6.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Development
- Alternative 2: Avoid CA-SBA-54
- Alternative 3: Increase Railroad/Freeway Buffer and Higher Sound Wall
- Alternative 4: Reduced Building Height
- Alternative 5: Business Park Development

This section also includes a discussion of the “environmentally superior alternative” among the alternatives analyzed.

The following are the project objectives as described in Section 2.0, Project Description.

1. Develop rental housing that meets a multitude of the City’s housing needs, including workforce housing for employees in the surrounding business parks and produces an economically viable project. Workforce housing is intended to be occupied by households whose head is in the workforce as well as housing affordable to people that the community relies on to supply basic services such as teachers, police, nurses, etc. (GP/CLUP, associated Glossary).

2. Maintain a density of residential units sufficient to accommodate units affordable by design and to provide the densities outlined in the General Plan as anticipated by the City in its Land Use and Housing Elements so as to meet its “Regional Housing Needs Assessment” requirements for the project site and to help address the local affordable housing deficit through provision of rental housing.

3. Provide common recreation areas, including a clubhouse, pool/spa, tot lot, picnic areas, and open space opportunities for residents of the project site.

4. Develop the project site such that it minimizes the potential for compatibility conflicts with neighboring properties by integrating residential development with the research park development, including provision of parking on-site as required by the City’s Zoning Ordinance to prevent spillover of parking off-site.

5. Provide building design for neighborhood compatibility with two story buildings at the front of the site.

6.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT

6.1.1 Alternative Description

Alternative 1, the “no project/no development” alternative assumes that no residential development would occur on the project site and that the environmental conditions would not change. The project site would remain vacant. This alternative would not add residents to the City’s population. Absent additional housing, population growth in the City would be accommodated through other proposed residential development projects within the City.
This alternative would not meet any of the project objectives, including those related to the development of affordable rental housing to meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements.

6.1.2 Impacts

Implementation of this alternative would not result in any physical changes to the project site as it would not accommodate any new development. This alternative would remove the unavoidably significant impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials and land use compatibility with U.S. 101 and UPRR. This alternative would also remove other mitigable impacts with respect to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, transportation, and utilities. The site would, however, retain zoning of Design Residential (DR-20) and the Medium-Density Residential (R-MD) land use designation and Affordable Housing Opportunity Site designation pursuant to the City’s General Plan, which would accommodate future residential development on the site.

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: AVOID CA-SBA-54

6.2.1 Alternative Description

Alternative 2, the “Avoid CA-SBA-54” alternative would involve eliminating the portion of the proposed development that lies within the boundaries of the CA-SBA-54 archaeological site. This alternative would reduce the significant, but mitigable, impact described in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources.

In order to avoid impacting CA-SBA-54, Building 6 and 56 parking spaces would be eliminated from the plan. The westernmost approximately 400 feet of the sound wall proposed for the northern site boundary would also be removed. The northwest corner of the site would be left as open space.

As described in the proposed project, Building 6 would be a 3-story building with 18 units. Under this alternative, the number of units would remain the same as the proposed project. In order to accommodate the units lost by eliminating Building 6 and meet the requirements of the Affordable Housing Opportunity Site of a minimum of 20 units per acre, the height of buildings 1, 2, 7, 8 would be increased from two to three stories. Site access, including the public and private roads, and the overall structural design of this alternative would be generally similar to that of the proposed project. This alternative would provide 56 fewer parking spaces than the proposed project, though it is possible that reconfiguration of buildings and proposed parking or removal of some open space could make up a portion of this deficit. This alternative is illustrated on Figure 6-1.

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives but may not meet the project objectives to provide parking on-site pursuant to City Zoning Ordinance requirements and would not meet the objective to provide building design for neighborhood compatibility regarding building heights.

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. As with the proposed project, the project site would be developed with new structures that would alter views of and through the project site. Under this alternative, eliminating Building 6 would result in a smaller footprint of development than the proposed project. Also, the
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buildings on the southern half of the project site closest to Cortona drive would increase from two to three stories. However, as with the proposed project, this alternative would not involve construction of buildings at a height that would substantially affect public views of the Santa Ynez Mountains or the coastal plain. Thus, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not significantly impact scenic vistas.

This alternative would still result in the removal of mature trees on the eastern and northern portions of the site. However, as with the proposed project, this impact would be less than significant. This alternative would have a smaller footprint of development compared to the proposed project; nevertheless, it would permanently alter the existing visual character of the project site. This alternative involves three-story residential buildings juxtaposed with existing two-story business parks that could create visual compatibility conflicts. As with the proposed project, impacts would be significant, but mitigable. This alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures AES-3(a-h).

New sources of light and glare on and around the project site due to the introduction of new structures, hardscape and associated lighting would be similar to the proposed project. As with proposed project, impacts would remain significant, but mitigable. The mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b. Air Quality. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include construction of new residential units which would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Ozone precursors NOx and ROG, as well as carbon monoxide (CO), would be still emitted by the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators, while fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would still be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction and building construction. Impacts would be incrementally lower due to the reduction in overall building footprint and required grading. Nevertheless, standard emission control measures as required by the SBCAPCD would still apply. Impacts would remain less than significant.

This alternative would have the same number of residential units compared to the proposed project and therefore would involve roughly the same amount of energy demand and the same generation of motor vehicle trips. Therefore, operational emissions would be the same as those of the proposed project. Impacts would remain less than significant.

This alternative would have the same number of residential units as the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to CAP consistency and population growth would be the same and impacts would remain less than significant. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2 could expose residential units on the project site to a carcinogenic health risk exceeding the SBCAPCD recommended health risk criteria. However, as with the proposed project, implementation of required mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

c. Biological Resources. This alternative would reduce the overall building footprint, but would not avoid impacts related to removal of coast live oak trees that are protected by Policy 9.1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan or the removal of trees that could support nesting birds. As with the proposed project, landscaping for this alternative could introduce invasive plant species that may escape into natural areas. These impacts would remain significant, but mitigable and mitigation required for the proposed project would apply. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not impact wildlife movement, wetlands, or sensitive habitat. As with the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant.
d. Cultural Resources. This alternative is designed to reduce the significant, but mitigable impact related to CA-SBA-54, which is an area of prehistoric archaeological significance. Although the proposed project’s impact to this resource can be reduced to below a level of significance with required mitigation measures, elimination of development within the area of CA-SBA-54 would incrementally reduce the potential for disturbance to the resource by eliminating components of the project that would overlie the resource (parking areas, roadway, and recreation space), eliminating the westernmost portion of the proposed sound wall along the northern property line, and avoiding the need for underground infrastructure in the western portion of the site. The impact associated with this alternative would be remain Class II and mitigation regarding monitoring would still be required.

e. Geology. Although this alternative would reduce the overall building footprint and would incrementally reduce the amount of grading required compared to the proposed project, it would be subject to the same potential geological impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for adverse effects caused by seismic settlement, liquefaction, erosion, and expansive soils would be approximately the same under this alternative as the proposed project. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Although the footprint of development under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project, this alternative would not reduce the size of the proposed project and thus the project’s long-term GHG emissions from transportation and non-transportation sources would remain the same. As with the proposed project, GHG-related impacts would be less than significant, although mitigation measures GHG-1(a-b) would still apply to further reduce project-generated emissions.

g. Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset. Like the proposed project, this alternative would include developing housing units near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors, a high-pressure gas pipeline, and businesses that store and use hazardous materials. Eliminating Building 6 and relocating 18 dwelling units to Buildings 1, 2, 7, and 8, would move those 18 residential units further away from the U.S. 101 and UPRR. This would incrementally reduce exposure to risk of upset conditions associated with those facilities. Continued compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials use, storage, and transport would minimize the potential risk of upset. Nevertheless, impacts associated with the proposed project were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I) and would remain so under this alternative.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. The building footprint under this alternative would be somewhat smaller than that of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be less overall impervious surface area under this alternative and surface water runoff and the erosion/sedimentation potential would be incrementally lower. Nonetheless, like the proposed project, this alternative would increase impermeable surfaces compared to existing conditions. Mitigation measures HWQ-2(a-b) would be required to reduce impacts to site drainage. In addition, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-1 and HWQ-3(a-b) to reduce water quality impacts during construction and operation to a less than significant level. As with the proposed project, implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

i. Land Use. The density of development would be the same under this alternative since it would still include 176 residential units on 8.36 net acres consistent with the Goleta General Plan Housing Element. Therefore, the land use impacts would be similar under this alternative. Like the proposed
project, this alternative would be consistent with the City’s General Plan and with the GMC’s zoning regulations. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures N-1, and N-2 would reduce temporary land use compatibility impacts associated with this alternative to a less than significant level. Quality of life impacts related to privacy for adjacent businesses may be incrementally greater than those of the proposed project due to the increased number of three-story buildings, but would continue to be less than significant. Neighborhood traffic impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project would be Class II, significant with mitigation incorporated. As this alternative would result in a reduction of parking by 56 spaces, it would create a potentially significant compatibility conflict related to overflow parking on adjacent streets.

**j. Noise.** The footprint of development and overall grading would be incrementally reduced under this alternative. Therefore, overall construction noise would be slightly reduced. Nevertheless, as with the proposed project, construction activities would be within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors. Temporary noise impacts due to construction activities would remain significant, but mitigable. The mitigation measures required for the proposed project to reduce construction noise impacts would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Like the proposed project, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term noise increases would be the same as the proposed project since this alternative would result in the same number of new residential units (176). As with the proposed project, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant since operational noise, including traffic and noise typically associated with residential development, would not exceed thresholds.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would place residential uses near the U.S. 101 and UPRR rights-of-way. By eliminating Building 6, fewer residential units would be located adjacent to the U.S. 101 and UPRR. Nevertheless, impacts would remain significant and mitigation measures N-5(a-c) would apply. These measures would reduce impacts associated with this alternative to a less than significant level. Vibration impacts generated by passing trains would remain less than significant.

**k. Public Services.** Although the location of residential buildings would be altered under this alternative, the overall size of development and number of units would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have the same overall impacts to public services as the proposed project. Mitigation measures related to site access required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to public services would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**l. Recreation.** This alternative includes the same basic components of the proposed project, but would have a smaller footprint and the number of units would be the same as under the proposed project (176). Thus, this alternative would result in approximately 480 new residents and would increase demand for public parks. Like the proposed project, this alternative would provide private recreational facilities for residents, including a clubhouse and an outdoor recreation area. The proposed sand volleyball court has been eliminated under this alternative, but this alternative would provide passive open space in the northwest corner of the site. Also, payment of parks development impact fees would be required under this alternative, similar to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts to recreation under this alternative would be less than significant.

**m. Traffic/Circulation/Parking.** This alternative would have the same number of residential units as the proposed project (176) and therefore would result in the same amount of daily traffic. As
discussed in Section 4.13, *Transportation/Circulation*, Mitigation Measure T-1 would reduce impacts at the Storke Road North of Hollister Avenue roadway segment to a less than significant level and Mitigation Measure T-2 would reduce impacts related to queuing on Hollister Avenue. Impacts to public transportation, intersections, and the highway segment in the CMP network would remain less than significant.

This alternative would reconfigure the project site to avoid impacting CA-SBA-54 and would remove approximately 56 parking spaces. Some or all of these parking spaces could be replaced if the buildings are reconfigured or if open space is removed to accommodate new parking areas. Absent the addition of parking spaces, this alternative would have approximately 274 parking spaces. This is fewer than the 326 spaces required by the GMC.

As with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure T-4 would be required for this alternative to accommodate the additional demand for bus service. With implementation of this measure, impacts to alternative transportation would remain less than significant.

**n. Utilities and Service Systems.** Although this alternative would have a smaller building footprint than the proposed project, the number of residential units and amenities on the project site would be the same as under the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have the same overall impacts with respect to utilities and service systems. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to utilities and service systems to a less than significant level.

### 6.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: INCREASED RAILWAY/FREeway BUFFER & HIGHER SOUND WALL

**6.3.1 Alternative Description**

Alternative 3, the “Increased Railway/Freeway Buffer and Higher Sound Wall” alternative would reconfigure the development to provide a larger buffer between the railroad and the U.S. 101 and increase the height of the sound wall to reduce noise impacts. As stated in Section 4.10, *Noise*, Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 are approximately 120 feet from the railroad under the proposed project. The combined noise exposure from U.S. 101 and the UPRR was calculated to be as high as 71 dBA at the most affected residence on the third floor of Building 3.

In this alternative, the height of the sound wall would be increased to 12 feet and would consist of a six-foot wall on top of a six-foot berm. With the sound attenuation expected from a 12-foot high barrier, the residential units would need to be about 200 feet from the UPRR in order for the exterior noise level at the most affected residence (third floor of Building 3) to be under 65 dBA CNEL, which is the maximum "acceptable" noise exposure for multi-family housing according to the Goleta General Plan. Therefore, in this alternative the buildings would be reconfigured so that they are set back approximately 200 feet from the railroad. To achieve this setback, buildings 3 and 6 would need to be removed and buildings 4 and 5 would need to be reduced in size. Therefore, buildings 1, 2, 7, and 8 would increase to three stories so that the overall number of units would remain the same as the proposed project (176 units). The proposed sand volleyball court and bike racks may also be reconfigured and moved slightly south. The additional space between the residential units and UPRR could be used for parking and/or open space. Up to 51 proposed parking spaces would be removed, but
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additional parking could be added between the residences and the northern property line. This alternative is illustrated on Figure 6-2. Although still significant, exposure to risk of upset hazards from the UPRR or U.S. 101 would be incrementally lessened.

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives but may not meet the objective to provide building design for neighborhood compatibility regarding building heights. In addition, the permittee’s architect has indicated that the reduced area for development may result in the loss of up to 59 units as compared to the proposed project if the proposed unit mix is to be retained (CSA Architects, October 7, 2014 letter on file with the City). If the unit mix reduced the number of 2 and 3-bedroom units and provided studio and one-bedroom units instead, it would be possible to maintain the required density. It is also possible that two toy buildings could remain at the front of the site as currently proposed.

6.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include developing the project site with new structures that would alter views of and through the project site. Like the proposed project, this alternative would not involve construction of buildings at a height that would substantially affect public views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and coastal plain. Elimination of the buildings in the northern portion of the site may incrementally reduce view alteration from Storke Road. However, increasing the height of buildings 1, 2, 7, and 8 from two to three stories would incrementally increase view blockage of the Santa Ynez Mountains from Cortona Drive. Overall, Alternative 3 would not significantly impact scenic vistas. Impacts to scenic vistas would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in the removal of mature trees on the eastern and northern portions of the site. However, the overall impact would be somewhat lower due to the elimination of buildings in the northern portion of the site where a number of mature trees are located. As with the proposed project, this impact would be less than significant.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would permanently alter the existing visual character of the project site. This alternative involves three-story residential buildings juxtaposed with two-story existing business parks that could incrementally increase visual compatibility conflicts as compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts would be significant but mitigable. This alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures AES-3(a-h).

New sources of light and glare on and around the project site due to introduction of new structures, hardscape and associated lighting would remain the same as under the proposed project. Impacts would remain significant, but mitigable, and similar to those of the proposed project. The same mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b. Air Quality. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include construction of new residential units, which would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Ozone precursors NOx and ROG, as well as carbon monoxide (CO), would be still emitted by the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators, while fugitive dust (PM10) would still be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction and building construction. Standard SBCAPCD emission control requirements would apply. Impacts would remain less than significant.
This alternative would have the same number of residential units as the proposed project and, therefore, would demand the same amount of energy and generate the same number of motor vehicle trips. Therefore, operational emissions would be the same as those of the proposed project. Impacts would remain less than significant.

This alternative would have the same number of residential units as the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to CAP consistency and population growth would be the same and impacts would remain less than significant.

Under this alternative, residential units would be set back approximately 200 feet from the railroad compared to 120 feet under the proposed project. However, Alternative 3 could still expose residential units on the project site to a carcinogenic health risk exceeding the SBCAPCD recommended health risk criteria. As with the proposed project, implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

c. Biological Resources. This alternative would reduce the overall building footprint. The alternative would not avoid impacts related to removal of coast live oak trees that are protected by Policy 9.1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan or that could support nesting birds. However, it would reduce impacts related to tree removal by eliminating buildings in the northern portion of the site where a number of mature trees are located. As with the proposed project, landscaping for this alternative could introduce invasive plant species that may escape into natural areas. These impacts would remain significant and, as with the proposed project, would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would not impact wildlife movement, wetlands, or sensitive habitat. As with the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant.

d. Cultural Resources. Building 6 would be eliminated under this alternative. Consequently, there would be less ground disturbing activity that could affect CA-SBA-54. Furthermore, in contrast to the proposed project, the sound wall would be constructed on top of a berm and would not require excavation for footings at ground level. Impacts would be somewhat less than under the proposed project, but would remain potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation required for the proposed project would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e. Geology. This alternative would slightly reduce the overall building area and would incrementally reduce the amount of grading required compared to the proposed project; nevertheless, onsite development would be subject to the same potential geological impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for adverse effects caused by seismic settlement, liquefaction, erosion, and expansive soils would be approximately the same under this alternative as under the proposed project. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The overall footprint of development under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project; however, this alternative would not reduce the overall size of the proposed project or number of residential units. Consequently, the project’s long-term GHG emissions from transportation and non-transportation sources would remain the same. As with the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant, although
recommended mitigation measures GHG-1(a) and GHG-1(b) would apply to further reduce project-generated emissions.

g. Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset. Like the proposed project, this alternative would involve developing housing units near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors, a high-pressure gas pipeline, and businesses that store and use hazardous materials. Residential units would incrementally be further away from the U.S. 101 and UPRR. This would incrementally reduce exposure to risk of upset conditions associated with those facilities. Continued compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials use, storage, and transport would incrementally minimize the potential risk of upset. Nonetheless, impacts associated with the proposed project were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I) and would remain so under this alternative.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. The building footprint under this alternative would be somewhat smaller than that of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be less impervious surface area under this alternative and overall surface water runoff and erosion/sedimentation potential would be incrementally lower. Nonetheless, like the proposed project, this alternative would increase impermeable surfaces compared to existing conditions. This alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-2(a-b) to reduce impacts to site drainage. In addition, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-1 and HWQ-3(a-b) to reduce water quality impacts during construction and operation to a less than significant level. As with the proposed project, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

i. Land Use. The density of development would be the same under this alternative as under the proposed project as this alternative would also include 176 residential units on 8.36 net developable acres. Therefore, land use impacts would be approximately the same under this alternative. Like the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with the Goleta General Plan and with GMC. With implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-2, this alternative’s temporary compatibility conflicts with adjacent uses would be reduced to a less than significant level. Quality of life impacts related to privacy for adjacent businesses may be incrementally greater than those of the proposed project due to the increased number of three-story buildings, but would continue to be less than significant. Neighborhood traffic impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project would be Class II, significant with mitigation incorporated.

j. Noise. The footprint of development and overall grading would be incrementally reduced under this alternative. Therefore, overall construction noise would be slightly altered since construction activities on the northern side of the project site would be reduced. However, the amount and duration of construction under this alternative would remain similar to that of the proposed project and construction activities would be within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors. The mitigation measures required to reduce temporary noise impacts during construction of the proposed project would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As with the proposed project, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term operational noise increases would be the same as those of the proposed project since this alternative would involve the same number of new residential units (176 units) as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant since operational noise, including traffic and noise typically associated with residential development, would not exceed thresholds.
Like the proposed project, this alternative would place residential uses near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors. However, this alternative would increase the setback to 200 feet and increase the height of the sound barrier along the northern property line so that exterior noise levels around the residential buildings would remain below 65 dBA CNEL. This would reduce both exterior and interior noise levels in project site residences. Therefore, although mitigation required for the proposed project to reduce interior noise levels would apply, Mitigation Measure N-5(c) related to reducing residential exterior noise at balconies and patios would not be needed. Impacts related to noise exposure would be reduced compared to those of the proposed project and, as with the proposed project, could be reduced to a less than significant level.

**k. Public Services.** The location of residential buildings would be altered under this alternative, but the overall size of development and number of units would be the same as under the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have the same overall impacts to public services as the proposed project. Mitigation measures related to site access that are required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to public services would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**l. Recreation.** This alternative includes the same basic components of the proposed project, but would have a smaller footprint and slightly more open space. The number of units associated with this alternative would remain the same as under the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would result in approximately 480 new residents and would increase demand on public parks. Like the proposed project, this alternative would provide private recreational facilities for residents, including a clubhouse, an outdoor recreation area, and a site for a sand volleyball court or similar facility. Also, payment of parks development impact fees would be required. As with the proposed project, impacts to recreation under this alternative would be less than significant.

**m. Traffic/Circulation/Parking.** This alternative would have the same number of residential units as the proposed project and therefore would result in the same amount of daily traffic. As discussed in Section 4.13, **Transportation/Circulation,** Mitigation Measure T-1 would reduce impacts at the Storke Road North of Hollister Avenue roadway segment to a less than significant level and Mitigation Measure T-2 would reduce impacts related to queuing on Hollister Avenue. Impacts to public transportation, parking, intersections and the highway segment in the CMP network would be similar to those of the proposed project and less than significant.

This alternative would reconfigure the project site to locate residences farther from U.S. 101 and the UPRR. Due to the construction of the berm with a six-foot sound wall on top, the area available for parking would be reduced along the rear property line. Therefore, this alternative would remove up to about 51 proposed parking spaces. However, there would be ample space between residential buildings and the northern site boundary to provide parking to meet the requirements of the GMC. Absent the addition of parking spaces, this alternative would have approximately 279 parking spaces. This is fewer than the 326 spaces required by the GMC.

As with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure T-4 would be required to accommodate additional demand for bus service. With implementation of this measure, impacts to alternative transportation would remain less than significant.

**n. Utilities and Service Systems.** The number of residential units and amenities on the project site would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have the same overall
impacts to utilities and service systems. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to utilities and service systems would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### 6.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: REDUCED BUILDING HEIGHT

#### 6.4.1 Alternative Description

Alternative 4, the “Reduced Building Height” alternative would involve reducing the height of buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6, currently proposed at the rear of the lot, from three stories to two stories. Although no significant environmental impact associated with the four buildings that are three-stories in height has been identified, this alternative would address concerns about private views raised by neighbors during the EIR scoping process and would provide building heights, in terms of number of stories, that are comparable to adjacent two-story business parks. Under this alternative, the total number of new housing units would be reduced by approximately 40. Accordingly, the total number of housing units under this alternative would be 136. Site access and the configuration of buildings, parking areas and roadways would be the same as under the proposed project. With 136 housing units on a site area of 8.36 net acres, the density of this alternative would be 15.8 units per acre.

Under this alternative, objectives 3 and 4 of providing common recreation areas for residents and developing the site such that it minimizes potential conflicts with neighboring properties would be met. Objectives 1 and 2 related to development of affordable rental housing that meets the General Plan Housing Element density requirement of a minimum of 20 units per acre and producing an economically viable project would not be met.

#### 6.4.2 Impact Analysis

a. **Aesthetics.** Similar to the proposed project, under this alternative project site would be developed with new structures that would alter views of and through the project site. With this alternative, structures would be two stories instead of three. By limiting the heights of the residential buildings to two stories, this alternative would incrementally reduce the project’s aesthetic impacts with respect to scenic vistas, visual character, and scenic resources. As there would be reduced scale and building mass, impacts to public and private views from surrounding areas and roadways, in particular Storke Road, would be slightly reduced. As with the proposed project, impacts to views of the scenic Santa Ynez Mountains under this alternative would be less than significant.

This alternative would still result in the removal of mature trees on the eastern and northern portions of the site. However, as with the proposed project, this impact would be less than significant.

This alternative, like the proposed project, involves residential uses juxtaposed with existing business parks that could create visual compatibility conflicts. The reduction to two stories would incrementally reduce such impacts. Nevertheless, like the proposed project, impacts would be significant, but mitigable and this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures AES-3(a-h).

By reducing the number of units and height of the structures compared to the proposed project, this alternative would incrementally reduce the amount of new sources of light and glare on and around the project site due to introduction of new structures, hardscape and associated lighting. Nevertheless, impacts would remain significant but mitigable. The same mitigation measures required for the
proposed project would apply to this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b. Air Quality. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include construction of new residential units, which would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Ozone precursors NOx and ROG, as well as carbon monoxide (CO), would be still emitted by the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators, while fugitive dust (PM10) would still be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction and building construction. By reducing the number of units, this alternative would incrementally reduce the duration and amount of construction activity. Nevertheless, standard emission control measures as required by the SBCAPCD would apply.

This alternative would have 40 (23%) fewer residential units compared to the proposed project and therefore would generate fewer vehicle trips and use less energy compared to the proposed project. Therefore, operational emissions would be commensurately reduced. As with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

This alternative would involve 136 units and therefore would generate approximately 372 residents (136 x 2.73 persons per household). Population growth associated with this alternative would be consistent with the 2010 CAP and, as with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

Like the proposed project, this alternative could expose residential units on the project site to a carcinogenic health risk exceeding the SBCAPCD recommended health risk criteria. Because this alternative involves fewer residential units, fewer people would be exposed to health risks. Nevertheless, mitigation required for the proposed project would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c. Biological Resources. This alternative would reduce the overall building height, but would not avoid impacts related to removal of coast live oak trees that are protected by Policy 9.1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan and that could support nesting birds. As with the proposed project, landscaping for this alternative could introduce invasive plant species which may escape into natural areas. These impacts would remain significant, but mitigable. Like the proposed project, this alternative would not impact wildlife movement, wetlands, or sensitive habitat. Similar to the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant.

d. Cultural Resources. Although the number of units would be reduced with this alternative, the configuration and footprint of buildings on the project site would remain the same. Therefore, cultural resource impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project and all mitigation required for the proposed project would apply. As with the proposed project, cultural resource impacts would be significant, but mitigable.

e. Geology. Although this alternative would reduce the overall building height and involve fewer units, this alternative would be subject to the same potential geological impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for adverse effects caused by seismic settlement, liquefaction, erosion, and expansive soils would be approximately the same under this alternative as the proposed project. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative.
f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would reduce the size of the proposed project by 40 units (23%) and thus would commensurately reduce the project’s GHG emissions from transportation and non-transportation sources. As with the proposed project, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant, although mitigation measures GHG-1(a) and GHG-1(b) would still apply to further reduce project-generated emissions.

g. Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset. Like the proposed project, this alternative would involve developing housing units near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors, a high-pressure gas pipeline, and businesses that store and use hazardous materials. The overall exposure potential would be incrementally reduced since this alternative would involve 40 (23%) fewer units. This would incrementally reduce exposure to risk of upset conditions. Continued compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials use, storage, and transport would minimize the potential risk of upset. Nevertheless, impacts associated with the proposed project were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I) and would remain so under this alternative.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. This alternative would include 40 fewer units than the proposed project, but the building footprint would be the same. Therefore, there would be the same amount of impervious surface area under this alternative and surface water runoff and the erosion/sedimentation potential would be similar to that of the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this alternative would increase impermeable surfaces compared to existing conditions and would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-2(a-b) to reduce impacts to site drainage. In addition, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-1 and HWQ-3(a-b) to reduce water quality impacts during construction and operation to a less than significant level.

i. Land Use. This alternative would include 136 units, or a 23% reduction compared to the 176 units under the proposed project. The project site has a General Plan designation of Medium-Density Residential (R-MD) and is also designated as an Affordable Housing Opportunity which designates a maximum of 25 units per acre and a minimum of 20 units per acre. With 136 units, this alternative would have a density of 16.2 units/acre (136 units/8.36 net developable acres), which is below the minimum density requirement of 20 units/acre and is inconsistent with the Goleta General Plan Housing Element

This alternative would have fewer residential units, would limit building height to two stories, and would generate less noise and traffic; therefore, this alternative may pose slightly fewer compatibility conflicts with surrounding uses than would the proposed project. Mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 would still be required to reduce temporary compatibility conflicts associated with construction to a less than significant level. Quality of life impacts related to privacy for adjacent businesses may be incrementally lower than those of the proposed project due to the reduced number of three-story buildings and units and, as with the proposed project, would be less than significant. Neighborhood traffic impacts would be slightly lower than those of the proposed project, but would still be Class II, significant with mitigation incorporated.

j. Noise. The number of units would be reduced by 40 (23%) under this alternative. Therefore, the amount and duration of construction under this alternative would be slightly less than that of the proposed project. Nevertheless, like the proposed project, construction activities would be within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors and temporary noise impacts due to construction activities would remain significant but mitigable. The mitigation measures required to reduce temporary noise impacts during
construction of the proposed project would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As with the proposed project, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Since this alternative involves 23% fewer residential units (136 compared to 176), long-term noise impacts would be reduced. As with the proposed project, long-term noise impacts would be less than significant.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would place residential uses near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors. However, as this alternative involves fewer units, fewer residents would be exposed to rail and freeway noise. Nevertheless, impacts would remain significant and mitigation measures N-5(a-c) would apply. Vibration impacts generated by passing trains would remain less than significant.

k. Public Services. This alternative would have 40 fewer residential units so would incrementally reduce impacts related to fire protections service. This alternative would be required to implement Mitigation Measure PS-1 to comply with Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District requirements. With implementation of this measure, impacts to public services would be reduced to a less than significant level.

l. Recreation. The number of units associated with this alternative would be 23% lower than under the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would commensurately reduce demand for public parks. Like the proposed project, this alternative would provide private recreational facilities for residents, including a clubhouse, an outdoor recreation area, and a site for a sand volleyball court or similar facility. Also, payment of parks development impact fees would be required. As with the proposed project, impacts to recreation under this alternative would be less than significant.

m. Traffic/Circulation/Parking. This alternative would have 40 (23%) fewer residential units than the proposed project and therefore would generate fewer vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. Using the trip generation rate of 6.65 average daily trips per unit (ATE, 2012), this alternative would generate approximately 905 trips compared to 1,170 trips generated by the proposed project. Traffic impacts would therefore be incrementally reduced. Nevertheless, the significant roadway segment impact on Storke Road North of Hollister Avenue would remain and Mitigation Measure T-1 would be required. Mitigation Measure T-2 would also be required to reduce impacts related to queuing on Hollister Avenue. Impacts to intersections and the highway segment in the CMP network would remain less than significant. Impacts to parking would also remain less than significant as the same number of parking spaces (330) could be provided and, since this alternative involves fewer residential units, fewer parking spaces would be required. With implementation of Mitigation Measure T-4 to provide a bus stop at the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Cortona Drive, impacts to public transportation also would remain less than significant.

n. Utilities and Service Systems. The number of residential units would be reduced by 40 (23%) under this alternative compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would commensurately reduce water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation compared to the proposed project. Nevertheless, mitigation measures that are required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to utilities and service systems would be reduced to a less than significant level.
6.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: BUSINESS PARK DEVELOPMENT

6.5.1 Alternative Description

Alternative 5, the “Business Park Development” alternative would involve a business park in place of the proposed residential development. This alternative assumes that buildout of the project site would be the maximum amount allowed by the Goleta General Plan and GMC if the project site was zoned and designated for Business Park uses, similar to surrounding properties (maximum lot coverage of 35%). It also assumes that the business park would be two stories in height given that the other developments in the area are one to two stories in height. Since the project site has 8.36 net developable acres, the maximum size of the business park would be approximately 260,400 square feet (130,200 square foot footprint and two stories tall). This alternative also assumes that 30% of the project site (111,601 sf) would be landscaped and the remaining 3 acres of developable area would be parking. This alternative also assumes that adequate parking would be provided to meeting City Zoning Ordinance parking requirements. Table 6-1 compares Alternative 5 to the proposed project.

The development assumptions for this alternative assume the maximum that could be accommodated onsite under a Business Park designation. A smaller development could also be constructed, which would reduce the overall impact of the alternative. For example, a one-story alternative with the same overall building footprint as described above would involve 130,200 square feet of development.

Alternative 5 would be inconsistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning and would not meet the project objectives of providing affordable rental housing, nor would it specifically address any specific significant environmental impact identified for the proposed project. Instead, this alternative is intended to address architectural compatibility concerns raised by neighboring property owners during the EIR scoping process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1</th>
<th>Comparison of Alternative 5 and Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park Development</td>
<td>260,400 sf*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total building footprint</td>
<td>130,200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total landscaping/open space</td>
<td>111,601 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paved areas (parking and driveways)</td>
<td>130,200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area disturbed (building footprint + paved area)</td>
<td>260,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents the maximum amount of development allowed within the Business Park zoning designation.
6.5.2 Impact Analysis

**a. Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with a two-story building in a business park instead of residential uses. As with the proposed project, the project site would be developed with new structures that alter views of and through the project site. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not involve construction of buildings at a height that would substantially affect public views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and coastal plain. Impacts to scenic vistas would remain less than significant.

Depending on the configuration of the building(s) and of the parking areas provided, this alternative may avoid the removal of mature trees on the eastern and northern portion of the site. As with the proposed project, impacts related to tree removal would be less than significant.

This alternative would involve business park development in an area characterized by business park development. Therefore, the significant but mitigable impact related to visual compatibility conflicts identified for the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level and mitigation for visual compatibility impacts would not apply. It should be noted, however, that this alternative would involve a 19% larger overall area of disturbance (building footprint and paved areas combined) than the proposed project.

This alternative involves business park uses instead of residential uses. However, this alternative would still create new sources of light and glare on and around the project site due to introduction of new structures, hardscape and associated lighting. Nevertheless, impacts would remain significant, but mitigable. The mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**b. Air Quality.** This alternative would involve construction of a business park, which would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Ozone precursors NOx and ROG, as well as carbon monoxide (CO), would be emitted by the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators, while fugitive dust (PM10) would be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction and building construction. Similar to the proposed project, it is assumed that construction would occur over approximately 14 months. Standard emission control measure as required by the SBCAPCD would still apply. As shown in Table 6-2, construction emissions would be below SBCAPCD thresholds and impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Operational emissions associated with Alternative 5 are shown in Table 6-3. This alternative would have slightly higher operational emission than the proposed project, but emissions would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. As with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

This alternative involves business park development instead of residential development and therefore would not result in population growth. This alternative would not generate population exceeding CAP forecasts.

This alternative does not involve residential uses; therefore, it would not expose residents to carcinogenic health risks associated with U.S.101 and UPRR. This alternative would reduce the significant, but mitigable health risk impact associated with the proposed project to less than significant
since the business park use would be less sensitive to carcinogenic risks than the proposed residential use.

**Table 6-2**

**Estimated Construction Air Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Emissions (tons/year)</th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Emissions for Alternative 5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBCAPCD Thresholds</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Exceeded?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Construction Emissions for Proposed Project for Comparison</strong></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All calculations were made using the CalEEMod computer model. See Appendix B for calculations. Site Preparation, Grading, Paving. Building Construction and Architectural Coating totals include worker trips, construction vehicle emissions and fugitive dust.

**Table 6-3**

**Operational Emissions for Alternative 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold (area + energy +mobile)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Exceeded?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold (mobile only)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Exceeded?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operational Emissions for Proposed Project for Comparison</strong></td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod v.2011.1, modeling results contained in Appendix B.

**c. Biological Resources.** Depending on the configuration of the business park, this alternative could avoid impacts related to removal of coast live oak trees that are protected by Policy 9.1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan. However, it is likely that at least some protected trees would be affected. Development would also result in the removal of trees that support nesting birds. As with the proposed project, landscaping for this alternative could introduce invasive plant species which may
escape into natural areas. These impacts would remain significant but mitigable. All mitigation required for the proposed project would apply.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would not impact wildlife movement, wetlands, or sensitive habitat. As with the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant.

d. Cultural Resources. Depending on the configuration of the business park and parking area, this alternative could potentially avoid the significant, but mitigable impact related to CA-SBA-54, which is an area of prehistoric archaeological significance. However, it is assumed that, at a minimum, parking lots and landscaped areas would overlie the resource, similar to the proposed project. Thus, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project and potentially significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures required for the proposed project would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e. Geology. This alternative would involve business park uses instead of residential uses, but the proposed development would be subject to the same potential geological impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for adverse effects caused by seismic settlement, liquefaction, erosion, and expansive soils would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative and, as with the proposed project, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. GHG emissions associated with Alternative 5 are shown in Table 6-4. Alternative 5 emissions would be almost twice as high as those of the proposed project; whereas the proposed project would have a building footprint of 68,518 square feet, Alternative 5 would have a much larger building footprint of 130,200 square feet. Nevertheless, emissions would be under the 4.6 MT CO₂e/SP/year efficiency threshold for residential and commercial projects recommended by BAAQMD (see Table 4.6-1 in Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions). As with the proposed project, GHG-related impacts would be less than significant. To further reduce project-generated emissions, mitigation measures GHG-1(a) and GHG-1(b) would still be recommended for this alternative.

g. Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset. This alternative would involve a business park. It would expose employees to the same risk of upset conditions from off-site sources to which the proposed project would be exposed. The business park use is considered less sensitive than the proposed residential use to this type of risk because a business park would not include people living on-site during both daytime and nighttime hours and would not be expected to include sensitive populations such as children and the elderly. Nevertheless, employees would be exposed to the same hazards to which residents would be exposed and employees could potentially be onsite 24 hours per day depending on the shifts in various types of businesses that occupies the site; therefore, overall impacts would be incrementally lower than those of the proposed project. Continued compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials use, storage, and transport would incrementally minimize the potential risk of upset, but the impact would still be significant and unavoidable (Class I).
Table 6-4
Combined Annual Emissions of Greenhouse Gases for Alternative 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Annual Emissions (Metric Tons CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1,475.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>55.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>130.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ and CH₄</td>
<td>1,616.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>90.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions from Alternative 5</td>
<td>3,391.39 metric tons CO₂e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Service Population Emissions</td>
<td>4.5 metric tons CO₂e/SP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions from Proposed Project</td>
<td>1,714 metric tons CO₂e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Service Population Emissions for Proposed Project</td>
<td>3.5 metric tons CO₂e/SP**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendix B for calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions.
* SP = Service Population, defined as residents + employees. Assuming 344 sf per employee, Alternative 5 would have approximately 760 employees (The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment Density Study, Prepared for SCAG, October 2001).
** The proposed project would have approximately 480 residents (see Section 4.2, Air Quality) and 2 employees for a total SP of 482.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. The total building footprint and paved areas under this alternative is anticipated to be higher than that of the proposed project (see Table 6-1). Therefore, there would be more impervious surface area under this alternative. As such, surface water runoff and the potential for erosion and sedimentation would somewhat be higher under this alternative. As with the proposed project, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-2(a-b) to reduce impacts to site drainage. In addition, this alternative would be required to implement mitigation measures HWQ-1 and HWQ-3(a-b) to reduce water quality impacts during construction and operation to a level less than significant level. As with the proposed project, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level less than significant level.

i. Land Use. This alternative involves development of a business park rather than affordable rental housing. The project size has a General Plan land use designation of Medium-Density Residential (R-MD) and is designated as an Affordable Housing Opportunity Site. The project site is zoned Design Residential (DR-20). Therefore, this alternative would be inconsistent with the City’s General Plan and GMC and would require a General Plan amendment and zone change. It would also conflict with the City’s Housing Element, which relies on the project site to meet the City’s affordable housing goals. On the other hand, placement of a business park development in an area characterized by other business parks and adjacent to U.S. 101 and the UPRR would create fewer compatibility conflicts with surrounding land uses than would the proposed residential use. Because of the potential for release of hazardous materials from U.S. 101, the UPRR, a natural gas pipeline, or existing businesses in the area,
compatibility with U.S. 101 and UPRR would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would have greater impacts with respect to land use plans and policies and fewer impacts with respect to compatibility.

j. **Noise.** The duration of development under this alternative would be comparable to that of the proposed project and construction would occur within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors. As with the proposed project, temporary construction noise impacts would be significant, but mitigable. The mitigation measures required to reduce temporary noise impacts during construction of the proposed project would apply to this alternative and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As with the proposed project, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Operational noise associated with the proposed project would involve typical noise associated with business park development such as vehicular movement, conversations, HVAC systems, loading, unloading, forklifts, and other equipment. Operational noise would be comparable to surrounding business park uses and impacts would be less than significant. As discussed below in *Transportation and Circulation,* this alternative would generate 84% more vehicle trips than the proposed project. Therefore, traffic-related noise would increase commensurately. Nevertheless, impacts would not exceed significance thresholds.

This alternative would place a business park near the U.S. 101 and UPRR corridors. Business park uses are considered less noise-sensitive than residential uses. Therefore, impacts related to noise exposure would be reduced compared to the proposed project. Vibration impacts generated by passing trains would remain less than significant.

k. **Public Services.** Although this alternative involves business park development instead of residential development, the same Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District requirements pertaining to defensible space, serviceable access, fire hydrants, sprinkler systems, etc., would apply. Therefore, this alternative would have the same overall impacts to public services as the proposed project. Mitigation measures related to site access that are required for the proposed project would apply to this alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures and the required filing of a Business Plan with the Fire Protection District, impacts to public services would be reduced to a less than significant level.

l. **Recreation.** This alternative would not involve residential uses and therefore would not increase demand for public parks. Impacts to recreation under this alternative be incrementally lower than the proposed project and would be less than significant.

m. **Traffic/Circulation/Parking.** As shown in Table 6-5, this alternative would generate approximately 3,323 average daily trips, or 84% more operational trips than would be generated by the proposed project. As such, impacts to area intersection and roadway segment level of service (LOS) operations would increase. Mitigation Measure T-1 would still be required to improve the capacity of Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue and Mitigation Measure T-2 would still be required to reduce impacts related to queuing on Hollister Avenue. Additional mitigation measures may be required, depending on the specific impacts to roadway segments and intersections. Impacts to parking would remain less than significant as this alternative would provide adequate parking for business park uses.

---

1 Alternatives 5 assumes maximum buildout under the Business Park designation. A smaller alternative could also be accommodated and would generate less traffic. For example, a one-story alternative with the same footprint as Alternative 5 would generate about half as much traffic, which is less than would be generated by the proposed project.
As with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure T-4 would be required to accommodate additional demand for bus service. With implementation of this measure, impacts to alternative transportation would remain less than significant.

n. Utilities and Service Systems. Alternative 5 would involve development of a business park rather than residential uses. Impacts associated with water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste are discussed below.

Water Demand. As shown in Table 6-6, water demand associated with Alternative 5 would be about 13% lower than that of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Demand Rate</th>
<th>Projected Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>260,400 sf</td>
<td>0.14 AFY/1,000 sf</td>
<td>36.46 AFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>111,601 sf</td>
<td>0.04 AFY/1,000 sf</td>
<td>4.46 AFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.92 AFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.14 AFY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Goleta, City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual.
AFY = acre-feet per year

Wastewater Generation. The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) does not have wastewater generation rates for business park uses. Therefore, a standard assumption that wastewater generation is 80 percent of water demand was used. Based on a water demand of 40.92 AFY, as shown in Table 6-6, Alternative 5 would generate an estimated 29,225 gallons of wastewater per day on peak days. This is 10% less than would be generated by the proposed project, which would generate an estimated 32,384 gallons per day. Nevertheless, GWSD has available capacity to treat wastewater generated by Alternative 5. Therefore, as with the proposed project, GWSD has available capacity to treat wastewater generated by Alternative 5 and impacts would be less than significant.

Solid Waste. During construction of Alternative 5, an estimated 1 million pounds of debris (506 tons) would be created (based on the average generation of 3.89 pounds per sf for non-residential construction debris from U.S. EPA, 1998). The proposed project would generate an estimated 764,730 pounds of debris. Therefore, impacts related to construction waste would be increased compared to the
proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts would be significant, but mitigable and Mitigation Measure UTL-3 would apply.

According to the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, office uses generate 0.0013 tons of waste per square foot. Therefore, Alternative 5 would generate approximately 338.5 tons of waste per year during operation, which is above the City's threshold of 196 tons per year. Assuming that Alternative 5 would divert 73% of waste, total waste would be 91.4 tons per year, which would not exceed the threshold of 196 tons per year. Including the 73% diversion rate, the proposed project would generate an estimated 119.6 tons per year and would be below the threshold. Therefore, solid waste impacts associated with the operation of Alternative 5 would decrease compared to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure UTL-4 would still apply to facilitate the diversion of solid waste.

6.6 ALTERNATIVE SITES

Alternative sites for developing a project similar to the proposed project (176 apartment units with parking and recreational amenities on an approximately 8.8 acre site.) 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-residential land use designation. Development on vacant sites with an Agricultural designation would result in losses of agricultural lands, creating a new impact for the residential project and requiring a General Plan amendment and zone change. Development on vacant non-residential sites would also require a General Plan amendment and zone change. Many of the remaining vacant sites have pending or approved applications for development with the City. Vacant residential sites designated as Affordable Housing Opportunity sites were reviewed, but found to be either too small or constrained by creeks and EHSA. The property owner does not own, control, or otherwise have access to potential alternative sites. Therefore analysis of an alternative site for the project is not warranted.

6.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-7 compares the physical impacts for each of the alternatives to the physical impacts of the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would be the overall environmentally superior alternative since it would avoid all project impacts. However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the basic project objectives as stated in Section 2.0, Project Description.

Among the development options, Alternatives 2 through 5 would all reduce one or more project impacts, as discussed below; however, no alternative removes the significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact from risk of upset:

- **Alternative 2 would avoid the potentially significant, but mitigable impact to cultural resources and would incrementally reduce, but not eliminate the potential for exposure to upset associated with U.S. 101, the UPRR, a natural gas pipeline, and existing businesses.** This alternative may increase parking impacts if additional parking cannot be provided.

- **Alternative 3 would avoid the potentially significant, but mitigable impact related to exposure of site residents to noise exceeding the City’s residential exterior standard and would incrementally reduce, but not eliminate the potential for disturbance of cultural resources and exposure to upset associated with U.S. 101, the UPRR, a natural gas pipeline,**
and existing businesses. This alternative may reduce the convenience of parking since parking spaces would be farther from residential units.

- **Alternative 4** would incrementally reduce impacts in several issue areas due to the reduction in building height and number of units, but would not avoid any of the proposed project’s significant environmental effects. This alternative would increase land use policy impacts due to the failure to meet the City’s housing objectives and required density of 20 to 25 units per acre.

- **Alternative 5** would incrementally lessen the significant, but mitigable impacts related to residential exposure to noise and health risk from U.S. 101 and the UPRR. It would also incrementally lessen residential exposure to risk of upset hazards associated with U.S. 101, the UPRR, area businesses, and a gas pipeline, but would expose employees to the same risks, therefore the risk of upset remains significant and unavoidable (Class I). This alternative could increase traffic generation and associated impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gases, and noise.

Alternatives 2-5 would all fail to meet one or more of the project objectives, as noted below:

- **Alternative 2** may not meet objectives 4 or 5 regarding building design compatibility within the neighborhood and may not meet the objective related to the provision of parking on-site.

- **Alternative 3** may not meet objectives 4 or 5 regarding building design compatibility within the neighborhood. It may also fail to meet objectives 1 or 2 if it is determined that the required 20-25 units per acre densities cannot be met.

- **Alternative 4** would not meet Objective 1 of providing a minimum of 20 units per acre and may not meet Objective 2 of providing a project that is affordable by design.

- **Alternative 5** would not meet Objectives 1 and 2 of providing rental housing and providing a minimum of 20 units per acre.

None of the alternatives would eliminate the only Class I impact of the proposed project, which relates to project specific and cumulative risk of upset. All other project impacts can be reduced to below a level of significance with proposed mitigation measures; therefore, although some alternatives would reduce impacts in such areas as cultural resources and noise, these reductions would be incremental in nature and adoption of an alternative rather than the proposed project would not be necessary to avoid significant environmental effects.
## Table 6-7
Impact Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Alternative 1 No Project/No Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Avoid CA-SBA-54</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Increase Railroad/Freeway Buffer and Sound Wall Height</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Reduced Building Height</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Business Park Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=/- and +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/+</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/=+</td>
<td>/=+</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- and +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/- and +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Circulation/Parking</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=/-</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
<td>=/‐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Superior to the proposed project (reduced level of impact)
- Inferior to the proposed project (increased level of impact)
=+/‐ slightly superior to the proposed project in one or more aspects, but not significantly superior
=/- slightly inferior to the proposed project in one or more aspects, but not significantly inferior
= Similar level of impact to the proposed project