

ATTACHMENT A

Findings for Approval County of Santa Barbara Energy and Climate Action Plan

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

1.1 FINDINGS PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081 AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15090 AND 15091:

1.1.1 CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Final Environmental Impact Report (14EIR-00000-00003) was presented to the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Supervisors considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report (14EIR-00000-00003) and its appendices prior to approving the project. In addition, all voting members of the Board of Supervisors have reviewed and considered testimony and additional information presented at or prior to public hearing on _____, 2014. The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of Supervisors and is adequate for this project.

1.1.2 FULL DISCLOSURE

The Board of Supervisors finds and certifies that the Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00003) constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate, and good faith effort at full disclosure under CEQA. The Board of Supervisors further finds and certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.

1.1.3 LOCATION OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Clerk of the Board located at 105 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101.

1.1.4 FINDINGS THAT IMPACTS ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

All subject areas identified in the Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00003) were considered to cause adverse impacts that are not found to be significant to the environment (Class III). Therefore, there are no alterations or feasible changes required for these impacts.

Land Use

The project does not propose to change existing land use designations or zoning and anticipates that land uses will be consistent with the designations established by the Comprehensive Plan Coastal Land use Plan and Land Use Element. Approval of the proposed Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) would establish conformance between the ECAP and the Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

Any future construction implementing ECAP measures and actions that involve roadway improvements would remain subject to County roadway design standards, such as sight distance requirements and curb-to-curb separation distances. Likewise, implementation of the ECAP's

measures and actions regarding bicycle facility improvements would be in accordance with the County's Bicycle Master Plan, which specifies design standards for bicycle facilities based on standards established by Caltrans, the Institute of Traffic Engineers, the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Aesthetics

The ECAP does not propose to change existing land use designations or zoning and anticipates that land uses will be consistent with the designations established by the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan. Nevertheless, some physical changes could be facilitated by the proposed ECAP that promote installation of utility-scale renewable energy generators. However, individual projects would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, subject to project-specific environmental review consistent with the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and zoning ordinances, and would have to be found consistent with state law and County policies and standard conditions of approval. Future project characteristics and locations are unknown and any impact analysis and conclusion on level of significance would be speculative at this time for such project-specific impacts.

Agricultural Resources

Implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies and the County zoning ordinances, as well as continued adherence to the California Coastal Act, would address agricultural impacts. Furthermore, the ECAP contains measures to benefit agriculture. In addition, while the loss of agricultural lands from the construction of renewable energy generating facilities could be substantial, such facilities are already allowed on agricultural lands under the existing regulatory environment. Thus, agricultural impacts associated with the proposed ECAP would be adverse, but less than significant, as the ECAP only promotes utility-scale renewable energy generation and does not propose to fund, entitle, or approve any specific energy generating facility projects.

Biological Resources

Implementation of future ECAP measures would be required to comply with the environmental reporting requirements of CEQA following submittal of a specific development proposal, including the need to evaluate potential biological impacts for both short- and long-term impacts in the form of site-specific biological studies on a case-by-case basis consistent with the County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and zoning ordinances. Individual projects would also have to be consistent with state law and County policies and standard conditions of approval. Therefore, impacts on wetlands and riparian habitat would be adverse, but less than significant.

Noise

At the time of specific project-level environmental review, implementation of certain ECAP measures, in combination with other future development in the region, has the potential to temporarily increase noise levels due to construction activities and permanently increase noise levels due to more developed circulation systems. It is anticipated that potential impacts would be addressed on a case-by-case project level basis through compliance with County Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance policy provisions.

Air Quality

The ECAP is intended to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated in the unincorporated county to contribute to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change by, among other things, promoting the use of fuel-efficient and alternatively fueled vehicles, promoting water conservation, and reducing waste generation. In addition to reducing GHG emissions, each of these measures would help to reduce criteria air pollutants.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed ECAP would not conflict with the goals of AB 32 or the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The effects of climate change could result in the exposure of unincorporated Santa Barbara County to associated environmental effects. While the exact extent of the environmental effects of climate change on the unincorporated county is not known at this time, state provision, in addition to existing County Comprehensive Plan policy provisions, address these effects.

1.1.5 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00003) prepared for the project evaluated a No Project Alternative, Alternative 2: 20% or More GHG Reduction Alternative (Includes Required Measures, Community Choice Aggregation, and Sustainable Communities Strategy), and Alternative 3: Modification of Measures BE 2 (Energy-Efficient Renovations) and BE 4 Energy Scoring and Audits) as methods of reducing or eliminating potentially significant environmental impacts. The Board of Supervisors finds that the alternatives are infeasible for the reasons stated:

A. No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes the ECAP and corresponding amendment to the Energy Element of the County of Santa Barbara's Comprehensive Plan would not be adopted and fails to achieve the basic objectives of the project. The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the ECAP: Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, and Noise.

The No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The No Project Alternative would not achieve the ECAP's beneficial impacts on air quality related, in part, to the ECAP's reduction in vehicle miles traveled, energy conservation programs, and support for renewable energy sources. Additionally, it would not establish GHG reduction measures, thus, it would not reduce the amount of GHG emission generated in the county. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors finds the ECAP revised project description (Alternative 3) is preferable to the No Project Alternative.

B. Alternative 2: 20% or More GHG Reduction Alternative (Includes Required Measures, Community Choice Aggregation, and Sustainable Communities Strategy)

Alternative 2 targets a 20 percent or more reduction in GHG emissions from the baseline year by 2020. This option includes all the GHG reduction measures and actions of the proposed ECAP and further strengthens the implementation actions related to the following measures: BE2 – Energy-Efficient Renovations, BE4 – Energy Scoring and Audits, WR1 – Waste Reduction, WR2 – Increased Recycling Opportunities, and WR3 –Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling.

BE 2 would be altered to implement an energy conservation ordinance requiring all residential and nonresidential properties to complete an energy audit and retrofit to reduce energy use by 30% or verify their participation and savings in other energy conservation programs by 2020.

BE 4 would be altered to require all residential properties provide an energy audit at the time of sale. Secondly, all residential property owners would be required to implement recommended energy efficiency measures provided by the energy audit or similar program. Lastly, all nonresidential properties would be required to provide buyers or tenants with the previous year's energy use documented through EnergyStar Portfolio Manager.

WR 1, WR 2, and WR 3 would be altered to establish net zero waste goals. Alternative 2 has all the same impacts to resources as the proposed ECAP but would have slightly greater beneficial impacts related to GHG emissions.

Alternative 2 would achieve the ECAP's beneficial impacts on air quality related, in part, to the ECAP's reduction in waste reduction, energy conservation programs, and support for renewable energy sources. It would establish GHG reduction measures and would, therefore, achieve the project objectives.

C. Alternative 3: Modification of Measures BE 2 (Energy-Efficient Renovations) and BE 4 Energy Scoring and Audits)

Alternative 3 consists of implementing the same ECAP as the proposed project, with revisions to the implementation actions of BE2 – Energy-Efficient Renovations and BE4 – Energy Scoring and Audits.

BE 2 would be altered to require energy audits for all building permits valued greater than \$15,000 and offer expedited building permit plan check for implementing audit recommendations, and consider providing rebates for completing the audit or waiver of building permit fees if upgrades were completed. In comparison, the proposed ECAP requires such audits valued at greater than \$10,000.

BE 4 would be altered to require residential property owners to complete energy audits at time of building sale. In comparison, the proposed ECAP requires a prescribed set of energy upgrades to be undertaken at the time of building sale or within one year from close of escrow.

Alternative 3 would decrease the estimated GHG savings, reducing the overall effectiveness of the ECAP by an estimated 3,900 MTCO_{2e} per year. However, the ECAP and proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan's Energy Element would commit the County to meeting a 15% reduction. The County will be conducting regular monitoring of community emissions and the implementation of reduction measures. If the County determines that emissions are not being reduced as anticipated, the implementation and monitoring protocols in the ECAP will require County staff and decision makers to develop additional reduction measures and to increase implementation of existing strategies to meet the 15% reduction target. For example, the ECAP estimates the benefit to the County of the achievement of the state's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). Established in 2002 under Senate Bill 1078, accelerated in 2006 under Senate Bill 107 and expanded in 2011 under Senate Bill 2, California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice

aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33% of total procurement by 2020. Santa Barbara County is served by two investor owned utilities, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE). The analysis in the ECAP relied on reporting documents from the utilities that presented current and projected progress toward the target at the time of preparation of the inventory and forecast. Based on the reports and consistent with the conservative approach to calculations in the ECAP, the ECAP assumed that PG&E and SCE would increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 28% of total procurement by 2020 rather than 33%. Based on current reporting by the utilities, the California Public Utilities Commission, and the California Energy Commission, PG&E and SCE appear to be on track achieve the 33% target by 2020. The progress of PG&E and SCE will be factored into the annual reporting and monitoring of the ECAP and would bring the County closer to meeting the 15% reduction target than assumed in the current ECAP.

Thus, this alternative would also result in a less than significant GHG emission impact similar to the proposed project. Alternative 3 would achieve the ECAP's beneficial impacts on air quality related, in part, to the ECAP's energy conservation programs and support for renewable energy sources.

The Board of Supervisors finds Alternative 3 to be the preferred alternative which meets the project objectives and provides flexibility for implementing emission reductions measures (ERMS) while achieving the County's GHG emission reduction target. The Board of Supervisors accepts this alternative as the revised project description for the ECAP. The Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 3 will be implemented through the following revised ERMs:

Energy and Climate Action Plan – add the following ERMS to the ECAP.

- Measure BE 2 (Energy-Efficient Renovations): Require energy audits for all building permits valued greater than ~~\$15,000~~ \$10,000, offer expedited building permit plan check for implementing audit recommendations, and consider providing a rebate for completing the audit or a waiver of building permit fees if upgrades were completed.
- Measure BE 4 (Energy Scoring and Audits): Require residential property owners to complete energy audits at the time of building sale. ~~or comply with a specified set of energy efficiency upgrades to their home at the time of building sale or within a year from the close of escrow, properties sold multiple times must only comply once.~~

2.0 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FINDINGS

Government Code Section 65358(a) requires a general plan amendment to be in the public interest.

The County of Santa Barbara Energy and Climate Action Plan Amendments include the addition of a new Energy Element Policy and Research Action. The primary intent of the Energy and Climate Action Plan Amendments are to create an implementation tool to identify actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions throughout the County, in order to meet state-required emission reduction mandates (set via Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 97), as well as the County's 15% GHG emissions reduction target. Ultimately, the reduction of GHGs improves air quality and lowers certain types of pollutants, both of which benefit the public. Overall, it is in the public

interest to reduce GHG emissions throughout the county by adopting the amendments associated with the Energy and Climate Action Plan.

The Montecito Planning Commission recommends that the County Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the Board of Supervisors certify the Energy and Climate Action Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 20144021021) (Attachment C) for Case No. 14EIR-00000-00003 pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).