

CHAPTER 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION

3.01 INTRODUCTION

The City's current General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) was adopted and the environmental impact report (EIR) was certified in October 2006. In March 2007, the City Council initiated a process for reopening the GP/CLUP to consider the emergence of suggested amendments by City staff, the public-at-large, landowners, developers, and special interest groups. Minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts were identified as Track 2 (adopted June 17, 2008), and revisions meriting more detailed review as to their potential impacts were identified as Track 3.

The Track 2 and Track 3 policies were the subject of a series of four workshops hosted by the City between September 15, 2007, and October 17, 2007, to collect feedback from the public. Public hearings were also held on January 17 and January 29, 2008, to receive comments. After considering public comment from these various workshops and hearings, the City Council decided which policies would proceed toward amendment, and identified the form of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation appropriate for each policy. Amendments categorized as *Track 2* revisions involved minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts, and were addressed in a CEQA Addendum adopted in March 2008. Amendments categorized as *Track 3* revisions involve those topics meriting more detailed review as to their potential environmental impacts, and are addressed in this Supplemental EIR.

The environmental analysis presented herein addresses those policies to be considered for amendment as Track 3 revisions. In general, these revisions were made to improve or clarify the text of selected policies or subsections, to provide City staff with increased flexibility in policy implementation, or to refine policies with more succinct and appropriate wording based upon the observations and experiences of City staff during the first 6 months of implementing the newly adopted GP/CLUP.

The policies evaluated in this Supplemental EIR have the potential to involve significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects. Accordingly, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the appropriate form of CEQA documentation for these Track 3 revisions is a Supplemental EIR.

3.02 ORGANIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Supplemental EIR includes the certified 2006 Final EIR by reference. The Supplemental EIR identifies changes in the environmental setting and regulatory environment since adoption of the Final EIR, addresses new or modified environmental impacts associated with revisions to selected GP/CLUP policies (Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3), and identifies mitigation measures designed to reduce new significant impacts where feasible. Table 3-1 provides a cross reference of proposed GP/CLUP policy changes (as proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3) and the environmental issue area and specific impact(s) that may be affected by the change.

**TABLE 3-1
CROSS-REFERENCE OF PROPOSED GP/CLUP AMENDMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL
ISSUE POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

Proposed Amendment (ID #)	Potential Impacts Affected by Proposed Amendments (Alternatives 2a, 2b, and/or 3)
Conservation Element	
CE 1	<p>Section 3.4 - Biological Resources Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-Status Habitats and Species Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-3. Long-Term Degradation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</p> <p>Section 3.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact 3.7-7 Surface Water</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>
CE 2	<p>Section 3.4 - Biological Resources Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-Status Habitats and Species Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-3. Long-Term Degradation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</p> <p>Section 3.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact 3.7-7 Surface Water</p> <p>Section 3.9 – Water Resources Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies are 303(d) listed</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>

(continued on next page)

TABLE 3-1 CONTINUED

Proposed Amendment (ID #)	Potential Impacts Affected by Proposed Amendments (Alternatives 2a, 2b, and/or 3)
CE 3	<p>Section 3.4 - Biological Resources Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-Status Habitats and Species Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-3. Long-Term Degradation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</p> <p>Section 3.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact 3.7-7 Surface Water</p> <p>Section 3.9 – Water Resources Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>
CE 4	<p>Section 3.4 - Biological Resources Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special-Status Habitats and Species Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-3. Long-Term Degradation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy</p>
CE 5	<p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>
CE 8	<p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>
CE 9	<p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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</p>

(continued on next page)

TABLE 3-1 CONTINUED

Proposed Amendment (ID #)	Potential Impacts Affected by Proposed Amendments (Alternatives 2a, 2b, and/or 3)
CE 10	<p>Section 3.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water</p> <p>Section 3.9 – Water Resources Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply Resulting from New Development Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies are 303(d) listed</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities</p>
Land Use Element	
LU 3	<p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation 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 Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</p> <p>Section 3.8 – Population and Housing 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</p>
LU 11	<p>Section 3.3 – Air Quality Impact 3.3-2. GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Not Consistent with the Clean Air Plan</p> <p>Section 3.8 – Population and Housing Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the GP/CLUP is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs</p>
Open Space Element	
OS 7	<p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses</p>
Transportation Element	
TE 13	<p>Section 3.3 – Air Quality Impact 3.3-2. GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Not Consistent with the Clean Air Plan</p> <p>Section 3.8 – Population and Housing 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</p> <p>Section 3.10 – Land Use and Recreation Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways</p>

Identified impacts were evaluated in terms of their potential significance based on their applicable significance thresholds and the classes of impacts (I through IV) used by the City for CEQA analyses. Cumulative impacts were examined in terms of the combined effects of the impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation and foreseeable projects in areas adjacent to the City. Residual impacts were examined in terms of the potential for significant effects to occur after mitigation of any Class I, Class II, or significant cumulative impacts. The EIR also identified GP/CLUP policies that would reduce potentially significant impacts resulting from Plan buildout to less-than-significant levels.

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

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

The results of this evaluation are presented in Sections 3.1 through 3.13. A tabular summary is provided in the screening tables in Appendix B. For those disciplines where the GP/CLUP amendments listed in Table 2-1 of this Supplemental EIR are not proposed to policies cited as mitigation for a given topic, would not result in greater or different impacts to the topic than those analyzed in the Final EIR, and do not have the potential to result in new potentially significant impacts to that topic, the analysis presented in the 2006 Final EIR is considered sufficient, and no further discussion is presented in this Supplemental EIR.

3.02.1 Existing Conditions

The environmental setting section describes the physical environmental conditions in the project area as they relate to the issue in question. According to the CEQA Guidelines, 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 2006 Final EIR. Changes in the environmental setting since adoption of the 2006 Final EIR are noted, where applicable.

3.02.2 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 2006 Final EIR. Changes in federal, state, or local regulations since adoption of the 2006 Final EIR are noted, where applicable.

3.02.3 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 Supplemental EIR will focus on changes in impact determinations associated with proposed policy revisions to the GP/CLUP.

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. Thresholds are based on the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines

Manual and/or the CEQA thresholds, and are identical to those referenced in the 2006 Final EIR.

Discussion of Relevant General Plan Policies. This section identifies policies proposed in the GP/CLUP that are relevant to a given environmental issue.

Environmental Impact Analysis. The environmental analysis considers the potential impacts resulting from short-term and long-term implementation selected policy revisions to the GP/CLUP. Specifically, the analysis will examine whether a proposed policy amendment:

- is consistent with the guiding principles and goals identified in the adopted certified Final GP/CLUP;
- would increase or result in new impacts compared with those impacts identified in the certified 2006 Final EIR; or
- would reduce the amount or efficacy of mitigation identified in the 2006 Final EIR for Class I or Class II impacts.

While the criteria for determining significant 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 GP/CLUP Supplemental EIR is approved, decision makers are required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Section 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 Supplemental EIR is approved, decision makers are required to make findings pursuant to CEQA Section 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 implementation that would be beneficial.

Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures are identified for potential GP/CLUP-related buildout impacts that are considered significant based on the significance criteria or thresholds of significance. These measures would reduce or avoid each impact, as appropriate.

For most environmental issues, potential impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout are reduced below significance through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies. As a result, the GP/CLUP policies are intended to be *self-mitigating*. For that reason, the analysis presented in this Supplemental EIR will identify whether proposed revisions to selected policies will affect their ability to mitigate impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout below a level of significance.

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.

3.03 REQUIREMENTS FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) require a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355).

Potential cumulative impacts are further described as follows:

- (a) *The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[a]).*
- (b) *The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[b]).*

Furthermore, according to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130(a)(1):

As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.

In addition, as stated in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064(i)(5), it should be noted that:

The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable.

3.03.1 Evaluation

The cumulative impact analysis evaluated in the GP/CLUP EIR comprises: (1) the citywide impact analysis from full buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP; and (2) outside the City boundary, known or foreseeable projects in unincorporated Santa Barbara County, City of Santa Barbara, and University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB). The City's prior adoption of the GP/CLUP

involved no immediate physical environmental impact. Rather, the Plan set the stage for future development within the City, and as such, the EIR analysis focused on the “indirect” impacts of adoption of the GP/CLUP. These impacts would result primarily from development associated with:

- development of existing vacant lands consistent with the land use plan map;
- redevelopment of existing developed lands to more intensive or different uses;
- major planned street and highway and infrastructure improvements, consistent with the transportation improvement map; and
- future development consistent with the proposed land use map and GP/CLUP goals, objectives, and policies.

The cumulative environment on which this future City development was assumed to occur included future growth within the region including the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, Santa Barbara County (including Isla Vista) from Highway 154 to the eastern City boundary and from Gaviota to the western City boundary, and UCSB. The City of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County, and UCSB growth projections for the region were added to growth assumed for the City, which is already factored into the GP/CLUP to arrive at the cumulative environment. Development projects included in the cumulative analysis for this Supplemental EIR are described in Table 3-2.

Because these impacts would occur over time as part of individual residential and commercial/ industrial development projects, a project horizon year (2030) was established for purposes of analysis in the EIR. The growth and changes in land use that were analyzed as impacts of the project throughout the EIR were projected to the year 2030, employing a cumulative analysis methodology.

**TABLE 3-2
CUMULATIVE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, AND UCSB
DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AS OF SEPTEMBER 2008**

Project	Location / Description	Jurisdiction	Status
City of Santa Barbara Projects			
1	Santa Barbara Airport—Hangars	40 Cass Place. Construct three metal aircraft hangars totaling 31,000 square feet (sf), and demolish 8,400 sf building. Project also includes Taxiway B realignment project, which demolishes existing northern end of Taxiway B (93,200 sf) and construction of new Taxiway B (167,760 sf).	City of Santa Barbara Approved
2	Rental Car and Fueling Facility	25 David Love Place. Construct 10,600 sf one-story building, 4,550 sf fuel canopy, 120,900 sf of paving, 21,950 sf of landscaping, and exterior lighting.	City of Santa Barbara Approved
3	Santa Barbara Airport—Airline Terminal Facility	500 Fowler Road. Construct new 66,045 sf two-story airline terminal facility. Rehabilitate original 5,000 sf terminal building constructed in 1942. Remove terminal additions constructed in 1967 and 1976. Remove existing rental car/security operations building, airline trailers, and baggage claim pavilions. Reconfigure existing short-term parking lot and revise loop road for alternative transportation lane.	City of Santa Barbara Approved
4	Santa Barbara Airport—Locker Room	500 Fowler Road. Construct new 720 sf single story trailer to be used as a locker room at the airport.	City of Santa Barbara Building Permit Issued
5	“Working” Airplane Hangar	495 S. Fairview Boulevard. Request for Coastal Exclusion to legalize as-built two-story work dock inside an existing “working” airplane hangar.	City of Santa Barbara Building Permit Issued
6	Santa Barbara Airport	162 Firestone Road. Demolish existing 4,000 sf airport building.	City of Santa Barbara Building Permit Issued
7	Residential Housing	4200 Calle Real. Construct 75 affordable rental units and 95 affordable senior units on 17-acre site.	City of Santa Barbara Building Permit Issued
8	Commercial/Industrial Development	6100 Hollister Avenue. Demolish 51,746 sf of existing commercial structures and construct 19 new commercial/industrial buildings of various sizes. Include 79,960 sf of office space, 79,960 sf of research and development space, 20,400 of retail space, and 571 on-grade parking spaces.	City of Santa Barbara Pending

(continued on next page)

TABLE 3-2 CONTINUED

Project	Description/Location ³	Jurisdiction	Status/ Approximate ASF ³	
University Projects				
9	UCSB Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Update (including Ocean Road Project)	UCSB growth anticipated under the 2008 LRDP was previously accounted for the City of Goleta 2006 GP/CLUP. Growth projections include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5,000 student enrollment increase; • 336 additional faculty; • 1,400 additional staff; • 1.8 million sf additional building space; • 5,443 net additional bed spaces; • 239 net additional student family units; • 1,874 additional faculty and staff units; • 5 additional acres of play fields; • 5,100 replacement parking spaces; and • 3,650 net additional parking spaces constructed. 	University	Planning stages
County of Santa Barbara Projects – Gaviota Coast				
10	Ballantyne Single Family Residence APN 079-090-036	Construct 13,333 sf dwelling, 800 sf guest house with 568 sf garage, 1,200 sf barn, municipal water line, and accessory structures.	County	Approved
11	Dos Pueblos Naples Residential Development Pre-App APN 079-180-101 & others	Pre-application to merge 25 lots into 10 new lots, and to construct a single-family dwelling on each lot.	County	Pre-application complete. No pending application.
12	Eagle Canyon Ranch Lot Line Adjustment APN 079-060-062 & others	Merge seven existing lots into four new lots and establish a building envelope for each lot.	County	Pending
13	Gaviota Holdings Habitat Restoration APN 079-200-002 & -005	Application for a Coastal Development to implement a habitat restoration plan.	County	In process
14	Morehart Land Company APN 079-160-007, -029, 030, & -031	Merge 12 lots into nine new lots, and construct eight new single-family dwellings.	County	Pending
15	Paradiso del Mare Inland Estate APN 079-200-008	Construct 9,436 sf dwelling with 792 sf detached garage, 280 sf studio, and 926 sf guest house with 293 sf garage.	County	In process
16	Paradiso del Mare Ocean Estate APN 079-200-004	Construct 6,505 sf dwelling with 680 sf detached garage, 280 sf gym, 861 sf guest house, and 506 sf garage.	County	In process

(continued on next page)

TABLE 3-2 CONTINUED

Project		Description/Location ³	Jurisdiction	Status/ Approximate ASF ³
17	Santa Barbara Ranch Project APN 079-140-012 plus over 185 others	Two projects are under consideration for purposes of CEQA: MOU Project: 54 new single-family dwellings on Santa Barbara Ranch totaling 485 acres. Alternative 1 Project: 72 new single-family dwellings on Dos Pueblos and Santa Barbara Ranches totaling 3,254 acres.	County	Approved
County of Santa Barbara Projects – Isla Vista and Goleta Valley				
18	Isla Vista Master Plan	Isla Vista growth anticipated under the 2008 Isla Vista Master Plan includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,447 residential units at maximum build-out; • potential population increase of 4,355 people; • 51,485 sf of commercial space and 382 residential units downtown; • 600 additional downtown off-street parking spaces would be required to accommodate full build-out; • 241 new affordable housing units totaling 6.34 acres; • new community center; and • at least one public parking lot on approximately 0.5–1 acre containing 50–250 parking spaces. 	County	Planning stages
19	Goleta Valley Community Plan Update	The 1993 Goleta Valley Community Plan is under revision to reflect existing conditions. The updated plan will address, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation; • housing; • environmental protection; and • agriculture. 	County	Planning stages
Sources: City of Santa Barbara (September 2008); County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department (September 2008); and UC Santa Barbara (April 2008).				
Notes: Listed projects are those that are approved for construction, or have received building permits, or for which a development application is in process with the approving agency. Totals listed for the UCSB LRDP and Isla Vista Master Plan represent net changes proposed under those respective plans.				

This page intentionally left blank.