Memorandum

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Jamie Goldstein, Deputy Director
Santa Barbara County Redevelopment Agency

DATE: August 9, 2007

RE: **Revisions (RV1) to the Proposed Final EIR for the Isla Vista Master Plan (03-EIR-08): Finding that CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b) applies and that changes to the project made by the Planning Commission during their public hearings on Plan adoption do not require major revisions requiring recirculation of the EIR (07GPA-00000-00002, 07GPA-00000-00005, 07GPA-00000-00006, 07GPA-00000-00007, 07ORD-00000-00005, 07RZN-00000-00005)**

Introduction

An Environmental Impact Report (03-EIR-08) was prepared for the Isla Vista Master Plan (Plan) to assess the potential adverse impacts resulting from new development and other activities associated with Plan implementation and full buildout. There has been a subsequent change to the Plan as a result of Planning Commission direction during their public hearings for Plan adoption, a density incentive program was added including a change in the Land Use designation for a part of the plan area to accommodate the density incentive program. This EIR revision documents and evaluates the modification directed by the Planning Commission for the proposed Final Program EIR (03-EIR-08) cover dated August 21, 2007.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 describes the circumstances under which a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review and the close of the public comment period on the draft EIR, but before EIR certification by the project decision-makers. According to Guidelines Section 15088.5(a), "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment on substantial adverse project impacts or feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.

EIR Revision Findings: It is the finding of the Board of Supervisors that the proposed Final EIR (03-EIR-08), as herein amended by the EIR Revisions analysis contained herein, may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements for the Isla Vista Master Plan and related redevelopment plan amendments, local coastal program amendments, general plan and community plan amendments and zoning map and text amendments. Inclusion of the change directed by the Planning Commission will not result in any new significant environmental impacts, nor will it result in a *substantial increase* in the severity (i.e. change in impact level classification) of any environmental impact beyond the level analyzed in relation to Alternative 6 in the EIR. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b), the proposed revisions described in this document have not been recirculated for additional public comment. The proposed Final EIR for the Isla Vista Master Plan is hereby amended by this revision document, together identified as (03-EIR-08 RV1).

1.0 Background

An EIR (03-EIR-08) was prepared for the Isla Vista Master Plan and related actions. The proposed Final EIR was released on August 21, 2007 and has not yet been certified.

The Planning Commission considered the Isla Vista Master Plan during a series of public hearings in 2007. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of the Isla Vista Master Plan, along with the related general plan and community plan amendments, redevelopment plan amendments and zoning ordinance text and map amendments. The Board of Supervisors is scheduled to consider adoption of the Isla Vista Master Plan and related matters at a public hearing on August 21, 2007.

2.0 Location

The Isla Vista Master Plan covers the unincorporated community known as Isla Vista located 9 miles west of the City of Santa Barbara on the South Coast of Santa Barbara County, California. It is surrounded on three sides by the University of California Santa Barbara. All of the Plan area lies within the State Coastal Zone.

3.0 Changes to the Project

The original Isla Draft Vista Master Plan (Plan) project description (herein called the "Original Proposed Project") is summarized in Section 2.0 of 03-EIR-08 (the "EIR") The final Plan includes the following changes to the project which were incorporated by the Planning Commission into its recommendations to the Board (the "Revised Proposed Project"):

1. Adoption of a density incentive program applicable to one area of the Plan that would encourage developers to build affordable housing, consolidate smaller lots, utilize environmentally friendly design and contribute towards community infrastructure. Developers interested in participating would apply to enter into a development agreement with the County through which they would receive additional density for provision of those benefits. Except for obtaining additional density based on lot size, all of the other density incentives require satisfaction of state density bonus program which is set forth in California Government Code Section 65915. The density received through the density incentive program would be in addition to that received under the state Density Bonus Program.

2. The Land Use designation in the incentive area would be changed and set forth within ranges to allow for the increased density that might be received under the density incentive program as summarized in the table below.

Area	Revised Project Density (u/ac)	Original Proposed Project Density (u/ac)
Res-H	25-55	30
Res-M	25-55	30
Mixed-H	40-65	40
Mixed-PRK	40-65	45
Mixed-M	40-65	40

4.0 Changes in Environmental Effects

Section 6 of the EIR presented and analyzed different alternatives to the Isla Vista Master Plan. Within Section 6, Alternative 6, the Housing Incentive Alternative, analyzed an alternative plan that included, among other things, higher land use designations in 5 areas of the Plan area; Residential High, Residential Medium, Mixed High, Mixed Park, and Mixed Medium. A depiction of these areas is set forth as Figure 6.7-10 of the EIR.

The areas that would be subject to the change in Land Use designation under the Revised Proposed Project are fully contained within the areas identified in Alternative 6 for increases in Land Use Designation density. In addition, in every area the maximum density allowed under the Revised Proposed Project is less than the maximum density allowed under Alternative 6. The zoning associated with the Revised Proposed Project would result in a build out of 1447, the

same as the original Proposed Project. The land use ranges associated with the Revised Proposed Project may allow more development than the land uses in the original Proposed Project, but in no case could build out of the Revised Proposed Project approach the build out of 2867 analyzed in Alternative 6.

The overall maximum density that could be built under the Revised Proposed Project is fewer units than could be built under Alternative 6. In addition, it is very unlikely that the maximum density allowed with by the land use in these areas under the Revised Proposed Project would be built. Reasons why it is unlikely include the following. First, zoning for these areas will not be changed, so projects seeking to build at higher densities must first obtain a Development Agreement. Obtaining a development agreement may not be economically advantageous for many projects given the additional time and expense involved in processing such a development agreement. Some developers may not wish to provide all of the low income units required to participate in this program. Most of the current parcels in the Incentive Area are not currently large enough to obtain density incentive on the basis of parcel size. Since the area is largely built out, to take advantage of this incentive, owners of the few vacant parcels will need to consolidate their properties with neighboring parcels, tear down the existing buildings on the properties and rebuild. It is unlikely that this will take place on a large scale basis.

Since only a portion of the density increase set forth in Alternative 6 is incorporated into the revised project, the overall density of the revised proposed project will be less than the density studied in Alternative 6. The impacts of the revised project, therefore, are within the range of impacts discussed in the EIR. As a result, the potential environmental impacts of the revised project can be understood through reference to the impact discussion of Alternative 6. Although the overall density increase will be less in the revised project than in Alternative 6, the analysis in Alternative 6 provides an upper limit as to what the environmental impacts associated with the increased density of the revision are. As discussed in more detail below, all of the additional mitigation measures set forth in the EIR for Alternative 6 are adopted for the Revised Proposed Project.

4.1 Land Use Population and Housing

The zoning associated with the Revised Proposed Project would result in a build out of 1447 new units, the same as the original Proposed Project. The land use ranges associated with the Revised Proposed Project may allow more development than the land uses in the original Proposed Project, but in no case could build out of the Revised Proposed Project approach the Alternative 6 build out of 2867 new housing units or the projected population increase of 8629.

Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels: The impact of the full building projected population increase of the Revised Proposed Project is less than that of Alternative 6. Alternative 6 did result in an improvement in the county's jobs/housing balance by bringing more housing to the "jobs heavy" South Coast. The Revised Proposed Project will have a smaller beneficial impact on the jobs/housing balance. The cumulative impacts associated with the increased population in the original project were identified as a Class 1 impact under both the Original Proposed Project and Alternative 6. Because the projected population growth associated with the Revised

Proposed Project is less than that of Alternative 6 there will not be a substantial increase in the severity of this environmental impact of the Revised Proposed Project as compared with Alternative 6.

4.2 Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: The original proposed project included a 35' height limit in the residential areas, and 40' in the downtown. Those height limits are increased up to 60' in some locations in the Alternative 6 analysis. The Revised Proposed Project does not include a change in the height limits allowed in the zoning ordinance as compared to the original proposed project; however it is foreseeable that some individual density incentive projects may exceed the applicable height limits through the use of development agreements.

The impact of some 4-story development (up to 50') would have a similar, but reduced impact as compared to the impacts discussed in the Aesthetics and Visual Resources section of Alternative 6. That section includes analysis of 4-story development in most Alternative 6 areas, as well as some 5-story development along El Colegio and the north side of Pardall Rd. Those areas analyzed in Alternative 6 are the same areas where the Incentive Program in the revised proposed project is suggested. The additional mitigation measures set forth on Alternative 6, Aesthetic and Visual Resources are hereby adopted for the Revised Proposed Project. Even with this mitigation measure however, the new impact remains significant and adverse (Class 1).

4.3 Agricultural Resources

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: There were no impacts to agricultural resources identified for the original proposed project or Alternative 6 due to lack of agricultural operations in the plan area. This remains unchanged for the Revised Proposed Project.

4.4 Air Quality

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: Construction related air emissions would be greater in the Revised Proposed Project as would increased air quality impacts related to increased population and vehicle trips. Table 6.7-2 of the EIR summarizes the air quality impacts of Alternative 6 assuming the implementation of the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. The total operational emissions associated with Alternative 6 total 236.9 lbs/day ROG, 73.6 lbs/day NOx, and 287 lbs/day of PM10.

As the revised proposed project requires developers to assemble sites and construct affordable housing in order to participate in the program, and since the area is generally already built out, it is anticipated that not every site will be increased to the maximum density allowed by the land use in the revised proposed project. Nevertheless, even if every site participated in proposed incentive program to the maximum extent allowed, the air quality impacts associated with the Revised Proposed Project would be no greater than those set forth in this summary and analyzed in relation to Alternative 6.

4.5 Biological Resources

Effect of Change on Impact Levels: As identified in the EIR Alternative 6, additional residential population would intensify human and pet visitation at the two protected ESH vernal pool habitats in the northwestern Plan area. However, as the Revised Proposed Project does not change the actual zoning, and participation in the Incentive Program is entirely voluntary, the impacts associated with the Revised Proposed Project will be less than those analyzed in Alt. 6.

In addition, for the reasons set forth in the Biological Resources section of the Alternative 6 analysis in the EIR, the possible increase in structural height associated with the Revised Proposed Project would not increase the risk of disruption to potential raptor roosting in the plan area.

The existing mitigation measures proposed (BIO -1, BIO 1.3) in addition to the IVRPD existing management strategies would ensure that potential biological impacts remain adverse but less than significant and they would be less than those associated with Alternative 6.

4.6 Cultural/Historic Resources

An increase in density and structural height within that portion of the Project Area eligible for the density incentive program will not affect the number of structures that can be developed or increase the amount of land likely to be disturbed. The existing planning area is generally already currently developed, or was developed at one time in the past.

Overall, adverse impacts on cultural and historic resources under the Revised Proposed Project would be similar to those of the both the Original Proposed Project and Alternative 6.

4.7 Geological Hazard

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: The new land use density associated with the Revised Proposed Project slightly increases impacts to geology and geologic hazards because additional development could increase the risk from soil hazards. However there would not be a substantial increase as compared to that of the Original Proposed Project and will be less than that of Alternative 6. This impact would continue to be less than significant.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: Since the addition of the density incentive program and land use designation change do not increase the area of development, the impacts from the Revised Proposed Project are similar as those analyzed for the original proposed project and Alternative 6.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: Although the Revised Proposed Project does not include a change in the zoning ordinance related to set backs and lot coverage requirements, it is foreseeable that individual density incentive projects may exceed otherwise applicable set back requirements through the use of development agreements. However, as the set backs associated with the original proposed project were set at zero feet in the downtown, 5'in the north part of the Incentive Area, and 15' in areas surrounding the downtown (zoned MRD 28 in the original proposed project, it is not anticipated that the revised proposed project will result in increased lot covered as compared to the original proposed project.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measures from the proposed project including but not limited to the requirements for best management practices (BMPs) these impacts will not be substantially increased beyond those analyzed for the Original Proposed Project and Alternative 6.

4.10 Noise

Effect of Revision on Impact Levels: The Revised Proposed Project will result in slightly more construction related impacts than under the original proposed project because more properties may be redeveloped and they may redeveloped at a higher density. However, because individual projects will be required to obtain a Development Agreement prior to building at densities higher than the original proposed project, it is not anticipated the change increased noise levels will be substantial.

Because of the potential for increased density, ambient noise levels and traffic related noise may be higher as compared to the original proposed project. However, with the implementation of the noise mitigation measures, these increases will not be substantially greater than the Original Proposed Project and will be less than those associated with Alternative 6.

4.11 Parks, Open Space and Recreation

Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels: The projected population increase of 8629 analyzed in Alternative 6 is greater than the potential population increase could be under the Revised Proposed Project. In addition, increased demand for recreational facilities under the Revised Proposed Project would be met by the construction of the additional facilities identified in the Plan and through the implementation of mitigation measures. As a result, impacts to Parks, Open Space and Recreation will be less than those associated with Alternative 6.

4.11 Public Services and Utilities

Effect of Revisions on Impact Levels.
The increased population associated with the Revised Proposed Project will create an increase in demand for public services. As impacts to Police services, schools, and water resources would not exceed levels of significance in Alternative 6, they would not exceed the thresholds for the revised proposed project. However, as with the Original Proposed Project, significant impacts to

fire protection, wastewater and sewage, and solid waste is anticipated but would be reduced as compared to the level of impact for Alternative 6.

The Goleta Water District conducted a Water Supply Assessment for Alternative 6. That Assessment is summarized on Table 6.7-2(a) of the EIR. The Assessment concluded that there were available water supplies to meet the increased demand associated with buildout of Alternative 6. Since Alternative 6 included greater density increase than that of the Revised Proposed Project, the Goleta Water District Water Supply Assessment demonstrates that sufficient water supplies exist to serve the increased population associated with the Revised Proposed Project.

4.13 Traffic and Circulation

Effect of Revisions on Impact Levels: The Traffic and Circulation analysis for Alternative 6 (EIR Section 6.7) describes the impacts to traffic and circulation resulting from implementation of Alternative 6. Since Alternative 6 is a higher density alternative than that of the Revised Proposed Project, the analysis and conclusions of that section can be used to determine the worst-case traffic and circulation impacts of the Revised Proposed Project.

Alternative 6 identified various traffic mitigation measures to mitigate additional impacts associated with the increased development of Alternative 6. The additional mitigation measures identified in the Traffic and Circulation analysis discussion of the Alternative 6 analysis are hereby adopted as additional mitigation measures for the proposed project.

As discussed in more detail in the Section 6.7 of the EIR the intersections with significant residual impacts after implementation of mitigation measures are as follows:

1. Hwy 101 SB Ramps/Los Carneros Road. Significant and adverse (Class 1)
2. Storke Road/Hollister Avenue. Significant and adverse (Class 1)
3. Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue. Significant and adverse (Class 1)
4. Mesa Road/Los Carneros Road. Significant and adverse (Class 1)
5. El Colegio Road Intersections. Significant and adverse (Class 1)

5.0 Minor Text Changes and Clarifications to Original Project Description

Various other minor text edits and clarifications to the Draft Isla Vista Master Plan and the 03-EIR-08 clarifications were made, none of which have any effects on the conclusions of 03-EIR-08 regarding the potential adverse or beneficial environmental effects of the Plan. A description of all minor texts edit that were made to the draft IVMP are set forth in a memorandum dated April 5, 2007 from Lisa Brownfield to Jamie Goldstein. Changes to the Draft EIR are described in the EIR errata.

6.0 Revised Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the EIR is hereby amended to include the additional mitigation measures identified for Alternative 6 in section 6.0 of the EIR. The purpose of these amendments are to include the additional mitigation measures associated with Alternative 6.

Impact CIRC-Alt 6-1.1: Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue. The Baseline volumes (41,625 ADT) and Baseline + Alternative 6 volumes (42,400 ADT) on the 4-lane segment of Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue exceed the acceptable capacity standard (34,000 ADT). Alternative 6 would add 775 ADT to the 4-lane segment, increasing the volumes by about 1.8%. This addition would exceed the County's roadway impact threshold and is considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure CIRC-Alt 6-1.1.1: The City of Goleta GTIP includes an improvement for which involves adding a third eastbound left-turn lane at the Storke Road/Hollister Avenue intersection. The City of Goleta GTIP improvement would also require adding a third lane on Storke Road northbound from Hollister Avenue to the HWY 101 southbound ramp intersection. There are currently two northbound lanes on Storke Road and the third lane would be required to accept the traffic from the three eastbound left-turn lanes on Hollister Avenue. Implementation of the third left-turn lane would also require widening of Hollister Avenue adjacent to the Camino Real Marketplace site, which may require additional right-of-way from adjacent properties.

Residual Impact: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CIRC-Alt 6-1.1.1 will reduce impacts to *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II*). At the time this document was published it was assumed that the GTIP improvement would be completed by the City. Given this project is not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that they will be completed. In the event the widening is not completed, this impact will not be mitigated. Therefore this impact remains a significant, adverse impact (Class I).

Impact CIRC-Alt 6-2: Intersection Impacts
Levels of service were calculated for the study-area intersections assuming the Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour traffic forecasts illustrated on Figure 6.7-16. Table 6.7-8 shows the Baseline and Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour levels of service for the study-area intersections and identifies the significance of the IVMP's traffic additions based on County and City thresholds.

Table 6.7-8
Baseline + Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Baseline V/C or Delay / LOS	Baseline + Alt. 6 V/C or Delay / LOS	V/C Increase or Trips
HWY 101 NB Ramps/Los Carneros Road	0.59/LOS A	0.66/LOS B	228 PHT
HWY 101 SB Ramps/Los Carneros Road	**0.92/LOS E**	**0.97/LOS E**	**311 PHT**
Hollister Avenue/Storke Road	**0.96/LOS E**	**0.96/LOS E**	**71 PHT**
Hollister Avenue/Los Carneros Road	0.73/LOS C	**0.83/LOS D**	**444 PHT**
Mesa Road/Los Carneros Road	**0.88/LOS D**	**1.06/LOS F**	**444 PHT**
Storke Road/El Colegio Road	0.47/LOS A	0.51/LOS A	0.042
El Colegio Road/Camino Corto	0.54/LOS A	0.60/LOS A	0.056
El Colegio Road/Camino Del Sur[a]	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**326 PHT**
El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road	**1.27/LOS F**	**1.48/LOS F**	**638 PHT**
El Colegio Road/Camino Pescadero[a]	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**618 PHT**
El Colegio Road/Embarcadero Del Mar	**0.97/LOS E**	**1.23/LOS F**	**607 PHT**
El Colegio Road/Embarcadero Del Norte[a]	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**564 PHT**
El Colegio Road/Stadium Road	0.63/LOS B	**0.89/LOS D**	**431 PHT**
Abrego Road/Camino Corto[a]	10.4 sec./LOS B	11.0 sec./LOS B	52 PHT
Abrego Road/Camino Pescadero[a]	12.6 sec./LOS B	15.3 sec./LOS B	188 PHT
Pardall Road/Embarcadero Del Mar[a]	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**381 PHT**
Pardall Road/Embarcadero Del Norte[a]	**22.1 sec./LOS C**	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**	**285 PHT**
Sabado Tarde Road/Camino Pescadero[a]	10.8 sec./LOS B	11.4 sec./LOS B	55 PHT
El Embarcadero/Embarcadero Del Mar-Norte[a]	9.4 sec./LOS A	9.7 sec./LOS A	46 PHT

a Unsignalized LOS based on average delay per vehicle.
Bold indicates locations where IVMP traffic additions exceed the City/County project-specific traffic impact thresholds.

Table 6.7-8 shows that the PM peak hour traffic generated by Alternative 6 would exceed the City/County/UCSB project-specific traffic impact thresholds. Impacts to the following locations are considered *potentially significant*:

- HWY 101 SB Ramps/Los Carneros Road (City)
- Storke Road/Hollister Avenue (City)
- Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue (City)
- Los Carneros Road/Mesa Road (County)
- El Colegio Road/Camino Del Sur (County)
- El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road (County)
- El Colegio Road/Camino Pescadero (County)
- El Colegio Road/Embarcadero Del Mar (County)
- El Colegio Road/Embarcadero Del Norte (County)
- El Colegio Road/Stadium Road (UCSB)
- Pardall Road/Embarcadero Del Mar (County)
- Pardall Road/Embarcadero Del Norte (County)

Hollister Avenue/Los Carneros Road: This intersection would operate at LOS D under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. Alternative 6 would add 444 PM peak hour trips to this location, exceeding the LOS D threshold of 15 trips.

The County GTIP includes a project that would provide dual westbound left-turn lanes at the intersection. The County GTIP improvement would provide for LOS C (V/C 0.73) operations under Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour conditions. The IVMP would participate in the funding of the improvement via the payment of City of Goleta GTIP traffic fees.

Mesa Road/Los Carneros Road: This intersection would operate at LOS F under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. Alternative 6 would add 444 PM peak hour trips to this location, exceeding the LOS F threshold of 5 trips. The County GTIP includes a project that would provide additional lanes on each of the intersection approaches. However, the County GTIP improvements would not provide LOS C operations. The following geometry, identified in Table 6.7-9 would provide LOS B operations at the intersection with Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour volumes.

Table 6.7-9
Los Carneros Road/Mesa Road
Geometry Required to Provide County Standard LOS

NB Approach	SB Approach	EB Approach	WB Approach
L T TR	L T TR	L TR	L TR

Table 6.7-10 shows the intersection levels of service with this improvement.

Table 6.7-10

Baseline + Alternative 6 Mitigated Intersection Levels of Service - Los Carneros Road/Mesa Road

Intersection	Baseline + Alt. 6		Baseline + Alt. 6 Mitigated	
	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Los Carneros Rd./Mesa Rd.	1.06	LOS F	0.68	LOS B

El Colegio Road Intersections: El Colegio Road intersections are located on both County and UCSB property as described below.

- Camino Del Sur – County
- Los Carneros Road – County
- Camino Pescadero – County
- Embarcadero Del Mar – County
- Embarcadero Del Norte – County
- Stadium Road – UCSB

The El Colegio Road intersections at Camino Del Sur, Los Carneros Road, Camino Pescadero, Embarcadero Del Mar and Embarcadero Del Norte are forecast to operate at LOS F with Baseline + Alternative 6 volumes.

As discussed in Section 3.13.4 of the EIR, two improvement options have been developed to accommodate future traffic volumes on El Colegio Road. One option is to install roundabouts at all of the intersections on El Colegio Road between Camino Del Sur and Stadium Road. Table 6.7-11 shows the Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour levels of service with the roundabout option for the El Colegio Road intersections between Camino Del Sur and Stadium Road. Levels of service were calculated for these roundabout intersections using the aaSidra software program.

Table 6.7-11
Baseline + Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour Levels of Service - Roundabout Option

Intersection	Baseline + Alt. 6 No Improvements	Baseline + Alt. 6 With Roundabout Option
Camino Del Sur/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	10.2 sec./LOS B
Los Carneros Rd./El Colegio Rd.	1.39/LOS F	**102.1 sec./LOS F**
Camino Pescadero/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	**67.9 sec./LOS E**
Embarcadero Del Mar/El Colegio Rd.	1.11/LOS F	**97.9 sec./LOS F**
Embarcadero Del Norte/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	21.5 sec./LOS C
Stadium Rd./El Colegio Rd.	0.82/LOS D	5.8 sec./LOS A

Table 3.13-10 shows that the El Colegio Road intersections at Los Carneros Road, Camino Pescadero and Embarcadero Del Mar are forecast to operate at LOS E-F with the roundabout option and would not be consistent with the policies outlined in the County's Circulation Element.

County staff has indicated that they intend to seek an amendment to the County Circulation Element to allow for LOS D as acceptable operations at the Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road intersection. Assuming that LOS D is an acceptable LOS at the intersection, an additional analysis was completed to determine how much Alternative 6 could be built out before the El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road intersection would operate at LOS E. Assuming no other improvements, approximately 10% of Alternative 6 could be developed before LOS E is attained at the El Colegio Road /Los Carneros Road roundabout intersection. Table 6.7-12 shows the LOS at the roundabout intersection of El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road with the Baseline + 10% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM peak hour volumes.

Table 6.7-12
Baseline + 10% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour LOS – Roundabout Option

Intersection	Baseline With Roundabout Option	Baseline + 10% Alt. 6 With Roundabout Option
Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road	44.1 sec./LOS D	54.9 sec./LOS D

With the Phelps Road extension in place, approximately 50% of Alternative 6 could be developed before LOS E is attained at the El Colegio Road /Los Carneros Road roundabout intersection. Table 6.7-13 shows the LOS at the roundabout intersection of El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road with the Baseline + 50% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM peak hour volumes.

Table 6.7-13
Baseline + 50% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour LOS – Roundabout Option - With Phelps Road Extension

Intersection	Baseline With Roundabout Option	Baseline + 50% Alt. 6 With Roundabout Option
Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road	20.1 sec./LOS C	44.2 sec./LOS D

An additional analysis was completed assuming an east-west Isla Vista roadway connection to Ocean Road south of Pardall Road using the Goleta traffic model. This connection would divert some of the east-west through traffic on El Colegio Road to the new roadway connection. Assuming the roundabouts on El Colegio Road and a connection to Ocean Road from Isla Vista, it was found that approximately 20% of the IVMP could be built out before LOS E operations would be experienced at the El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road intersection. Table 6.7-14 shows the LOS with the Ocean Road connection and 20% build-out of Alternative 6.

Table 6.7-14
Baseline + 20% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour LOS –
Roundabout Option with Isla Vista Road Connection to Ocean Road

Intersection	Baseline + 20% IVMP With Roundabout Option
Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road	44.2 sec./LOS D

A final analysis was completed assuming the roundabouts on El Colegio Road, completion of the Phelps Road extension, and a connection to Ocean Road from Isla Vista, it was found that approximately 55% of Alternative 6 could be built out before LOS E operations would be experienced at the El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road intersection. Table 6.7-15 shows the LOS with the Ocean Road connection and 55% build-out of Alternative 6.

Table 6.7-15
Baseline + 55% Build-out of Alternative 6 PM Peak Hour LOS –
Roundabout Option With Phelps Rd. Extension &
Isla Vista Rd. Connection to Ocean Rd.

Intersection	Baseline + 55% of Alt. 6 With Roundabout Option
Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road	54.3 sec./LOS D

Table 6.7-16 shows the Baseline + Alternative 6 PM peak hour levels of service with the four-lane option for the El Colegio Road intersections between Camino Del Sur and Stadium Road. The analysis assumes installation of traffic signal control on El Colegio Road at Camino Pescadero and Embarcadero Del Norte. The analysis also assumes dual southbound left-turn lanes at the El Colegio Road/Los Carneros Road intersection.

Table 6.7-16
Baseline + IVMP PM Peak Hour Levels of Service - Four-Lane El Colegio Road Option

Intersection	Baseline + IVMP No Improvements	Baseline + IVMP With Four-Lane Option
Camino Del Sur/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	**>50.0 sec./LOS F**
Los Carneros Rd./El Colegio Rd.	1.39/LOS F	**0.94/LOS E[a]**
Camino Pescadero/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	**0.81/LOS D[b]**
Embarcadero Del Mar/El Colegio Rd.	1.11/LOS F	**0.85/LOS D**
Embarcadero Del Norte/El Colegio Rd.	>50.0 sec./LOS F	0.79/LOS C[b]
Stadium Rd./El Colegio Rd.	0.82/LOS D	0.63/LOS B

[a] Assumes installation of dual southbound left-turn lanes.
[b] Assumes installation of traffic signal control.

Table 6.7-16 shows that the El Colegio Road intersections at Los Carneros Road, Camino Pescadero and Embarcadero Del Mar are forecast to operate at LOS D-E with the 4-lane El Colegio Road option and would not be consistent with the policies outlined in the County's Circulation Element. Additional improvements would be required. These are discussed below.

Camino Del Sur/El Colegio Road: The intersection would operate at LOS F with the 4-lane improvement under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. The provision of a traffic signal would provide LOS B (V/C 0.69) operations and would fully mitigate the Alternative 6 impact at this location.

Los Carneros Road/El Colegio Road: The intersection would operate at LOS E with the 4-lane improvement under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. Provision of dual eastbound left-turn lanes would provide LOS C (V/C 0.79) operations and would fully mitigate the Alternative 6 impact at this location. This improvement would require widening Los Carneros Road north of El Colegio Road to provide two receiving lanes for the eastbound left-turns.

Camino Pescadero/El Colegio Road: The intersection would operate at LOS D with the 4-lane improvement under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. Provision of a separate eastbound right-turn lane would provide LOS B (V/C 0.69) operations and would fully mitigate the Alternative 6 impact at this location.

Embarcadero Del Mar/El Colegio Road: The intersection would operate at LOS D with the 4-lane improvement under Baseline + Alternative 6 conditions. Provision of a separate eastbound right-turn lane would provide LOS C (V/C 0.72) operations and would fully mitigate the Alternative 6 impact at this location.

Pardall Road intersections at Embarcadero Del Mar and Embarcadero Del Norte: These intersections are forecast to operate at LOS F with Baseline + Alternative 6 volumes. The IVMP includes a project to construct roundabouts at these locations. The roundabouts would measure 35 feet in diameter and would include splitter islands on each approach to divert traffic around the roundabout. Construction of roundabouts at these intersections would improve the Baseline + Alternative 6 levels of service to LOS C or better. Additional discussion regarding these improvements is contained in the Catalyst Projects/Pardall Road Improvements section.

Residual Impact: Implementation of the mitigation measures listed above minimizes impacts at the majority of identified intersections. Individual intersection impacts are listed below:

HWY 101 SB Ramps/Los Carneros Road: Implementation of the identified mitigation measure will reduce impacts to *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* At the time this document was published it was assumed that this project would be completed by the respective agency stated above. Given these projects are not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that they will be completed. In the event this project is not completed, the impact will not be mitigated. Therefore this impact remains a significant, adverse impact (Class I).

Storke Road/Hollister Avenue: Implementation of one of the identified mitigation measures will reduce impacts to *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* At the time this document was

published it was assumed that this project would be completed by the respective agency stated above. Given this project is not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that it will be completed. In the event this project is not completed, the impact will not be mitigated. Therefore this impact remains a significant, adverse impact (*Class I*).

Los Carneros Road/Hollister Avenue: Implementation of the identified mitigation measure will reduce impacts to *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* At the time this document was published it was assumed that this project would be completed by the respective agency stated above. Given this project is not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that it will be completed. In the event this project is not completed, the impact will not be mitigated. Therefore this impact remains a *significant, adverse impact (Class I).*

Mesa Road/Los Carneros Road: Implementation of the County GTIP improvements would not provide LOS C operations. However, implementation of the recommended roadway geometry and design would provide acceptable LOS. Impacts are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* Projects identified in the IVMP would be required to pay a County GTIP development fee to help fund construction of local roadway improvements. However, the payment of these fees does not guarantee the above roadway improvement would be completed prior to the identified impact occurring. Therefore this impact remains a *significant, adverse impact (Class I).*

El Colegio Road Intersections: With implementation of the roundabout option, the El Colegio Road intersections at Los Carneros Road (LOS F), Camino Pescadero (LOS E) and Embarcadero Del Mar (LOS F) would operate below the County's LOS standard and would be inconsistent with the existing County Circulation Element. Completion of the Phelps Road extension would fully mitigate the project impacts at Camino Pescadero and Embarcadero Del Mar and the Los Carneros Road intersection would operate at LOS D. An amendment to the County's Circulation Element would be required.

Implementation of the 4-lane El Colegio Road improvement would not provide LOS C operations at the El Colegio intersections with Los Carneros Road, Camino Pescadero and Embarcadero Del Mar. However, implementation of the 4-lane improvement and the recommended roadway geometry and design cited above would provide acceptable LOS at these locations. Impacts are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* Projects identified in the IVMP will be required to pay a development fee to the County GTIP to help fund construction of local roadway improvements. However, the payment of these fees does not guarantee the above roadway improvement will be completed prior to the identified impact occurring. Further, as portions of the proposed mitigation project are not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that they will be completed. Therefore this impact remains a *significant, adverse impact (Class I).*

Cumulative Impacts

The pending and approved projects identified in Chapter 3, will result in cumulative impacts to traffic and circulation. Together, these cumulative projects will ultimately generate 3,351,485 sf of commercial and industrial development and 3,313 new residential units throughout the Goleta Valley, UCSB and Isla Vista area. This will result in a cumulatively significant increase in potential traffic and circulation impacts.

The Baseline analysis outlined above includes all of the reasonably foreseeable future development within the Isla Vista-Goleta area. This analysis applies the City's and County's project-specific traffic impact thresholds to the IVMP, which are more stringent than the cumulative impact thresholds. Given that the Baseline traffic forecasts include trips generated by approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable projects and the application of the more stringent project-specific impact thresholds, all potential cumulative impacts have been addressed within the Baseline and Baseline + IVMP scenarios.

Implementation of mitigation measures identified in this section would reduce impacts to significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II). Projects identified in the IVMP would be required to pay a County GTIP development fee to help fund construction of local roadway improvements. However, the payment of these fees does not guarantee the above roadway improvement would be completed prior to the identified impact occurring. Further, as a number of the proposed mitigation projects are not within County jurisdiction, the County cannot guarantee that they will be completed.

Alternative 6 will contribute a significant amount of this cumulative growth to the area (2,867 housing units and 51,485 sf of commercial development). As a result, the Alternative 6 cumulative traffic and circulation impacts are *significant and unavoidable (Class I).*