CHAPTER 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000, et seq.). An EIR is a public informational document designed to provide decision-makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of a proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid significant effects, and to describe reasonable alternatives to a project that may reduce or avoid significant effects. An EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth-inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

The applicant, Shelby Family Partnership, L.P. (Shelby), requested City of Goleta (City) discretionary approvals to subdivide a 14.38-acre parcel into 64 lots for the development of 60 single-family residences and four open space areas. The 14.38-acre parcel is in western Goleta at 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road (see Figures 2-1 through 2-3 in Chapter 2). If approved, the discretionary actions would result in the creation of 60 single-family dwellings, open space areas, and additional improvements consisting of a community picnic area, an asphalt walking trail, an open turf area, and a children's tot lot. Infrastructure improvements would include a looped internal road system with one cul-de-sac and two intersections with Cathedral Oaks Road; installation of stormwater curb extensions; installation of landscaping; and installation of a 5-foot-wide interior sidewalk throughout the subdivision.

The applicant is also requesting amendments to the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP). A separate Supplemental EIR for the General Plan Amendment (GPA) is being prepared by the City and is incorporated by reference herein. The Supplemental EIR (City EIR No. 12-EIR-003; "Shelby GPA SEIR") was prepared at the same time and in coordination with this project-specific EIR. Decision-makers will consider the Supplemental EIR before taking action on the proposed GPA. Once decision-makers take action on the GPA, a decision on whether to approve the Shelby project can be made. Therefore, for the purposes of this project EIR, it is assumed that decision-makers rendered a decision on the GPA and the land is now designated for residential use in the General Plan. Consequently, the corresponding change to the R-1 (Single Family Residential) zone district would not raise any environmental issues.

This EIR is prepared by the City in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines to evaluate potential environmental impacts resulting from the development and operation of the residential subdivision pursuant to those subdivision and development plan approvals. Under CEQA Guidelines § 15367, the City is the Lead Agency for this EIR. The City will use this EIR when considering the requests that would allow implementation of the project.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP), including an EIR Scoping document, was circulated for review and comment by the public, agencies, and organizations as required under CEQA. The NOP and comments received on the NOP are provided in Appendix A. The NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to officially solicit statewide agency input on the project. A public notice for the NOP was published in the *Santa Barbara News Press* on July 26, 2012 to solicit comments. The public review period for the NOP began on July 23, 2012 and ended on September 6, 2012. A total of 25 comments were

received in response to the NOPs for the Shelby Project EIR and the Shelby GPA SEIR, including 12 unique letters for this Shelby Project EIR. This Draft EIR has taken into consideration all of the comments received in response to the NOP for the Shelby Project EIR, including comments received during a public scoping meeting on August 8, 2012.

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

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

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City will review and prepare written responses to each comment as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. A Final EIR will then be prepared, incorporating all of the comments received, responses to the comments, and the Draft EIR, along with any changes to the EIR that result from the comments received. All responses to comments submitted on the Draft EIR by public agencies will be provided to those agencies at least 10 days prior to final action on the project. In addition, all persons who commented on the Draft EIR will be notified of the availability of the Final EIR and of the date of the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings concerning certification of the Final EIR. If the City Council certifies the Final EIR, the City Council will make the necessary findings required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines regarding the extent and nature of the impacts as presented in the Final EIR.

Public input is encouraged at all public hearings before the City concerning the proposed project.

1.2 STRUCTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

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

Chapter 4, "Environmental Impact Analysis," addresses each of the issues that were identified during or after the scoping period. Section 4.1 addresses issues related to aesthetics. Section 4.2 addresses air quality issues. Section 4.3 addresses biological resources. Section 4.4 addresses cultural resources. Section 4.5 addresses greenhouse gas emissions. Section 4.6 addresses hydrology and water quality issues. Section 4.7 addresses transportation and traffic issues. The impact analysis for each issue area examined in this EIR is presented in seven subsections as described below:

- **Existing Conditions**—This subsection provides information describing the relevant environmental setting as well as the applicable regulatory setting.

- **Regulatory Framework—**This subsection summarizes the regulations, plans, and standards that apply to the proposed project and relate to the specific issue area in question.
- **Thresholds of Significance—**This subsection identifies the thresholds used to assess the significance of project impacts. These are based primarily on applicable CEQA criteria and the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*.
- **Project Impacts and Mitigation—**This subsection describes the nature and extent to which the project would change the existing environment and makes a determination of whether or not these changes would exceed the thresholds of significance.
- **Cumulative Impacts—**This subsection identifies the potential for significant effects to occur as a result of the project in combination with other development anticipated in the vicinity of the project site. Where this potential exists, a determination is made as to whether or not the project's contribution to this impact is cumulatively considerable and therefore significant.
- **Mitigation Measures—**Mitigation measures are identified for each significant project and cumulative impact that would occur as a result of the project. Although not required under CEQA, in some cases mitigation measures are also recommended for impacts that are considered less than significant in order to further reduce such impacts.
- **Residual Impacts—**This subsection identifies the levels of significance for project impacts following the implementation of mitigation measures, specifically identifying significant unavoidable adverse impacts, i.e., impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

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

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project are to:

1. Develop the property into a residential neighborhood for approximately 60 families.
2. Provide a variety of housing sizes.
3. Provide neighborhood amenities including a walking trail, a children's tot lot, and an open turf area.
4. Incorporate green building measures and sustainable site planning into the development's design.

1.4 REQUESTED APPROVALS

The following discretionary City actions are requested by the applicant as part of the approval process for the project:

- A General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the project site from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential, and to remove the project site from the Open Space Plan Map (GP/CLUP Open Space Element Figure 3-5). (Note: This action is addressed separately in the Shelby GPA SEIR.)

- A rezone to change the zoning designation of the project site from AG-II-10 (Agriculture II, 40-acre minimum parcel size) to 7-R-1 (Single Family Residential, 7,000-square-foot minimum lot size).
- A Vesting Tentative Map for the creation of 64 lots.
- A Development Plan for 60 single-family dwellings and four open space areas with private access and public utilities.
- A Zoning Ordinance Amendment to reduce the minimum lot frontage requirement in the Single Family Residential zone district from 65 to 60 feet.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1 summarizes the project's environmental impacts and the measures identified to mitigate these impacts. Impacts are classified as follows:

- Class I: Significant impact that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class II: Significant impacts that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class III: Less-than-significant impacts. Mitigation measures are not required but may be recommended for incorporation into project conditions of approval by the decision maker to minimize adverse but less-than-significant effects that are tied to policy or other regulatory standards or required permit findings.

Impacts in Table 1-1 are identified by their impact classification (Class I, II, or III). Therefore, the same general environmental issue area (e.g., Aesthetics/Visual Resources) may be discussed under more than one impact classification.

The project would result in a **significant and unavoidable** (**Class I**) impact associated with the following environmental issue area:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources (scenic vistas and scenic resources)

The project would result in one or more **potentially significant, but mitigable** (**Class II**) impacts in each of the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources (substantial light and glare)
- Biological Resources (special-status plants and animals, riparian/other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, wildlife movement)
- Cultural Resources (archaeological resources, paleontological resources)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (surface water and groundwater quality, stormwater flows and drainage)
- Transportation and Traffic (Santa Barbara County Association of Governments [SBCAG] Congestion Management Program impacts)

The project would result in one or more **less-than-significant** (**Class III**) impacts in each of the following impact classifications:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources (visual character and quality; obstruction of onsite visual resources; loss of vegetation, open space, or natural character)

- Air Quality (short-term construction emissions impacts, long-term emissions impacts, objectionable odors, exposure to toxic air contaminants)
- Biological Resources (conflicts with policies)
- Greenhouse Gases (construction emissions, operational emissions, consistency with AB 32)
- Transportation and Traffic (traffic, public transit/alternative modes of transportation, cumulative roadway segment impacts, cumulative intersection impacts)

The project would result in **less-than-significant (Class III)** impacts, which did not require further discussion in the EIR, for the following environmental issue areas:

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

Please refer to the NOP Scoping document and its attachments in Appendix A for additional information regarding the Class III impacts identified immediately above.

Table 1-1 summarizes the project's potential environmental impacts as well as EIR mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce these impacts. For a more detailed discussion of project impacts and mitigation measures, please refer to the individual issue area sections of this EIR. As stated above, Table 1-1 categorizes project impacts by impact classification (Class I, II, and III) and then by environmental issue.

TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Proposed Mitigation
CLASS I IMPACTS: Impacts that would be significant and unavoidable	
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	
Impact AES-1: Scenic Vistas and Scenic Resources	MM AES-1. Height Limitations
CLASS II IMPACTS: Impacts that would be potentially significant but can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels	
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	
Impact AES-3: Substantial Light and Glare	MM AES-3a. Exterior Night Lighting Restrictions
Biological Resources	
Impact BIO-1: Special-status Plant/Animal Species	MM BIO-1a. General Biological Resources Protection During Construction MM BIO-1b. Protect Special-status Plant Species MM BIO-1c. Protect Special-status Animals MM BIO-1d. Protect Special-status Reptiles and Amphibians MM BIO-1e. Protect Special-status Birds MM BIO-1f. Protect Bat Species MM BIO-1g. Protect Nesting Birds (including Raptors)
Impact BIO-2: Riparian/Other Sensitive Natural Communities	MM BIO-2a. Protect Riparian Habitat, Wetlands, and Wildlife Movement
Impact BIO-3: Wetlands	MM BIO-3a. General Biological Resources Protection During Construction MM BIO-3b. Protect Riparian Habitat, Wetlands, and Wildlife Movement
Impact BIO-4: Wildlife Movement	MM BIO-4a. Protect Riparian Habitat, Wetlands, and Wildlife Movement
Cultural Resources	
Impact CUL-2: Archaeological Resources	MM CUL-2a. Construction Monitoring MM CUL-2b. Pre-construction Workshop: Cultural Resources MM CUL-2c. Discovery of Human Remains
Impact CUL-3: Paleontological Resources/Geologic Features	MM CUL-3a. Discovery of Paleontological Resources MM CUL-3b. Pre-construction Workshop: Paleontological Resources
Hydrology and Water Quality	
Impact HYD-1: Surface Water and Groundwater Quality	MM HYD-1. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Impact	**Proposed Mitigation**
Impact HYD-2: Stormwater Flows and Discharge	MM HYD-2a. Final Drainage/Stormwater Quality Protection Plan MM HYD-2b. Maintenance Agreement
Transportation and Traffic	
Impact TRA-8: SBCAG Congestion Management Program (CMP) Impacts	MM TRA-8a. Improvements to U.S. Highway 101 / Storke Road Southbound On-Ramp Intersection MM TRA-8b. Contribute Fees to Goleta Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP)
CLASS III IMPACTS: Impacts that would be less than significant	
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	
Impact AES-2: Visual Character and Quality	No mitigation required.
Impact AES-4: Obstruct Onsite Visual Resources	No mitigation required.
Impact AES-5: Loss of Vegetation, Open Space, or Natural Character	No mitigation required.
Air Quality	
Impact AQ-2: Air Quality Impacts	No mitigation required. **Recommended mitigation:** MM AQ-2a. Implement SBCAPCD-required Construction Dust Control Measures MM AQ 2b. Implement SBCAPCD-Recommended Construction Exhaust Control Measures MM AQ 2c. Limit Diesel Emissions
Impact AQ-3: Objectionable Odors	No mitigation required.
Impact AQ-4: Health Risk Assessment Regarding Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants	No mitigation required.
Biological Resources	
Impact BIO-5: Conflicts with Policies	No mitigation required.
Greenhouse Gases	
Impact GHG-1: Generation of Emissions in Excess of Threshold Levels	No mitigation required. **Recommended mitigation:** MM GHG-1a. Implement BAAQMD Best Management Practices for Construction MM GHG-1b. Implement Measures to Reduce Operational GHG Emissions

Impact	**Proposed Mitigation**
Transportation and Traffic	
Impact TRA-1: Long-term Traffic Impacts	No mitigation required.
Impact TRA-3: Public Transit/Alternative Modes of Transportation	No mitigation required.
Impact TRA-4: Access and Circulation	No mitigation required.
Impact TRA-5: Short-term Construction Traffic	No mitigation required. **Recommended mitigation:** MM TRA-5a. Prepare Construction Transportation Plan MM TRA-5b. Distribute the Construction Activity Schedule and Construction Routes
Impact TRA-6: Cumulative Roadway Segment Impacts	No mitigation required.
Impact TRA-7: Cumulative Intersection Impacts	No mitigation required.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

1.6.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

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

In this case, if the project is not approved, the site is expected to remain in its existing condition. The existing setting includes a 2,015-square-foot residence, 726-square-foot garage, and 1,152-square-foot barn. The project site had an avocado orchard until the late 1990s, a remnant of which is evident on the northern third of the lot. The property is currently used in part for the storage of woodchips and firewood. The avocado orchard could be re-established, and other land uses allowed by right under the property's existing zoning of Agriculture-II.

For the purposes of the alternatives analysis, the No Project Alternative would include the largest amount of structural development allowable on the project site by right, which would be a complex of greenhouses totaling 20,000 square feet in floor area (e.g., 10 greenhouses at 2,000 square feet each). Row crops, orchards, or animal grazing would also be allowed over most of the project site.

1.6.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Alternative A—Avoidance of Streamside Protection Area

This alternative would be a project similar to the current project but with all development pulled out of a 100-foot SPA buffer measured from the eastern edge of the riparian corridor of El Encanto Creek.

1.6.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Scale Alternative B—Minimum 65-Foot Lot Frontage

This alternative would be a project similar to the current project but with all lots meeting the minimum lot frontage requirement of the 7-R-1 zone district of 65 feet, and no lots exceeding the subdivision standard maximum lot depth to width ratio of 3:1. The proposed project includes 46 lots that do not meet the 65-foot lot frontage requirement. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the site would be reconfigured to include 48 units, rather than 60, a 20% reduction compared to the proposed project.

1.6.4 Alternative 4: Multi-family Residential Development

This alternative would be a project of 60 multi-family units (such as duplexes, triplexes, or other medium-density residential buildings) on the same project site.

1.6.5 Alternative 5: Girsh/Westen Alternative Site

This alternative would be a project of 60 units located on an approximately 10-acre site in the 7100 block of Hollister Avenue, west of Santa Felicia Drive, in Goleta.

1.7 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 1-2 provides a summary of the relative impacts of each alternative. Alternative 2, the Reduced Scale Alternative A—Avoidance of Streamside Protection Area, is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

TABLE 1-2
COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

	Impact of Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project[1]					
Environmental Effect	**Proposed Project**	**Alt. 1: No Project**	**Alt. 2: Reduced Scale Alternative A**	**Alt. 3: Reduced Scale Alternative B**	**Alt. 4: Multi-family Residential Development**	**Alt. 5: Girsh/Westen Alternative Site**
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	I	I / Less	I / Similar	I / Similar	I / Greater	I / Similar
Biological Resources	II	II / Similar	II / Less	II / Similar	II / Less	II / Similar
Cultural Resources	II	II / Similar	II / Similar	II / Similar	II / Similar	II / Similar
Hydrology and Water Quality	II	II / Similar	II / Less	II / Less	II / Similar	II / Similar
Transportation and Traffic	II	II / Less	II / Less	II / Less	II / Similar	II / Greater
Other impacts	--	--	--	--	Land Use	Hazards (I and II)

[1]**Impact Comparison:**

The first symbol identifies the impact classification (e.g., Class I = significant and unavoidable; Class II = potentially significant, but mitigable to less than significant; Class III = adverse, but less than significant).

Next, there is a comparison to the project even if the classification is the same (e.g., both the proposed project and the alternative result in a Class II impact, but the alternative has "Less," "Similar," or "Greater" of an impact compared to the proposed project).

1.8 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The primary area of controversy are associated with the project's potential to impact include the conversion of previous agricultural land to residential uses (which is addressed in the Shelby GPA SEIR).

1.9 REFERENCE MATERIALS

Chapter 7 contains a complete listing of all technical reports and plans submitted by the project sponsor, as well as maps and documents on file at the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Department that have been used in evaluating the project and are incorporated by reference in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15150. Documents incorporated by reference in this EIR are referenced in the various issue area sections. Reports, documents, and maps are matters of public record and are available for public review at the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Department, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B,

Goleta, phone number (805) 961-7540; or contact Mr. Shine Ling, Associate Planner, at (805) 961-7548 or via email: sling@cityofgoleta.org.

Key documents that are incorporated by reference include the following:

1. Development Application. Map No. 32,045. 7400 Cathedral Oaks. Received February 2, 2011. De Vicente + Mills Architecture.
2. Vesting Tentative Map (05–154–GPA/RZN/TM 32,045). June 2012. Prepared by L & P Consultants.
3. Final Development Plan and Preliminary Grading, Drainage & Improvement Plan for 05-154-GPA/RZN/TM 32045/FDP. January 2011. Prepared by L & P Consultants.
4. Preliminary Landscape Plan. TM 32,045. 7400 Cathedral Oaks Road. November 24, 2010. Katie O'Reilly Rogers, Inc., Landscape Architect.

This page intentionally left blank