic habitat values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations.

a) The Department also has regulatory authority with regard to activities occurring in streams and/or lakes that could adversely affect any fish or wildlife resource. For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, the project applicant (or "entity") must provide written notification to the Department pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, the Department then determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. To facilitate our issuance of the agreement when CEQA applies, the Department as a responsible agency under CEQA may consider the local jurisdiction’s (lead agency) document for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the Department under CEQA the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the agreement. Early consultation is recommended, since modification of the proposed project may be required to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

The Department suggests a pre-project or early consultation planning meeting for all projects. To make an appointment, please call Martin Potter, Environmental Scientist, at (805) 640-3677. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Betty Courtneycourtneycourtneycourtney
Betty Courtney
Senior Environmental Scientist
South Coast Region
cc: Ms. Betty Courtney, CDFG, Santa Clarita
Mr. Martin Potter, CDFG, Ojai
Ms. Natasha Lohmus, CDFG, Carpinteria
Ms. Mary Meyer, CDFG, Ojai
Mr. Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento
August 15, 2012

Patricia Saley
City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Services
130 Cremona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117

Re: APCD Response to Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for Shelby Trust General Plan Amendment and Residential Subdivision Project, 12-EIR-005, 12-EIR-003

Dear Ms. Saley:

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Shelby Trust General Plan Amendment and Residential Subdivision Project. There are two aspects to the project that will be addressed in two separate EIRs:

- The General Plan Amendment (12-EIR-003) involves: amendment of the Land use Plan Map to change the property’s designation from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential, amendment of the test of the Conservation Element Subpolicy CE 11.2 relating to Conversion of Agricultural Lands, and amendment of the Open Space Map of the Open Space Element to remove the property.

- The proposed project (12-EIR-005) involves: a Rezone of the property from AG-II-40 (Agriculture II, 40 acre minimum parcel size) to 7-R-1 (Single Family Residential, 7 units/acre), a Zoning Ordinance Amendment, a Vesting Tentative Map for the creation of 64 lots, a Development Plan for 60 single-family dwellings and 4 open space areas, and a Development Agreement.

The subject property, a 14.38-acre parcel zoned AG-II-40 and identified in the Assessor Parcel Map Book as APN 077-530-019, is located at 7500 Cathedral Oaks Road in the City of Goleta.

The EIR Scoping Document (July 19, 2012) determined that Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions were effects not found to be significant and therefore will not be analyzed in the EIR. However, APCD staff offers the following suggested conditions on the development of the proposed project:

1. Standard dust mitigations (Attachment A) are recommended for all construction and/or grading activities. The name and telephone number of an on-site contact person must be provided to the APCD prior to issuance of land use clearance.

2. APCD Rule 345, Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities establishes limits on the generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites. The rule includes measures for minimizing fugitive dust from on-site activities and from trucks moving on- and off-site. The text of the rule can be viewed on the APCD website at www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule345.pdf.
3. Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. Therefore, during project grading, construction, and hauling, construction contracts must specify that contractors shall adhere to the requirements listed in Attachment B to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate emissions from diesel exhaust.

4. All portable diesel-fired construction engines rated at 50 brake-horsepower or greater must have either statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) certificates or APCD permits prior to operation. Construction engines with PERP certificates are exempt from APCD permit, provided they will be on-site for less than 12 months.

5. Advisory: The applicant should determine whether any structure(s) proposed for demolition or renovation contains asbestos that is friable or has the potential to become friable during demolition or disposal. If any structure does contain friable asbestos, the asbestos should be removed by a contractor that is state certified for asbestos removal. For additional information regarding asbestos in construction, please refer to APCD’s website at www.sbcapcd.org/biz/asbestos.htm.

6. At a minimum, prior to occupancy any feasible greenhouse gas reduction measures from the following sector-based list should be applied to the project:  
   • Energy use (energy efficiency, low carbon fuels, renewable energy)  
   • Transportation (reduce vehicle miles traveled, compact and transit-oriented development, pedestrian- and bike-friendly communities)  
   • Water conservation (improved practices and equipment, landscaping)  
   • Waste reduction (material re-use/recycling, composting, waste diversion, waste minimization)  
   • Architectural features (green building practices, cool roofs)


Please contact me at 961-8890 or by e-mail at cvw@sbcapcd.org if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Carly Wilburton  
Air Quality Specialist  
Technology and Environmental Assessment Division  

Attachments:  
   Fugitive Dust Control Measures  
   Diesel Particulate and NOx Emission Measures  

cc: Project File  
   TEA Chron File
ATTACHMENT A
FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL MEASURES

These measures are required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Proper implementation of these measures is assumed to fully mitigate fugitive dust emissions.

- During construction, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for human consumption.

- Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

- If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.

- Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.

- After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, treat the disturbed area by watering, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.

- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading of the structure.

**Plan Requirements:** All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans and as a note on a separate information sheet to be recorded with map. **Timing:** Requirements shall be shown on plans or maps prior to land use clearance or map recordation. Condition shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**MONITORING:** Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and maps to be recorded. Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.
Particulate emissions from diesel exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the state of California. The following is an updated list of regulatory requirements and control strategies that should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible.

The following measures are required by state law:

- All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state’s portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.

- Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, § 2449), the purpose of which is to reduce diesel particulate matter (PM) and criteria pollutant emissions from in-use (existing) off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. For more information, please refer to the CARB website at www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm.

- All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to Title 13, § 2485 of the California Code of Regulations, limiting engine idling time. Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; electric auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.

The following measures are recommended:

- Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.

- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

- If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California.

- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer’s specifications.

- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

**Plan Requirements:** Measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. **Timing:** Measures shall be adhered to throughout grading, hauling and construction activities.

**MONITORING:** Lead Agency staff shall perform periodic site inspections to ensure compliance with approved plans. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.
August 17, 2012

Patricia Saley
City of Goleta Planning & Environmental Services
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Re: APCD Comments on Kenwood Village General Plan Amendment and Project EIRs
12-EIR-003, 12-EIR-004, 08-205-GPA, -RZ, -TTM, -DP, -CUP

Dear Ms. Saley:

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kenwood Village General Plan Amendment and Residential Subdivision Project. There are two aspects to the project that will be addressed in two separate EIRs:

- The General Plan Amendment (12-EIR-003) involves: amendment of the city’s Land Use Plan Map to change the property’s designations from Agriculture, Planned Residential B, and Single-Family Residential to Planned Residential, amendment of the test of the Conservation Element Subpolicy CE 11.2 relating to Conversion of Agricultural Lands, and amendment of the Open Space Map of the Open Space Element to remove the property.

- The proposed residential subdivision (12-EIR-004) consists of a tract map to create 65 lots and construction of 13 single-family and 47 multi-family dwelling units. A rezone is also proposed to change the existing zoning designations from Design Residential 4.6, Single Family Residential, and Limited Commercial to Planned Residential Development. Grading for the project consists of 41,000 cubic yards of cut and 50,000 cubic yards of fill and 9,000 cubic yards of import.

The subject 10-acre site consists of three vacant parcels identified in the Assessor Parcel Map Book as APN 077-130-006, 077-130-019, and 077-141-049, with multiple zoning designations including Design Residential 4.6, Single Family Residential, and Limited Commercial. The project area is generally located west of El Encanto Creek, east of residential development on Baker Lane, south of residential development on Tuolumne Drive, and north of Calle Real and Highway 101 in the city of Goleta.

The EIR Scoping Document for the proposed residential subdivision (12-EIR-004) determined that Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions were effects not found to be significant and therefore will not be analyzed in the EIR. However, APCD staff offers the following comment on the environmental analysis in the Scoping Document:

1. **Proximity to Highway 101.** The proposed project includes the redesignation of land uses from Agriculture to Planned Residential and construction of residences approximately 100 feet from Highway 101. APCD staff recommends that sensitive land uses, such as residential, should not be sited within 500 feet of the U.S. 101 freeway. This is based on guidance from the California Resources Board (Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective, CARB,
April 2005) and supplemented by information gathered by APCD, summarized in the attached “Public Health and High Traffic Roadways”. This recommendation is based on a number of proximity studies that were conducted in areas throughout the state. The studies link traffic-related air pollutant emissions to a number of health effects, such as increased cancer risk, reduced lung function, increased asthma and bronchitis, and increased medical visits.

Siting of sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the freeway increases the occurrence of respiratory illness for future residents in the project area, and should be discussed in the Air Quality section of the environmental document. The City of Goleta’s General Plan Conservation Element Subpolicy CE 12.1 states that review of land use designation and new development within 500 feet of Highway 101 shall ensure that health risk to new sensitive receptors be adequately analyzed, and the project set back and mitigated to minimize health risk. We recommend discussing the project’s consistency with this General Plan policy.

If new development is proposed within the recommended 500 foot buffer area, we recommend that the project be designed to minimize exposure to roadway-related pollutants and mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Design features may include maximizing the distance between the roadway and sensitive receptors, locating air intake at non-roadway facing side of buildings and ensuring that windows nearest to the roadway do not open. Mitigation measures may include installing mechanical ventilation systems with fresh air filtration and constructing a physical barrier between the roadway source and receptors of pollutants (e.g., sound wall or vegetative planting).

The Air Pollution Control District also offers the following suggested permit conditions:

1. Standard dust mitigations (Attachment A) are recommended for all construction and/or grading activities. The name and telephone number of an on-site contact person must be provided to the APCD prior to issuance of land use clearance.

2. APCD Rule 345, Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities establishes limits on the generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites. The rule includes measures for minimizing fugitive dust from on-site activities and from trucks moving on- and off-site. The text of the rule can be viewed on the APCD website at www.sbcapcd.org/rules/download/rule345.pdf.

3. Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. Therefore, during project grading, construction, and hauling, construction contracts must specify that contractors shall adhere to the requirements listed in Attachment B to reduce emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate emissions from diesel exhaust.

4. All portable diesel-fired construction engines rated at 50 brake-horsepower or greater must have either statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) certificates or APCD permits prior to operation. Construction engines with PERP certificates are exempt from APCD permit, provided they will be on-site for less than 12 months.

5. At a minimum, prior to occupancy any feasible greenhouse gas reduction measures from the following sector-based list should be applied to the project:
• Energy use (energy efficiency, low carbon fuels, renewable energy)
• Transportation (reduce vehicle miles traveled, compact and transit-oriented development, pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly communities)
• Water conservation (improved practices and equipment, landscaping)
• Waste reduction (material re-use/recycling, composting, waste diversion, waste minimization)
• Architectural features (green building practices, cool roofs)


If you or the project applicant have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact me at (805) 961-8893 or via email at edg@sbcapcd.org.

Sincerely,

Eric Gage
Air Quality Specialist
Technology and Environmental Assessment Division

Attachments: Fugitive Dust Control Measures
             Diesel Particulate and NOx Emission Measures

cc: Project File
    TEA Chron File
ATTACHMENT A
FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL MEASURES

These measures are required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Proper implementation of these measures is assumed to fully mitigate fugitive dust emissions.

- During construction, use water trucks or sprinkler systems to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for human consumption.

- Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

- If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.

- Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.

- After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, treat the disturbed area by watering, or revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.

- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recording and land use clearance for finish grading of the structure.

**Plan Requirements:** All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans and as a note on a separate information sheet to be recorded with map. **Timing:** Requirements shall be shown on plans or maps prior to land use clearance or map recording. Condition shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**MONITORING:** Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and maps to be recorded. Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD Inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.
ATTACHMENT B
DIESEL PARTICULATE AND NO\textsubscript{x} EMISSION MEASURES

Particulate emissions from diesel exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the state of California. The following is an updated list of regulatory requirements and control strategies that should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible.

The following measures are required by state law:

- All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state’s portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.

- Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, § 2449), the purpose of which is to reduce diesel particulate matter (PM) and criteria pollutant emissions from in-use (existing) off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. For more information, please refer to the CARB website at www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm.

- All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to Title 13, § 2485 of the California Code of Regulations, limiting engine idling time. Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; electric auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.

The following measures are recommended:

- Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible.

- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

- If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California.

- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer’s specifications.

- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

**Plan Requirements:** Measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. **Timing:** Measures shall be adhered to throughout grading, hauling and construction activities.

**MONITORING:** Lead Agency staff shall perform periodic site inspections to ensure compliance with approved plans. APCD Inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.
August 21, 2012

Ms. Patricia Saley
Acting Planning and Environmental Services Director
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: Notice of Preparation – Shelby Trust Subdivision Project and General Plan Amendments

Dear Ms. Saley:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparations for the Shelby Trust Subdivision Project and General Plan Amendments. At this time, the County submits comments from the Planning and Development Department and the Fire Department. The County looks forward to continued dialogue on the Shelby Trust Subdivision Project and General Plan Amendments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office directly or Glenn Russell, Director, Planning and Development Department, at (805) 568-2085.

Sincerely,

Chandra L. Wallar
County Executive Officer

Cc: Glenn Russell, Director, Planning and Development Department
    Eric Peterson, Division Chief/Fire Marshal, Fire Department

Enclosures: Planning and Development Department letter, August 14, 2012
            Fire Department letter, August 10, 2012
August 15, 2012

Acting Planning and Environmental Services Director Ms. Patricia Saley
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: Comments on the Shelby Trust Residential Subdivision Project, Shelby Trust
Subdivision/Kenwood Village LLC Project General Plan Amendments

Dear Ms. Saley:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Shelby Trust Subdivision Project and General Plan Amendments. The Planning and Development Department submits the following comments for your consideration in preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIR):

**Biological Resources:**
The DEIR should include an analysis of potentially significant effects on biological resources beyond the extent of the proposed project site and the City of Goleta's jurisdictional boundary. Project related work identified in the scoping document could have both a project effect and a cumulative effect on nearby resources located in the unincorporated area of the County, such as riparian corridor and wildlife habitat. Pursuant to CEQA §15126.4 (a)(1), appropriate mitigation should be included to address any significant adverse impacts.

**Cultural Resources:**
The DEIR should include an updated analysis of the cumulative effect on cultural resources in the vicinity, including sensitive archeological sites to the west of the project site. The DEIR should include a discussion of possible project alternatives that could avoid impacts to sensitive archeological resources. Pursuant to CEQA §15126.4 (a)(1), appropriate mitigation should be included to address any significant adverse impacts.

**Fire Hazards:**
The Goleta General Plan FEIR identified a significant impact to fire protection services with build-out of the General Plan, but mitigated this cumulative impact with the addition of a new fire station in western Goleta. The DEIR should identify impacts and discuss progress towards the completion of a new fire station.
August 10, 2012

Ms. Patricia Saley
Acting Planning and Environmental Services Director
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Dear Ms. Saley:

SUBJECT: City of Goleta NOP for the Shelby Trust Subdivision Project
and General Plan Amendments

Fire Department staff has reviewed the above referenced project and has no comments on the project
as presented at this time.

As always, if you have any questions or require further information, please call 805-681-5523
or 805-681-5500.

In the interest of life and fire safety,

Eric Peterson
Division Chief/Fire Marshal

EP: mkb
Housing:
The Subdivision Project Scoping Notice states that housing would be evaluated as part of the General Plan Amendment EIR, and thus the potential population and housing impacts associated with the project are assumed to have been addressed. However, the General Plan Amendment Scoping Notice does not mention housing. The General Plan Amendment EIR should discuss housing and consistency with the City of Goleta Housing Element.

Recreation:
The DEIR should include a discussion and analysis of project effects on the adopted on-road trail along Cathedral Oaks Road. Pursuant to CEQA §15126.4 (a)(1), appropriate mitigation should be included to address any significant adverse impacts.

Transportation/Traffic:
The DEIR should include a discussion of potential impacts to County of Santa Barbara circulation infrastructure as result of increased traffic. This should include an analysis of potential impacts to intersections, bicycle routes, pedestrian access, transit routes, and designated safe routes to school that are located within surrounding unincorporated areas. Traffic should be considered cumulatively with reasonably foreseeable projects, such as development of Glen Annie Golf Club and the Bishop Ranch. Pursuant to CEQA §15126.4 (a)(1), appropriate mitigation should be included to address any significant adverse impacts. This discussion should include the County of Santa Barbara as a review authority for impacts to intersections and infrastructure in the unincorporated area of the County.

Visual Resources:
The DEIR should include an analysis of any potentially significant effects on public views from unincorporated County land and impacts to the rural character of the area. Pursuant to CEQA §15126.4 (a)(1), appropriate mitigation should be included to address these potential impacts.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, or would like to discuss these issues further, please call Holly Harris, Planner, at (805) 568-3577.

Sincerely,

Glenn S. Russell, Ph.D., Director

Cc: Case File
Holly Harris, Planner, P&D
Dear Ms. Saley and Mr. Ling:

As a long-time Goleta resident and champion of our city’s unique status, I must voice my objections to the latest attempts by developers to amend our established General Plan, which would then enable them to develop even more of Goleta’s remaining open spaces for their own financial gain.

The anticipated Kenwood Village Residential Project and the Shelby Trust Subdivision Project strike me as just more of the same. Goleta has already become overdeveloped and overcrowded. To allow even more major development projects would only make matters worse for all who live and work here.

Consider the adverse environmental impacts which these two projects would create:

- Increased traffic congestion, already critical during rush-hour periods on Cathedral Oaks Road and Calle Real, and at all major intersections along those two thoroughfares (and, how long has it been since the City conducted and publicized official traffic counts on these busy roads?);
- Air and noise pollution, due to increased heavy construction equipment use and added vehicle traffic;
- Loss of irreplaceable agricultural lands, which could otherwise be protected from development under the proposed ballot initiative to be voted on in the November election;
- Possible reductions in public safety as the ratio of residents to police and fire headcount would increase;
- Large additional demands on already threatened water resources (no one can predict the extent and duration of the major drought now affecting the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada watersheds, not to mention our own); and,
- Increased demand on waste water and solid waste disposal services.

Let us not forget the reasons why we citizens worked so hard to create the City of Goleta:

- To determine and maintain local control over our own civic destiny;
- To have our own elected officials whose sworn mission is to preserve and protect our City; and,
- To thwart Santa Barbara County Planning and Development department’s avowed objective: “To Create Full Build-Out of The Goleta Valley”.

Harry S Rouse <k6pdq@verizon.net>
I will greatly appreciate your attention to the above thoughts. Remember, once we have lost the unique character and nature of our dear city, it will be lost forever.

Just consider the sad fates of the once-beautiful little Southland communities of Newport Beach, Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Long Beach, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Playa del Rey, Marina del Rey and Santa Monica. What they had and treasured so many years ago can never be recovered!

Sincerely yours,

Harry S. Rouse
27 Calaveras Ave., Goleta
Tel. 685 1785
August 22, 2012

Shelby Trust and Kenwood Village LLC GPA
Case No. 05-154 GPA/08-205 GPA/12-EIR-003

Comments on the Scoping Document-NOP
Ingeborg Cox, MD, MPH

The Air Resources Board recommends not locating residences within 500 feet of a freeway. According to the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District the 101 freeway in the City of Goleta meets the intended definition of a freeway.

Terry Dressler, former Air Pollution Control Officer states: “Our guidance is clear and consistent: Planning agencies should avoid locating new residences (of any type, whether for children or seniors) within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway.” (see attached e-mail with a copy of his card)

The Children’s Health Study, a 15 year University of Southern California study involving more than 11,000 children from sixteen communities, found that children who live within 500 meters, or 1625 feet, of a freeway have substantial deficits in lung function and lung development (On the Air newsletter, APCD Summer 2007). Why is the health of sensitive receptors not been taken into consideration?

The southern portion of lot 077-130-006 needs to remain agriculture as locating residences within 500 feet of the 101 freeway would affect the health of the future sensitive receptors living in the residences. Farm worker housing should not be placed in an area that is not beneficial for their health.

Exposure to diesel particulate has been designated as the state’s number one toxic air contaminant and represents 70% of the estimated cancer risk in the state.

Air quality impacts from incompatible land uses can contribute to increased risk of illness, missed work and school, a lower quality of life and higher costs for public health and pollution control. (Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, California EPA and California ARB).

The cumulative impact the impact to the LOS for the 101 SB freeway is cited on page 19 as LOS E in the a.m. but the NB ramp is listed as LOS:“C”. I question the results for the p.m. peak hour level of service for the NB because when school is in session cars line up to the extent that one freeway lane comes to a standstill. The public needs to know the specific date of when the traffic count done. Traffic counts when school is not in session would not give an accurate picture. I also question the LOS “C” for the NB ramp.

Is Calle Real going to be widened before this project gets built? If the answer is in the negative, the residents already residing here will be impacted by standstill traffic when residents of Kenwood Village are trying to make a left turn to the site. Where is the overflow parking going to go? Calle Real in this area is too narrow to have cars parked on either side.

Fire protection is also another issue this area. Until a new fire station is constructed any consideration for further land conversions or any developments need to be put on hold.
Under Cultural Resources the Scoping Document states that Shelby Trust property contains CA-SBA-1735 and the Kenwood Village LLC property contains CA-SBA-1093.

Has the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) reviewed this NOP and have they been asked for a Sacred Lands File Check for each of these sites?

Has the appropriate Regional Archaeological Information Center been contacted for a record search? Page 12 states “The types of artifacts anticipated, if found onsite, would be capable of indicating when even limited prehistoric use of the area occurred.”

How deep did the Phase 1 Archaeological Survey go? If it went less than 13 feet, then at least spot sampling of the area should be done to that dept. Why is the public not informed of who are the Native American contacts for the site?

The Shelby Trust has 11.3 acres of “Prime Farmland”, which I understand is the land with the best soils and climate for growing crops.

The Kenwood Village property has 5.3 acres of “Unique Farmland”. I understand that category is used for growing rare and specialty crops.

Conversion of agricultural land with the denomination “Prime Farmland” and “Unique Farmland” should not be permitted. Once agricultural land is paved over you cannot get it back it is lost forever. Just the fact that the land is not being cultivated does not mean it can no longer be used for agriculture.

AFT (American Farmland Trust) has found that, unlike residential development, farmland produces a net surplus in tax revenues for local governments because service costs are lower.

The segment of El Encanto Creek bordering the site is mapped as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) and consequently shall maintain the 100 foot Streamside Protection Area (SPA). There is the potential of introducing petroleum products and landscape chemicals into the storm water flow that then will be discharged into el Encanto Creek and will end up in the receiving waters of the Deveraux Slough affecting it and its wildlife.

In the Kenwood Village General Plan if only six units will be “affordable” to moderate and upper moderate income households, does this mean that the rest of the units are being built for low to very low income households? What is the affordability of the 13 single family residences? A price range needs to be placed in the document, since “affordability” can be interpreted in many ways.

Table 12 on parking needs correction. You have 60 units, parking rate for visitor is one space per 5 units. The required parking for visitors should be 12 and not 6. Consequently the spaces required would be 146 and NO excess in parking is being provided.

What are the impacts if there is a massive earthquake and Goleta is locked in because the 101 freeway, the main connector, is out of commission. Local agriculture needs to
stay in Goleta or we otherwise should change our logo, as we are no longer going to be THE GOOD LAND if the few pieces of agricultural land left get cemented over.

It appears that whenever a developer cannot meet a criterion they proceed to change the General Plan, and the city appears to be complying with it. The General Plan should not be changed at the pleasure of the developer. In my opinion, it is a document that the citizens of Goleta helped to create while participating in work shops, so changes should be something that is done only as a last resort.
Date: Thursday, January 28, 2010 11:59 AM
From: Terry E. Dressler <dressler@sbcapcd.org>
To: docxie1@cox.net <docxie1@cox.net>
Subject: RE: Guidance Re: Locating Residences Near Freeways

Dr. Cox,

In our guidance we do not differentiate between the young and elderly. Most of the studies cited to support the guidance are studies of children's health, however the veteran cohort study was one that specifically addresses the health effects on older subjects of living near high-traffic roadways.

Our guidance is clear and consistent: Planning agencies should avoid locating new residences (of any type, whether for children or seniors) within 500 feet of the 101 Freeway.

I hope this addresses your question.

Terry
August 22, 2012

Ms. Patricia Saley  
Acting Planning and Environmental Services Director  
City of Goleta  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA  93117

RE:  EIR (12-EIR-003) and EIR (12-EIR-004)

Ms. Saley:

We believe that the environmental impact of the proposed development is disastrous.

The owners are telling us that it is in our interest to trade their loss of economic gain on their agricultural property for a loss of environmental quality for all of us.

In the past this argument was rejected by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors who denied farmers lot splits.

The commercial development south of 101 has radically increased the amount of traffic that use the 101 entrance and exit at Glen Annie.

There are no traffic lights on Calle Real between Glen Annie and Ellwood Station Road near the 7/11. That makes it all the more difficult to exit on a daily basis and means much car idling which adds to smog and an extreme risk in the area in case of emergency. Goleta has experienced fire and flooding and mud slides on 101. Evacuation is not easy and is a health risk.

The Goleta plan called for open space for environmental and aesthetic reasons.

The golf course north of Cathedral Oaks and east of Glen Annie was developed in land that was designated as open space. Changing land that is zoned agriculture to residential means losing another open space. This is a terrible precedent because of the environmental impact. Goleta is an arid plain. The number and type of units will be a strain on all the utilities, especially water. Noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution, and smog from traffic will increase.

Thank you for your time.

Maggie and David Friedlander  
7281 Tuolumne Drive  
Goleta, CA  93117
From: Frank & Shirley wingnlunas@verizon.net
To: Pat Saley
CC: Shine Ling
Sent: Wed 8/22/2012 5:34 PM

Dear Patricia Saley and Shine Ling:

A lot of work was put into the General Plan to guide Goleta. Once we start chipping away at it it will be weakened and destroy the vision for our valley.

Neither the Shelby Trust Subdivision or Kenwood Village take into consideration lack of water, traffic expansion and lack of realistic parking.
At this point in time we need to focus on filling the empty homes in our neighborhoods which are turning our neighborhoods in slums.

For me the Kenwood Village is even more intrusive. Having owned this home for 46 years, I am dismayed that Mr. Alker with the flip of an ink pen can take so much away from me and my neighbors. We will lose our much loved ocean view. The second floor of the homes at the back will put their bedrooms directly in my backyard and across from my bedroom window. Destroying 46 years of paying for the privacy brought by to us by an open field.

Mr alker said the road coming out of the project into Tuolume Dr. Will be closed to drive through traffic which is great but it will not stop all of the access cars Owen and brought in by their guests to be left on the over parked Tuolume Dr. Their is already a lot of hostility in the neighborhood from the slum lord that rents out to 5-8 students with just as many cars in his two corner homes. In order to prevent this Calle Real would need to be widened to allow parking along the sides for Kenwood Village to have enough parking. I do not see that the realistic parking problem brought to neighborhoods by new housing has ever been realistically addressed.

The last problem that needs to be addressed is the traffic on Calle Real. Our neighborhood is already suffering because of the growth around us without considering changes needed to make Calle Real safe. The idea of at least 240 more cars on this two lane room is nothing to dismiss in your consideration.

And last but not least is the change from agriculture to residential. Looking at our economy, water and heat through the US we may need every inch of land for food produce we can find in this gently climate.

This is a popular hunting and sometimes nesting grounds for the White Tailed Kites. A beautiful unique bird that can hover above the ground when looking for prey. These like most raptors require a lot of open space for hunting to insure their survival.

To make a long letter short (sorry about that) This project would be a terrible invasion of our privacy with their 2 story buildings. The traffic problem cannot be avoided without widening Calle Real and adding stops and turning lanes. Parking would also be needed for the overflow of available spaces. Water is already at a low point in recent history. Agricultural land can not be
taken back once covered with blacktop. This project would undermine the General Plan which was put into force to guide and protect our valley from out of control growth.

Please consider the impact of both of these projects and the erosion of our valley with so much development.

Thank you for hearing me at the planning meeting and again here in writing.

This is a photo of a small part of the problem with the Cul-de-sac Between Tuolumne Dr. And the Kenwood project. I have photos from times of the day to show that it doesn't get any better.
August 23, 2012

Ms. Pat Saley
City of Goleta
Planning & Environmental Services
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

SUBJECT: Comments on the Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report (12-EIR-003) for Kenwood Village; 08-205-GPA and the Shelby Trust; 05-154-GPA

Dear Pat,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the scope of the environmental impact report (EIR) for the proposed General Plan Amendments needed to approve the Kenwood Village project. We appreciate staff’s effort to ensure that an adequate EIR that addresses the key issues is prepared. We generally agree with the majority of the information provided in the scoping document, but we do have a few specific comments and corrections. A summary of the comments are provided below.

Comments on the EIR Scope

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please note that one of the Assessor Parcel Numbers for the Kenwood Village Site is missing from the written description and from Table 1. Please add APN 077-141-049. The written description also has an inaccurate APN – please change APN 77-130-066 to 77-130-006.

The written description (paragraph 3) states that the “existing land use designation of the Kenwood Village LLC property would not allow for the proposed residential development” it should read that the “existing land use designation of the lower portion of the Kenwood Village LLC…” In addition, the following sentence in the paragraph states that the proposed GPA would “allow for the conversion of the property from the Agriculture and Single Family Residential land use designation to a non-agriculture land use designation allowing residential development on the entirety of the property.” We suggest that it be characterized in the EIR in the following manner: “allow for the conversion of the property from the Agriculture and Single Family Residential land use designation to a Planned Residential designation that would...”
allow for both single family and multi-family residential development on the entirety of the property.”

In Table 1 indicates that 3.9 acres of agricultural land would be converted. The area designated for Agriculture actually totals 3.7 acres and the area designated Residential is 6.3 acres. This revision is based on a careful study of the different designation areas during the agricultural viability analysis.

1.3 Open Space Element, Open Space Plan Map (Figure 3-5 in the GP/CLUP)

Please note that the upper 6.2 acres of the Kenwood Village project site was incorrectly designated as open space on the General Plan Open Space map (confirmed by City staff). The process to remove the open space designation for the lower 3.7 acres, proposed by the Applicant, will allow the City to correct this mistake.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.2 Existing Setting

Please note that one of the Assessor Parcel Numbers for the Kenwood Village Site is missing from the first paragraph - please add APN 077-141-049.

3.0 SCOPE OF ANALYSIS IN SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

Table 3 shows that APN 077-130-019 has an Agricultural designation, but only a portion of APN 077-130-006 has this designation. As noted above, the total number of acres is actually 3.7 acres rather than 3.8 acres.

Part 1 – Changes to impacts and/or mitigation measures identified by the GP/CLUP EIR

In the third paragraph the City discusses how the proposed changes to Policy CE 11.2 will be analyzed. It is stated that the analysis “will not include a detailed, site-specific analysis of the potential satisfaction of the criteria set forth in the proposed amendment to the Conservation Element, Subpolicy CE11.2 by each parcel with an Agriculture land use designation. Such analysis will be done when an application for a conversion of those parcels is filed and the City is able to undertake that detailed, site-specific analysis.” However, the proposed amendment to CE 11.2 was crafted to limit the number of potential conversions that would be possible. We request that the EIR consultant prepare a cursory analysis, at a minimum, to demonstrate whether any of the other parcels designated Agriculture within the City limits could be
converted under the proposed policy language. We believe that no other parcels could meet the conversion criteria.

Part 2 – Land use designation change from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential for Shelby Trust property and Agriculture and Single-Family Residential to Planned Residential for Kenwood Village LLC property

We request that the EIR acknowledge that Mr. Alker is requesting a maximum density of 6 units per acre under the proposed Planned Residential Development designation. Therefore, “the maximum potential development under the proposed GP/CLUP land use” designation that would be analyzed in the EIR would be 60 residential units.

Additional Information on Agricultural Resources

As part of the development application, information regarding the viability of the land designated as Agriculture was submitted to the City. The project team prepared and submitted an assessment of the site’s viability using the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines – Agriculture Resource Guidelines and the State Department of Conservation’s Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model. Both the guidelines and model employ a point system for measuring viability. The land designated for Agriculture was shown to be unviable under both the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines and the State’s LESA model. We request that this information be provided to the EIR consultant and that it be incorporated into the EIR.

Conclusion

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the document. We look forward to working with staff and the EIR consultant to complete this document in a timely and complete manner. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions regarding the information contained herein.

Sincerely,

Lisa Plowman
Planning Manager

XC: Mr. Ken Alker
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