

## CHAPTER 3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Goleta released the Proposed Final EIR for the Marriott Residence Inn/Hollister Center Project (12-EIR-1; SCH #2007121058) in October 2013 (i.e., Part 1). The project was introduced to the City of Goleta Planning Commission on October 28, 2013. At the request of the applicant, the Planning Commission continued the project indefinitely on November 25, 2013, to allow for circulation of the Proposed Final EIR. Although Final EIRs are required to be circulated for additional public review, the City of Goleta noticed and circulated the Proposed Final EIR for additional public comment from December 3, 2013 to February 3, 2014. A copy of each numbered comment letter and a numbered response to each comment are provided in Chapter 3, Response to Comments, of Part 2 of this document. To avoid confusion, the comment letters are numbered to begin where the comment numbers on the Revised Draft EIR left off, starting with Comment Letter No. 9. Table 3-1 summarizes the comments received on the Proposed Final EIR.

In total, three state agencies, one local agency, and four interested parties/individuals submitted written comments on the Proposed Final EIR. Table 3-1 provides a comprehensive list of commenters (separated into these three groups, provided in the order in which they are responded to below) and comment letter number used to identify the commenter. The complete text of the comments (presented as the actual comment letters) and the Lead Agency's responses are provided in Section 3.2 of this chapter.

**TABLE 3-1  
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PROPOSED FINAL EIR**

Comment Letter No.	Commenter	Comment Summary
<b>State Agencies</b>		
9	Scott Morgan Director State Clearinghouse (January 13, 2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Notes agencies that responded during the comment period are enclosed.</li> <li>▪ Notes Public Resources Code § 1104(c) states the nature of comments and responsibility of the agency.</li> <li>▪ Notes proposed project is in compliance with State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft documents under CEQA.</li> </ul>
10	Dave Singleton Program Analyst Native American Heritage Commission (December 4, 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommends records search at the appropriate Information Center and to list known or previously recorded resources in the Proposed Final EIR.</li> <li>▪ Recommends preparation of technical report if further archaeological survey is required.</li> <li>▪ Recommends site location, Native American human remain locations, and associated funerary objects remain confidential and not available to public.</li> <li>▪ Provides a list of Native American Contacts for consultation.</li> <li>▪ Recommends the EIR consider environmental justice and consult with representatives of tribal governments.</li> <li>▪ Advises mitigation measures should be included to address accidental discovery of archaeological resources, as well as</li> </ul>

Comment Letter No.	Commenter	Comment Summary
		<p>Native American human remains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommends the proposed project avoid resources, or mitigate if avoidance is not possible.</li> </ul>
11	<p>Patricia A. Abel District Deputy Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas &amp; Geothermal Resources (February 7, 2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ States that the Division has no jurisdiction or statutory responsibility for the proposed project because there are no oil or gas wells on the project site.</li> <li>▪ Recommends nearby well, Amerades Hess Corp “Perry” 1 well, be considered in relation to the project location.</li> <li>▪ Recommends that structures should not be placed in a way that would impede future access to any potential wells on the project site.</li> <li>▪ Notes that the Division does not have any documentation regarding oil production and related infrastructure on the project site; however, equipment relating to oilfield operations may be encountered during excavation.</li> <li>▪ Provides contact information for questions.</li> </ul>
<b>Local Agencies</b>		
12	<p>Kamil S. Azoury, P.E. General Manager/ District Engineer Goleta Sanitary District (January 9, 2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Goleta Sanitary District provides wastewater service to the project site and would provide wastewater service for the proposed project.</li> <li>▪ States that the Goleta Sanitary District provides sewer service for approximately 11,000 customer accounts within the service area, not 6,000 as stated in Section 4.13 of the Proposed Final EIR.</li> <li>▪ States that wastewater treatment services are provided to approximately 85,000 people in the region (Goleta Valley, UCSB, Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and unincorporated Santa Barbara).</li> <li>▪ Recommends the applicant coordinate with Southern California Edison on its existing power pole on Hollister, which the Goleta Sanitary District currently utilizes.</li> <li>▪ States that the Goleta Sanitary District will review and approve sewer facilities, including the location of the sewer service connection point, sampling manholes, and grease interceptor(s).</li> <li>▪ States that planting trees over existing sewer lines should be prohibited in the Landscaping Plan or mitigated for. The Vitrified Clay Pipe sewer line and the District sewer manhole need to be kept accessible.</li> <li>▪ Provides contact information.</li> </ul>
<b>Interested Parties</b>		
13	<p>David Stone, RPA Cultural Resources Manager Dudek (January 30, 2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ States that an ethnohistoric study of CA-SBA-58 is unnecessary.</li> <li>▪ States that CA-SBA-58 is neither a “historic landscape,” “historic site,” nor an “ethnographic landscape” relative to CEQA and, therefore, no cultural landscape study is required.</li> </ul>
14	<p>Peter N. Brown Attorney at Law Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck (February 3, 2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ States that the Proposed Final EIR response to comments regarding ethnohistoric and ethnographic are accurate in Section 4.6 of the EIR.</li> <li>▪ States that the Proposed Final EIR includes well-supported and accurate analysis of climate change.</li> <li>▪ Considers the CEQA analysis of climate change accurate in that it considers the impact of the project on the environment, not of</li> </ul>

Comment Letter No.	Commenter	Comment Summary
		the environment on the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Suggests that since the proposed project does not cause any significant impacts when considering emissions of greenhouse gases, mandatory mitigation would be unlawful.</li> </ul>
15	Timothy Thompson Vice President and Senior Consultant Cardno Entrix (February 3, 2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ States that the Proposed Final EIR sufficiently and appropriately analyzes water supply impacts.</li> </ul>
16	Marc Chytilo Law Office of Marc Chytilo (February 3, 2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Questions the traffic generation factor used in the traffic study and EIR.</li> <li>▪ States that it is unusual to change land use categories when revising a traffic study and the change needs to be justified.</li> <li>▪ Notes traffic counts at adjacent intersections were not compared to each other.</li> <li>▪ Suggests consistency between related-projects list of development projects and the most up-to-date traffic study.</li> <li>▪ Notes that mitigation measures are included in either the Revised Draft EIR or the traffic study, but not both and outlines mitigation measures.</li> <li>▪ Suggests providing the cumulative calculation of LOS.</li> <li>▪ Expresses concerns over the role of the Traffic Engineer for the City in 2008 for the proposed project and then for the applicant on follow-up analysis. Requests an independent traffic engineer review.</li> <li>▪ Expresses concerns over mitigation that relies on two non-ramp overcrossing structures that have not yet been constructed.</li> </ul>

### 3.2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES OVERVIEW

This section of the Revised Final EIR contains all comments received on the Proposed Final EIR during the public review period along with the Lead Agency’s responses to these comments. Reasoned, factual, good-faith responses have been provided to all comments received, with a particular emphasis on significant environmental issues. Detailed responses have been provided where a comment raises a specific issue. Where a comment does not raise a significant environmental issue, the comment is noted, and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration.

The following section contains the original comment letter, which has been bracketed to isolate the individual comments, preceded by the responses to the comments by comment letter. All comments are included in the Revised Final EIR, and accordingly are entered into the administrative record for the proposed project. As part of the record, the comments and responses will be forwarded to the City’s decision-makers for their consideration of the proposed project.

*This page intentionally left blank*

**State Agencies**

*This page intentionally left blank*

**Local Agencies**

*This page intentionally left blank*

**Interested Parties**

*This page intentionally left blank*