ADDENDUM TO CERTIFIED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE *PLAN SANTA BARBARA* GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
[CFEIR State Clearinghouse #2009011031]

November 7, 2011
Final December 1, 2011 - City Council Approved

This addendum to the certified Final EIR (FEIR) for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update documents final changes to the General Plan made by the Santa Barbara City Council and associated changes to project impacts, all of which fall within the range of policy options, growth scenarios, and impacts studied in the FEIR, and do not raise new environmental issues.

FEIR ADDENDUM PROCEDURES

This FEIR addendum is prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) *Guidelines Section 15164 Addendum to an EIR*, which provides that an addendum to a certified final environmental impact report may be prepared to identify minor changes or additions to the environmental document for the current project description.

The *Guidelines* provide that an addendum need not be circulated for public review but is attached to the FEIR. The decision-making body considers the addendum together with the Certified FEIR in making a decision on the project.

SUMMARY OF CERTIFIED FEIR FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The FEIR evaluates potential environmental effects from citywide development under draft General Plan Update policies over the twenty-year Plan horizon to the year 2030. A comparative impact analysis was included in the FEIR to examine a range of alternative growth scenarios and development policy options.

Class 1 Impacts: The FEIR analysis concludes that even with identified mitigation measures, unavoidable significant impacts associated with increased traffic congestion and greenhouse gas generation would occur by 2030 under the project scenario and under all the alternatives studied.

Class 2 Impacts: The FEIR concludes that, with incorporation of identified mitigation measures as General Plan policies and programs, the following potentially significant effects would be reduced to less than significant levels under the project scenario and all alternatives: air quality (highway diesel exhaust), biological resources (native upland, creek/riparian, and coastal habitats and species), geological conditions (coastal bluff retreat), hazardous materials (adequate collection facility capacity), heritage resources (historic resources), hydrology and water quality (sea level rise), noise (highway noise), open space and visual resources (open space), and solid waste management (adequate management facility capacity).

Class 3 Impacts: Other potential impacts were found by the FEIR to be less than significant under the project scenario and under all alternatives, due to already existing City policies and programs together with updated policies and programs in the Plan. These include other impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, geological conditions, hazards, heritage resources, hydrology and water quality;

noise; open space and visual resources; public services; water supply and other public utilities, energy issues, climate change, jobs/housing balance issues; and socioeconomic issues.

The *Plan Santa Barbara* Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment (March-May 2010), a public comment hearing held, and written responses to comments provided in the Final EIR. The City of Santa Barbara Planning Commission certified the FEIR for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update [Resolution 013-010, September 30, 2010].

CURRENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION: FINAL GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The final General Plan updated policies are similar to the policies analyzed as the Hybrid alternative in the FEIR (*FEIR Vol. I, Section 22, p. 22-25 through 22-57*). The Hybrid alternative blends policy components from the original Project Draft General Plan, the Lower Growth alternative, and the Additional Housing alternative, and incorporates most of the EIR Mitigation Measures.

As with the Hybrid alternative, the final General Plan refined policies and land use changes address environmental concerns and balance among General Plan objectives, including further reducing the amount of allowable growth, further controlling the size, bulk, and scale of new buildings, further protecting historic resources and community character, enhancing the City's economic vitality, and exploring approaches to minimize traffic congestion. The approach emphasizes appropriate policies for mixed-use commercial and residential development for the small additional increment of growth. Some policy modifications also provide added clarity to improve communication of policy intent and use.

The following additional policy adjustments were made to the final General Plan. The final General Plan Map is included as *Exhibit A* to this addendum.

Non-Residential Growth Limits

The Policy LG2 limitation for net new non-residential growth to the year 2030 is 1.35 million square feet for defined allocation categories of small additions, vacant land, and community benefit projects (the latter including economic development projects). This limitation would establish substantially lower square footage than under current provisions for the prior twenty-year period (3.0 million square feet) or under the original project description (2.0 million square feet), and slightly greater square footage than under the Hybrid alternative (1.0 million square feet). The policy aims to limit further jobs/housing imbalance and future traffic congestion.

Exclusions from allocation categories under the Policy LG2 non-residential square footage limitation would include minor additions, pending and approved projects, government facilities, replacement of previously existing demolished square footage, and annexations. For purposes of environmental review these exclusions are together estimated to involve up to 0.5 million additional square feet to the year 2030. This is the same assumption used in the FEIR analysis of excluded categories for the Hybrid Alternative. The growth limitation policy (1.35 million square feet) together with excluded uses (0.5 million square feet assumed) total 1.85 million square feet net additional non-residential development by the year 2030 for purposes of environmental analysis.

Residential Unit Size/Density Incentive Program

Similar to the Hybrid Alternative, the final General Plan land use policies would be modified to focus incentives for housing types that address priority affordable and workforce housing needs, incorporate economic considerations into incentives, and apply incentives to appropriate and compatible areas.

Final General Plan housing policies continue to provide policy incentives to encourage workforce housing in smaller units in well-designed buildings, through a average unit-size/density incentive program that

will replace the current Variable Density incentive ordinance to reduce unit sizes, a rental/employer housing density overlay, and specified parking provisions.

The current Variable Density incentive ordinance would be replaced with a trial program of residential average unit size/density incentives for eight years or until construction of 250 units, at which time the program would be revisited or would sunset. This Average Unit-size Density (AUD) Incentive program would entail the following provisions:

- *Base Density:* A base residential density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre remains for multiple-family residential designations and commercial designations allowing residential or mixed-use development.
- *Average Unity Size:* The incentive program would allow higher densities based on the average unit size in a project, rather than on the number of bedrooms as in the current program. The targeted average unit size is 1,100 square feet (compared to the original project at 1,300 square foot maximum and Hybrid alternative at 1,000 square foot average). The intent is to provide incentive for smaller unit sizes to help limit building sizes and traffic, and address work force housing affordability.
- *Density Ranges:* The incentive program would establish the following multiple-family and mixed-use residential density ranges:

  -Tier 1/ Medium High Density Residential, 15-27 dwelling units per acre (compared to 15-22 du/ac under the original project and 15-25 du/ac under the Hybrid alternative)

  Tier 2/High Density Residential 28-36 dwelling units per acre (compared to 23-33 du/ac under the original project, and 26-45 under the Hybrid alternative)
- *Priority Housing Incentive:* Tier 3/Priority Housing Overlay would allow a greater density range from 49-63 dwelling units per acre in select areas of the City to encourage development of rental, employer-provided, and cooperative housing. This represents a further density incentive of 75% over the High Density Residential density range, (compared to no overlay under the original project, and a 50% increase up to a density range of 39-67 du/ac under the Hybrid alternative).

  The overlay incentive applies to areas designated for Commercial/High Density Residential, High Density Residential, and Commercial-Industrial/Medium High Density Residential on the General Plan Map. A map depicting the AUD incentive program, including the overlay area is provided in Addendum *Exhibit B.*
- *Parking Requirements:* The incentive program provides a minimum parking requirement for projects using the program at one space per unit (similar to original project and Hybrid alternative policies).

General Plan Map Designations

The final General Plan Map (*Addendum Exhibit A*) is similar to the map evaluated for the EIR Hybrid alternative (FEIR Figure 22.2, September 2010 Proposed General Plan Map), but with refinements to the land use designations as summarized below.

In general, the Land Use Map further limits the extent and locations of the High Density Residential incentive designations. *Addendum Exhibits C* and *D* provide a map and more detailed listing of these modifications to the General Plan Map land use designations.

General Urban Area Designations *(note that the area #s referenced correspond to the Exhibit C map):*

- *Central City – Medium High Density Residential Incentive:* Portions of the central City are designated Commercial/Medium High Density Residential and Medium High Density Residential on the final General Plan Map, rather than Commercial/High Density Residential and High Density Residential.

This is aimed at providing further compatibility with existing residential neighborhoods and areas with substantial numbers of historic structures, and reducing the amount of High Density Residential designations citywide.

These areas are located in the Upper State Street neighborhood (# 3 De La Vina/Alamar Avenue area); Hitchcock neighborhood (#2 eastern side of Hitchcock Way between San Roque Creek and Monterey Pine Street); Oak Park and Upper East neighborhoods (# 4 Sola Street to Mission Street, Highway 101 to State Street and Garden Streets); and Downtown, West Downtown, and Lower State neighborhoods (#5 on both sides of State Street from Haley Street to Victoria Street).

- *Highway 101 Buffers – Medium High Density Residential Incentive:* Areas north of Highway 101 are designated Commercial/Medium High Density Residential and Medium High Density Residential, rather than Commercial/High Density Residential so as not to increase the residential potential within 250 feet of the freeway while current air quality concerns exist. The areas are located in the Upper State Street neighborhood (# 1 State Street to east of Arroyo Burro Creek), West Downtown and Lower State neighborhoods (#6 Sola Street to Anacapa Street), and Milpas neighborhood (#9 east of Ashley Avenue, and south of Quinientos Street to the east side of Milpas Street).
- *Coastal Areas South of Highway 101 – Medium High Density Residential Incentive*: Coastal areas south of Highway 101 are designated Commercial/Medium High Density Residential and Medium High Density Residential, rather than Commercial/High Density Residential to maintain compatibility with existing development and coastal policies, and in consideration of current air quality concerns. The areas are located within the West Beach neighborhood (#7 north of the south side of Montecito Street and east of the west side of Castillo Street), and Milpas neighborhood (#10 east of Nopalitos Street, north of Calle Puerto Vallarta, and west of Corona Del Mar Drive).
- *High Density Residential Incentive*: Three parcels are designated for Commercial/ High Density Residential rather than Commercial/Medium High Density Residential consistent with adjacent designations and existing uses on the property. The parcels are located in the East Side neighborhood (#8 southwest of the corner of Allaire and Quinientos Streets).

<u>Hillside & Open Space Designations</u>:

- *Las Positas Road - Residential and Open Space Areas:* Parcels in the Veronica Meadows area (#13) are designated Low Density Residential and Park per recent annexation actions.
- *Reservoirs - Open Spaces:* The La Coronilla Park portion of the Vic Trace Reservoir (#12) is designated Park rather than Institutional; and the Sheffield Reservoir Open Space (#11) is designated Park rather than Institutional to reflect current, ongoing surface land uses.

Additional Policy Modifications

The final General Plan includes language refinements from the earlier March 2010 and September 2010 Draft General Plans that augment or clarify but do not substantially change intent, approach, or application of measures for building design and character (LG goal and LG12.2); minimizing noise effects in residential neighborhoods (LG goal), providing water meters (H16.7), open space access and continuity (OP2); protecting industrial zoned areas (EF15); protecting historic resources (HR goal and HR2 policies); greenhouse gas emissions (ER1.2); air quality (ER7); coastal bluff analysis for projects (ER24.3); encouraging transit passes (C6.3), providing for safe emergency evacuation routes C8); and fire protection along creek corridors (PS13).

The final General Plan also incorporates policies reflecting additional recommended measures identified in the EIR for:

- Air quality (EIR RM AQ-1/ GPU ER8 and ER8.1);
- Native habitat and species protection (EIR RM Bio-1/ GPU ER11.2, EIR Bio-2/ GPU ER12.5, EIR Bio-3.a/ GPU ER12.2, EIR Bio-3.b/ GPU ER12.3 and ER12.3);
- Coastal bluff retreat (EIR RM Geo-1/ GPU PS10.2);
- Hazard risks (EIR RM Haz-1/ GPU PS9.2 and PS9.3, EIR RM Haz-2/ GPU PS9.4, EIR Haz-3/ GPU PS14 and PS15);
- Flooding (EIR RM Hydr-1/ GPU ER17.1);
- Water quality (EIR RM Hydr-2/ GPU ER15.3, ER15.4, and ER15.5);
- Noise reduction (EIR RM Noise-1/ GPU26.5, RM Soc-1/ GPU ER27.3);
- Protecting visual character (EIR RM Vis-2/ LG12, LG12.1, LG12.2a-d);
- Parks and recreation (EIR RMServ-1/ GPU OP1.4);
- Public facilities funding (EIR RM Serv-3/ GPU EF26);
- Water supply (EIR PU-1/ GPU PS4, EIR PU-2/ GPU PS7.4);
- Energy (EIR RM Energy-2/ GPU ER1.3);
- Climate change (EIR Climate-3/ GPU ER5.2); and
- Improving jobs/housing balance (EIR RM Pop-1b-d/ GPU EF22, H22.10, H11.18).

CHANGES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CIRCUMSTANCES

There have been no changes in citywide environmental conditions or applicable regulations affecting this programmatic impact analysis since preparation of the FEIR for the General Plan Update.

FINAL PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

Environmental impacts under the final General Plan Update policies would be similar to those identified in the FEIR for the Hybrid alternative, with minor changes described below in this addendum. No changes from impact significance classifications identified in the FEIR (i.e., Class 1, 2, or 3 impacts) would result from final Plan refinements.

As with the Hybrid alternative, most of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts were incorporated into the final General Plan Update policies and programs. These measures address traffic congestion; greenhouse gas generation; highway diesel exhaust; upland, creek/riparian, and coastal habitats and species; coastal bluff retreat; hazardous materials collection facility capacity; historic resources; sea level rise; highway noise; open space; solid waste management facility capacity, and jobs/housing balance. Similar to the Hybrid alternative, the final GPU includes the slate of measures identified in FEIR Mitigation Measure Trans-2 for Transportation Demand Management (TDM), alternative travel modes, and parking pricing, but does not direct a robust expansion of these programs.

Transportation – The final General Plan Circulation Element policies identify the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies identified in Mitigation Measure Trans-2 for future consideration, and do not specify an implementation level or timing. Therefore, as with the Hybrid alternative, no traffic mitigation credit is provided for purposes of impact analysis, although some unknown level of implementation and mitigation may likely occur over the twenty-year horizon of the Plan.

The assumption for the amount of citywide residential build-out to the year 2030 remains at 2,795 dwelling units (plus 403 units within the sphere of influence). The final General Plan residential density incentive program reduces the locations for General Plan Map land use and/or overlay designations that

allow higher density residential development to 453 acres citywide (from 792 acres under the Hybrid alternative), and also adds an initial eight-year timing limitation.

As a result, it is likely that somewhat less of the citywide residential development may occur within the downtown traffic zones (Travel Model Area Types 1 and 2) that generate lower peak-hour commute traffic than would have occurred under the original project or Hybrid alternative.

The final GPU includes a non-residential growth limitation policy of 1.35 million square feet of additional non-residential development to the year 2030 for specified categories. This amount is substantially less than under the No Project/Existing Policies alternative (3.0 million sq. ft.) or the original project (2.0 million), and is slightly greater (0.35 million sq. ft.) than under the Hybrid Alternative analysis (1.0 million sq. ft.). Because employment generates peak-hour vehicle traffic, associated traffic congestion impacts could be somewhat greater for the final General Plan than under the Hybrid Alternative, but less than under the No Project/ Existing Policies alternative.

The FEIR identifies 13 City intersections that are considered currently impacted during peak-hour traffic, and traffic impacts of the original Project were identified as 20 intersections. The Hybrid alternative impacts were identified as greater than under the original project, due to the policy modifications that provide less mitigation credit for the Trans-2 TDM, alternative travel mode, and parking programs, and due to less area of the Downtown designated for potential higher density residential development. The Hybrid alternative impact was identified as within the range of the 20 intersections identified for the project and the 26 intersections identified for the No Project/Existing Policies alternative (*EIR Hybrid analysis Transportation Technical Appendix Fehr & Peers 8-24-10, FEIR p. 22-57*).

The number and extent of impacted intersections under the final General Plan could be slightly greater than under the Hybrid Alternative due to the additional non-residential growth potential, and reduction of downtown areas with higher density incentive residential designations. However, as with the Hybrid alternative analysis, the factor most affecting the impact level analysis is that the robust Trans-2 mitigation measures are not applied as they were for the original project. The Trans-2 mitigation for expansion of transportation demand management, alternative mode, and parking pricing measures were identified in the EIR as the most effective measures for reducing traffic impacts because they would apply to all existing cumulative traffic, not just the incremental increase.

As with the Hybrid alternative, the impact for the final General Plan would also be expected to be within the range of the original project (20 impacted intersections) and the No Project/Existing Policies alternative (26 impacted intersections) studied in the EIR. The final GPU traffic congestion impact remains ***significant (Class 1)*** for intersections not subject to feasible mitigation with Mitigation Trans-1 for roadway and signal improvements.

Climate Change – The FEIR estimates existing citywide greenhouse gas generation at 1.358 million metric tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), and projected emissions levels at the year 2030 for the original Project (1.574 million metric tons/year CO_2e), the Hybrid alternative (1.571 mmtpy CO_2e), and the No Project/Existing Policies alternative (1.605 mmtpy CO_2e). Final GPU impacts associated with greenhouse gas generation would be within this range of impacts identified in the EIR. The effects would likely be slightly greater than under the Hybrid Alternative but less than the No Project/ Existing Policies alternative, due to the final policy refinements for land use/density incentives and the non-residential growth limitation. The differences among greenhouse gas emission estimates for the original Project, Hybrid Alternative, final GPU, and No Project/Existing Policies alternatives are within the margin of error for calculations on this global issue. Numerous policies and programs in the final GPU reduce greenhouse gas generation and provide partial mitigation. In addition, a number of State actions taken in

the recent time period since the EIR was prepared may act to further reduce statewide greenhouse gas generation, including the projections for Santa Barbara.

The projected increase in greenhouse gas generation under the final GPU is at this time still identified to exceed State objectives for reduction in greenhouse gas generation, and would therefore remain ***significant (Class 1)***.

Water Supply – Water demand within the City under the final GPU is estimated to increase by up to 241 acre-feet per year (AFY) for additional non-residential uses and 531 AFY for residential uses, for a total increase of up to 772 AFY by the year 2030. Existing demand of 14,000 AFY (including 10% drought buffer) together with the 772 AFY increase in demand would result in estimated total future water demand of 14,772 AFY within the City by the year 2030.

This increase in water demand would be slightly less than under the original Project scenario (increase of 791 AFY and total future demand of 14,791 AFY), and slightly greater than under the Hybrid Alternative (increase of 726 AFY and total future demand of 14,726).

The future demand under the final GPU would remain well within the identified average supply level of 15,358 AFY, leaving an estimated 586 AFY above the City's required 10% drought buffer. The City also recently adopted a Long Term Water Supply Plan (June 2011) for water supply management to the year 2030 using a more conservative figure of 794 AFY increase in demand (895 AFY including sphere of influence areas of water service outside City limits). The impact of the final General Plan remains ***less than significant (Class 3)***.

Noise – With somewhat greater traffic impacts than the Hybrid Alternative and no assured application of the robust TDM mitigation, highway-related noise impacts of the final GPU on existing residential uses would be potentially greater than under the original Project, and similar or slightly greater than under the Hybrid Alternative. Mitigation Measure Noise-1 would continue to apply to the final GPU to monitor noise changes and implement measures as needed such as building retrofits, vegetation, and barriers. The final GPU highway residual noise impact would remain ***less than significant with mitigation (Class 2)***.

Historic Resources - The FEIR analysis found impacts of the original Project to be less than significant with incorporation of additional policy protections for historic resources, such as buffer provisions and additional design/historic district protections. The Hybrid Alternative assumed incorporation of these additional policy protections and also reduced the area for higher density residential development in the Downtown to assure compatibility with the historic character. The final GPU also incorporates the additional buffer and district policy protections and further reduces areas with the higher density incentive designations. The residual impacts of the final GPU on historic resources would be similar or slightly less than under the Project or Hybrid Alternatives, and would remain ***less than significant (Class 2)***

Open Space and Visual Resources – With similar policy provisions directing in-fill development to central areas of the City and providing programs protective of open space, the impact of the final General Plan policies and small increment of additional development on gradual loss of open space would be similar to that identified under the Hybrid Alternative, and would remain ***less than significant (Class 3)***.

Other Impacts – Other potential impacts of the final General Plan would be similar to identified impacts of the Hybrid Alternative, and all would remain less than significant (Class 2 or 3 respectively as identified for individual impacts under the Hybrid analysis).

Final General Plan impacts to air quality, public services, hydrology and water quality, public utilities (wastewater, solid waste, and communications utilities), and energy consumption would be incrementally greater than under the Hybrid alternative due to slightly greater non-residential potential.

Refinements to the final General Plan Map provide land use designations that do not increase residential development potential within the interim highway buffer area, which is beneficial toward reducing potential air quality impacts.

Final General Plan impacts to biological resources, geological conditions, and hazards would be similar to those identified for the Hybrid Alternative.

Final General Plan effects on socioeconomic issues would be incrementally more beneficial than under the Hybrid alternative due to potential additional job opportunities associated with non-residential growth. With the slightly greater non-residential growth potential, the estimated jobs/housing imbalance under the final General Plan (1.417 jobs/housing unit) would be similar or incrementally worse than the Hybrid alternative, and better than the original Project (1.44 jobs/unit) and No Project/Existing Policies alternative (2.04 jobs/unit).

CEQA FINDING

Based on the above review of the final General Plan project and in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162*, no subsequent Environmental Impact Report is required for the current project, because new information and changes in project description, circumstances, impacts, and mitigations are within the scope of alternative policy options, growth scenarios, and impact levels studied in the Certified FEIR and do not involve new impacts.

This addendum identifies the final General Plan project changes and associated minor changes to project impacts identified in the Certified Final EIR.

The Certified FEIR [SCH #2009011031] together with this addendum constitutes adequate environmental review and documentation in compliance with CEQA for the final General Plan project.

Final Addendum:

_____Date : _____

Barbara R. Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Exhibits:

A. Final General Plan Map (November 2011)

B. Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program Map (including Priority Housing Overlay)

C. General Plan Designations Change Areas Map

D. Description of Final General Plan Map Change Areas

References:

Certified Final EIR for *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update (September 2010)

Long-Term Water Supply Plan (City of Santa Barbara, June 2011)

Personal communications with City of Santa Barbara Public Works transportation staff Rob Dayton and water resources staff Bill Ferguson; AMEC Earth & Environmental environmental analysts Dan Gira and Michael Henry; and Fehr & Peers transportation analysts Brian Welch and Reid Keller.