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The Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Community College District was called to order by President Kathryn O. Alexander on Thursday, April 3, 1975 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of Santa Barbara City College.

Members present:

Mrs. Kathryn Alexander, President
Mrs. Ann Gutshall, Vice-President
Dr. Joe W. Dobbs
Mr. Sidney R. Frank
Mr. James R. Garvin
Mrs. Joyce H. Powell
Mr. Benjamin P. J. Wells (arrived at 4:22 p.m.)

Members absent:

None

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting:

Dr. Glenn C. Gooder, Superintendent-President and Secretary-Clerk to the Board of Trustees
Dr. Donald K. Sorsabal, Administrative Dean, Business Services and Assistant Secretary-Clerk to the Board of Trustees

Mr. M. L. Huglin, Administrative Dean, Instruction
Dr. Alfred Silvera, Administrative Dean, Student Services and Activities

Mr. Kenneth Jost, Reporter, THE CHANNELS
Mr. Eric Mankin, Reporter, Santa Barbara News & Review
Mr. Steve Sullivan, Reporter, Santa Barbara News Press
Mr. Jim M. Williams, Director, College Information

Mr. Dean H. Ankeny, Director, Purchasing
Ms. Beverlyn G. Baggao, SBCC Student
Mr. Peter C. Chapman, UCSB Campus Planning
Ms. Terri Gehr, SBCC Student
Ms. Miriam Hawthorne, Commission on the Status of Women
Others present for all or a portion of the meeting – continued:

Mr. Burton P. Miller, Assistant to the Superintendent-President
Mr. C. D. Platt, 1009 Del Sol, Santa Barbara
Miss Lee Rook, UCSB, Campus Planning
Mrs. Dee K. Rose, Administrative Secretary, Business Services
Dr. Orrin Sage, Jr., self-employed
Mr. Alfred Savinelli, SBCC Student
Mr. Donald L. Trent, Director, Facilities Development
Mr. Robert Vickery, City of Santa Barbara Transportation Department

Mrs. Elsie M. Brandt, Secretary to the Superintendent-President
Mr. Jerry E. Morin, Audio-Visual Technician

Mrs. Alexander, President of the Board of Trustees, noted that all the members of the Board were present with the exception of Mr. Wells who was expected shortly.

Mrs. Alexander declared the meeting open as a Public Hearing and announced that the public here today would have an opportunity to speak to the Environmental Impact Report. She asked persons to identify themselves, and if they were representing an agency or organization, if they would identify that source. She then asked Dr. Orrin Sage to speak first as he had prepared the EIR report for the District.

Dr. Orrin Sage, President, Geopac Corporation
Project Coordinator/Environmental Impact Report

Dr. Sage: Thank you. The Public Hearing we are attending this afternoon is a direct result of the Environmental Quality Act (EQA) of 1970. This Act requires an EIR be prepared on all projects, multiple or phase projects, needing State funding, or State permits. The SBCC Master Plan is such a project. The Public Hearing this afternoon specifically is to enable the public to be able to enter into the EIR process by soliciting their comments to the EIR report. The report was prepared by outside consultants; by SBCC faculty; and production was done by the City College. I was overall project manager/coordinator.

What I would like to do is to give a very brief summary of the Master Plan which has already been presented to the public. It was presented at SBCC at an 'open house'. Then a little about the findings of the EIR; primarily the adverse environmental impacts and the beneficial environmental impacts. Then after that for the general public present tell a little about the difference between a draft and final report. You will realize that actually your comments are part of the EIR process, and then open up for discussion.
The SBCC Master Plan as shown on map (displayed in hand) is a phase development in four steps:

Step 1: 1975 capacity of 3,772 plan - this plan envisions 3,772 full-time day students. The actual facilities development that will occur with this plan are detailed in the EIR and in the attached Master Plan. I will not go into that now as I want to give just a brief overview as far as the steps are concerned.

Step 2: 1980 plan - envisions 4,080 full-time students.

Step 3: Interim capacity 5,040 plan - now there was no date attached to this step of the plan because this particular step is contingent upon enrollment. Whether or not that enrollment is reached in 1985 or the year 2000 is not presently known but the Master Plan will be able to accommodate those number of students.

Step 4: Maximum capacity 6,000 plan - envisions 6,000 full-time students at SBCC. Once again there is no date attached to this step.

The Master Plan itself as far as facilities development is using what is called a cluster concept. This will allow the growth of SBCC to occur in an orderly manner based on the actual enrollment of the City College at a particular time. Therefore, there won't be a large number of buildings vacant because of declining or enrollments that failed to fill the necessary projects. In the EIR study we determined that there were two adverse environmental impacts and one of these can be sufficiently mitigated. The other one is more of a philosophical question.

The first one has to do with traffic congestion. As the college grows, at least under present standards, dependence upon the automobile will also increase and traffic congestion in the area will increase as enrollment rises. Now at the present time, certain key areas adjacent to SBCC are undergoing traffic congestion. These include the intersections of Castillo St./Montecito St., Carrillo St./San Andres St., and Carrillo St./Highway #101. Now in the EIR we have suggested a series of mitigation measures that should definitely be employed by City College in order to shift the travel mode from the automobile to other means of travel. The reason that we feel that these mitigation measures will work is because over 72% of the present student body of SBCC reside within 5 miles of the campus, so this opens up a lot of alternative modes of transportation such as bicycles, walking, shuttle services, and car pools. So the traffic congestion can probably be alleviated in the future.

The other environmental impact that was encountered has to do with the commitment of a certain resource and that resource being water. All of you that are from the southcoast area know that Goleta and other areas presently have water moratoriums because of the increased scarcity of water as growth continues in the Santa Barbara southcoast area.
Certain projections have been made, or estimates have been made, as far as the safe yield available to the residents of the city of Santa Barbara. These estimates vary from 300 to 368 acre feet per year of surplus water. The overall SBCC Master Plan will probably use about one quarter of this safe yield. At this point, we get into a philo-
sophical trade-off as far as should the surplus water be allocated to
SBCC expansion or to other means of land use. This, of course, is up
to the decision makers that are involved with a particular development
of an area. I just want to point out that the impact is a real one.
Mitigation measures, of course, would be a general curtailment of
growth in Santa Barbara City or utilizing alternative water sources.

The SBCC Master Plan indirectly at least has mitigated some of the
problems of water use and that is in their landscaping because they
suggested that native plants, requiring less water, be utilized in the
Master Plan, and this is definitely a very good idea. Also, water con-
servation measures could be implemented if and when the need occurred.

Now as far as the beneficial impacts are concerned, probably the
greatest beneficial impact would be the development of the west campus
area in order to stop the erosion, the siltation, and the flooding
that occurs after rains on west campus area. This is the west area
which was previously graded for the Sea Village condominium develop-
ment. Another beneficial impact, also in regard to west campus area,
would be landscaping and cosmetic effects to improve the esthetics of
the area as you presently see it. A lot of beneficial improvements
could be made on that area.

Thus far, I have received comments from Mr. Sidney Frank of the
Board of Trustees and the Santa Barbara Community Development Depart-
ment, and I just want to state that so it will be entered into the
record. Those comments will be incorporated into the EIR. Presently
the EIR is a draft report. Now in order to go from a draft report to
a final report, the following items need to be included. First of all,
you need the draft EIR report. To that you add comments from public,
the general public, or from agencies (governmental agencies, conserva-
tion agencies, that sort of thing). That is included. Also, a list
of the individuals and the agencies that have sent in comments is in-
cluded. Another thing that is included is the response to these com-
ments and these can be attached to the draft EIR report as an addendum,
and it would be included with the report. The comments and the re-
sponses are then reviewed, in this case by the Board, and, if the
answers to the comments are adequate by law, then the draft EIR report
is made a final. At that time, the Notice of Determination is filed
and sent to the Secretary of Resources, State of California, and then
a final EIR report is sent to each of the agencies that commented,
plus one file copy for the State Clearinghouse. Then a period of 14
days goes by and if there are no other additional comments, the EIR
process is complete.

Once an EIR process is complete, then the City College can request
State funding, or for budgetary reasons whatever, because they now have
the final EIR included with these requests. In this way, the public,
the people who are at the hearing today, then have an input.
In this way, the public, the people who are at the hearing today, then have a direct input into the EIR process. With that I would like to open the meeting to the public. If you have any comments on the EIR, would greatly appreciate it when you make your comment, if you would state your name and address, so that that would be entered into the records and then your particular comment.

Mrs. Alexander: Dr. Sage, I have one comment, or question. I noticed in the section where you are discussing the ruling of the Coastal Commission that the coastal area should be saved for public use rather than have industries or such things that can be built inland, or located inland. It occurs to me that the EIR report might not sufficiently stress the amount of community use of these facilities, and I wonder if we might not incorporate an addendum that would include some statistics from Mr. Williams' office in the use of beach areas. There are some people who like to sit on the sand, some people who like to play in the waves and there are some people who just like to walk along and look at the view and I think it was the feeling then - I know it was much mentioned when we went for our first bond issue - that by locating the Theater/Arts Building over on that piece of property and opening it up for the general public use, that we would be using it as a natural resource for all the people in this area. It occurs to me that this could be included because the development of it in this fashion is not something that comes under either, say traditional beach uses which are digging in the sand, or under uses that they have specifically excluded like industries where you have a certain number of people and then lock the gate. Do you think that would be useful?

Dr. Sage: Yes, I would agree with you completely on that, because, of course, the land use, as far as City College is concerned, is more of a public function versus private condominium use or another industry. If there were some statistics available as far as the general public use of the facilities here that could certainly be included as an addendum to the report.

Any suggestions from the audience?

Mr. C. D. Platt, 1009 Del Sol, Santa Barbara (retired landscape architect from Iowa):
I have been here about 8 or 9 years. I think it is a wonderful project - have looked over it many times. Just wanted to confirm the suggestion made for public use along the shore side. That would be a continuation of Shoreline Park, or that type of thing. The public has taken to that very well. That would take care of good public use without interfering with the use of building land that is for buildings. I would gather that that is a very excellent idea.

Dr. Sage: Thank you.

Mr. Eric Mankin, Reporter, Santa Barbara News & Review, Nopal Street, Santa Barbara
I was wondering what measures were taken to publicize the existence of this.
Dr. Sage: Mr. Trent, if you can answer that question.

Mr. Trent: The distribution list that we had for the EIR - there were 50 copies printed of the report. Seven copies for the Board members; 20 copies sent to State agencies through the State Clearinghouse; copy sent to the Water Control Board; a copy in the City Library to be checked out; copy to Public Works; copy was on file and was listed in our advertisement that was posted at the City Planning office; copy to County Planning office; to Office of Environmental Quality; and it was also posted in the President's office. We had six copies on file to be checked out from our campus library.

In addition, sent to various agencies in the city that work with us when we talk about our planning which includes Public Works, Traffic Engineer, Development of Community Services. In addition, of course, copies to the consultants who worked on it and the Master Plan architects.

Mr. Mankin: What steps taken beyond legal requirements and public advertisement to let people know this was available.

Mr. Trent: We had an open house, it was approximately a month and a half ago, I believe, in which we had a lot of publicity on our Master Plan called the "Look of Tomorrow", and we had, in fact, every word that was included in the document on display. We had a very good public turnout for that event. The EIR was advertised.

Mr. Mankin: Just the paid advertising. The reason I ask is I am a reporter for the News & Review and we try to keep in contact with these things. And, of course, the way I found out about it was a press release on my desk three days ago saying that this hearing was going to take place. Had I known this document was available in March - I guess I didn't read the legal ads closely enough - then it might have been possible for us certainly to digest it and possible get a few people out here and be a little more knowledgeable; to make this a little more fruitful give and take.

Mr. Trent: There was legal advertising and included in discussion at our last two Board meetings. Also, on the agenda set as a Public Hearing.

Mr. Mankin: But there was no announcement sent out that the thing was available?

Mr. Jim Williams, Director of College Information, SBCC:

If I may interject a thought - I believe that the Santa Barbara News & Review receives a copy of the agenda of each meeting and those items have been included there.

Mr. Mankin: The only reason I said that was because there was a great deal of money tied up in preparation of that document and it was not easy to know it existed.
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Mrs. Alexander: I think the point that they are trying to make is that anyone who reads the agenda, and the agendas are distributed to the press, that it was in there. This would have been a method for finding out about it.

Mr. Mankin: Like, for example, when freeway project comes up what often happens is it just appears in the newspaper, and it is hard to know it is available in a library, etc. I don't remember seeing it in this case.

Mr. Williams: I have done probably about four news releases and they have all been sent to the Santa Barbara News. I'll be happy to give you copies after the meeting.

Mr. Mankin: I just have a couple of questions. I noticed that in reading the report just briefly - in the talk at the highest growth estimate there was something like 2,842 parking places listed as being on campus. The rule-of-thumb I learned was like you park a hundred cars to the acre which that division gives me something like 28.4 acres for parking. I read in the report that there is not sufficient space on campus. It occurs that there should be alternate forms of transportation.

Dr. Sage: The question of on-campus bikeways was from the Master Plan. This was interjected into the project description because this is what the Master Plan addressed. Now under mitigation measures in the EIR, we strongly suggested alternative transportation modes be implemented and one of the mitigation measures was to facilitate, or help facilitate, bikeways.

Mrs. Alexander: Also, Mr. Trent, who is our Director of Facilities - is there something you wish to add to this, too?

Mr. Trent: Bikeways are not forbidden on campus. Bikeways are included and bike parking is included on our campus, as there would be pedestrian paths. There would be parking areas for bikes and located as conveniently close as possible. It very much was a part of the Master Plan. It did say they would not cross pedestrian bridge into areas where there would be congestion or possibility of accident with pedestrians.

Mr. Mankin: Proportion of parking to students - is that greater or less?

Mr. Trent: The parking study was made by Robert Crommelin, consultant from L.A., and the Master Plan architects. And they did a considerable amount of study on other community colleges, UCSB, and came out with the proportional number of students and also included contingencies in the Master Plan. Also recommended as well as the EIR that we study alternate means of having students come onto campus.
Mr. Mankin: If in order to, it is crucial to, minimize adverse effects of traffic congestion outside the campus, to encourage alternate ways of getting there, why are all these parking places being constructed?

Mr. Trent: The Master Plan gave this contingency and was saying if there are not alternative means studied and provided over the years, this is the parking that will be required in structures. The Master Plan does not indicate that there will be structures built. It does state that in the event the means of transportation continues as it is today, this is the parking that would be required, and that's why it is stated in this report that we study alternate means.

Mr. Mankin: So the College presently has no plans to construct any parking phases?

Mr. Trent: Yes, we do have plans to construct the first phase for 355 cars - is on the drawing boards right now.

Mrs. Alexander: Dr. Gooder has a comment to make.

Dr. Gooder: I think it would be helpful to note, Don that in the Master Plan we really have three alternative levels of parking plans. The hope is to settle for the absolute minimum. The Master Plan envisions only three different possible levels of parking. So they have tried to incorporate an ideal situation, as nearly as we can anticipate a kind of a middle situation and then the maximum in the possibility if there is no improvement in the whole use of the internal combustion engine. So there was an effort to be realistic about that. So that decisions could be made as time goes on about which level of parking will have to be implemented.

Mr. Trent: It also set a procedure and suggested that we monitor the needs.

Dr. Sage: I might add something to that, also. Parking lots that are now being constructed or planned for construction will, of course, alleviate the environmental impact that we presently have and that is congestion for parking, which is a very serious problem here, and this was considered under the no-project alternative.

Mrs. Alexander: There is a question in the back of the room.

Mr. Robert Vickery, employee, S. B. City Transportation:

I have reviewed the EIR report. These are my personal comments. One, there is a lot of detail in the parking lot portion and how it can be phased out. The phasing of the parking lots and what is going to happen with the different increases in students. All the different phases of plans. But there is very little detail in the how you are going to set forth the programs of car pooling or shuttle buses, or programs to minimize automobile use. There was great detail in the automobile parking and great detail in the reconstruction of streets. More to accommodate the motor vehicle. I was wondering if there was any possibility of getting this much detail into the program of minimizing this automobile use, since we are talking about accommodating about 6,000 students.
Dr. Sage: In the EIR, I'm sure you read, Bob, we have suggested certain mitigation measures for this. Of course, these measures would have to be adopted by City College or an alternative series of measures which would essentially achieve this total split some time in the future.

Mr. Trent: I have had many conversations in the past couple of years with Mr. Clint Lefler of the City. We have discussed it many times -- the advisability of having some type of a joint committee with the City and the College on the major uses of traffic at the College. I would like very much to be involved in that committee so we can pull together some type of program. We have a lot of information that is available. We would like to get whatever other information would be helpful, and I think we can't provide a plan for a transit system, or a plan for solving the problem that the transit district plans to solve to this date but we would like to participate. It is not something that we can develop a plan for. I think it is something that would have to be a joint effort.

Mr. Vickery: The only reason I mentioned it was everything else was very precise and concrete Phase I, Phase II, Phase III, alternatives and everything else, but the mitigating measures to minimize would be car pooling, shuttle bus, and was left to that. I was hoping to see something before Phase II takes place, a car pool program taking place, or before Phase III takes place, or whatever the next phase at that time. Evaluation of such and such taking place. A cost of parking on street or permit parking on campus at such and such a cost. Some concrete detailed information concerning the rest of the report.

Mr. Trent: The detail for that type of thing is dependent on the other people and is dependent on our cooperation with other agencies and their cooperation with us. We can master plan what happens within our boundaries and make suggestions but we can't dictate what degree of cooperation we will get. I can speak from my standpoint that we are ready to sit down any time and provide as much information as we can.

Mrs. Gutshall: Mr. Trent, you said something about two years ago it had been suggested that there be a committee of say the transportation people and us in regards to this and nothing has happened.

Mr. Trent: No I have been talking with Mr. Lefler about traffic in general and he has also included in our Master Plan reviews discussions of a southcoast region committee even an informal committee to start. It was more recent, probably. It has not been set up. Just an idea within the last two months.

Mrs. Gutshall: Who then should carry through with this idea?

Mr. Trent: It is my understanding it would be the traffic engineering department and we would be invited.

Mrs. Gutshall: What if we start it and invited them?

Mr. Trent: I don't think we have the expertise to do it. In their office they have the expertise (more of it) in these types of things and we would like to be in a position to be of help.
Mrs. Gutshall: I guess what I am actually saying is if everybody sits and waits for somebody else to begin, it's never going to get started. And I'm wondering why, because this is the water and traffic on our campus here - two of the most important things that we have to think about. Maybe we better get started. If we wait for them, it may not happen, so is there any possibility of our asking them to set up a meeting with the appropriate agencies?

Mr. Trent: I could send a letter and ask them, if this would be possible. I think that in our conversations we talked about the need for solving all or looking at all of the traffic problems in the area, not simply the harbor, or the school, but the school and the harbor and the park. All of the general areas because they are all inter-related. Bus systems would not be something that would solve school problems, but also solve downtown area. So they are inter-related. It is really a joint venture.

Mr. Wells: Now along that line, too, on the bus system. Now there is a metropolitan transit system. I know the need was met in the Goleta area with minibuses to go to the campus. I see them quite often full. People would rather use some other type of transportation than cars. If we indicated what our transportation needs were, that possibly the MTD would study a method of meeting that need by minibuses or certain lines from where our students come from.

Mr. Trent: That was part of the idea of a joint meeting to discuss this need - wanted to determine what types of information were necessary. In our case, it would mean a survey of the students, and we could obtain that information.

Mrs. Powell: There is another thing, too, the Board on occasion has talked parking fee for students and so far we have turned it down. There is no parking fee. This I'm sure would cut down on the number of cars brought to campus. UC, for example, has a fee and it has forced people to carpool or use bus. So this is something we could discuss anyway that would make probably a concrete difference. If we didn't charge for bike parking and we did charge for car parking, I think probably our bike parking would rise - our car parking would drop. There would be a highly unpopular group of students. It might be a trade off.

Mrs. Alexander: Actually this is mentioned in the EIR report, and it is pointed out that community colleges are supposed to be freely available to people. Supposing we charge $100 for a parking sticker and thereby excluded a sizeable portion of the people who might otherwise be coming. I think the matter has to be thought about.

Mrs. Powell: That could be discussed; also, it could be that anybody on financial aid would have their parking fee waived, or something like that.

Dr. Sage: It can also be done in concurrence with an alternative transportation development system, such as a minibus or shuttle system, or something like that and the disincentive to drive your car because you have to pay a high parking fee; you are in financial problems and you can't afford to do it. You have an alternative then. It's pretty hard to argue "I can't come to school because I can't afford a place to park",...
you can say "you can ride the minibus". Those would have to be developed concurrently.

Mrs. Powell: At the same time, though, so it doesn't discriminate.

Mr. Trent: It would be developed over a period of time. That will be added, too, and that is partly why that particular type of thing was mentioned in the Master Plan and not spelled out in detail. The Master Plan identified that existing need by today's standards but recommended that we conduct studies like this and enter into this kind of planning which is a long range thing. The concepts on traffic and bicycles have changed drastically in just the past year, and even more so in the last two years. I don't think it would have been possible for the Master Plan architects - and they could have suggested such a plan - but I think it is something that is an on-going thing that we will be studying from now on, and implementing in various stages.

Mrs. Gutshall: Are you saying that we will be asking the appropriate agencies to now start a feasibility study on alternate system for students to get to the campus?

Mr. Trent: With your permission, I would send a letter to Mr. Lefler and ask him if it might be possible for some type of study to get together and talk about our common needs.

Mrs. Gutshall: I don't have to tell you about our parking problems! And it's not going to get better and I think we better start studying it with the appropriate agencies. As you indicated, it isn't just here, it is around the whole college community area and has a lot to do with downtown, etc., and I would hope that we could start this as soon as possible.

Mr. Trent: We are programmed to have 365 spaces for parking - will start construction in about two months after this process is over. We are expected to start construction in early Fall.

Mrs. Alexander: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Mankin: I was reading the section on letting the west campus remain in its present state, and I was wondering if there were any other mitigating measures they'd be saving to avoid erosion control, the size of construction buildings, parking lot ---

Dr. Sage: Don, you might want to talk about the construction timetable, as far as erosion control, because I think that comes before the actual building construction.

Mr. Trent: It's included in the Master Plan to take care of the erosion. You are asking the question - Is there an alternative to building?

Mr. Mankin: Well, what I was reading here, was the alternative way to build there or let the whole thing wash down to the Pacific Ocean, but it seems like if it is possible to take measures for erosion control while you're waiting to build, you will possibly just leave those places in effect and not build at all and eliminate those adverse effects.
Mr. Trent: That gets back to reason why the District bought the property. Our purchase was not an alternate to the project that was proposed which was the apartment project.

Mrs. Alexander: I think the project itself answers this. It says that where theoretically possible that nothing happened over there actually the chances of nothing happening are practically zero.

Dr. Sage: The no-project alternative means that the facilities plan and the Master Plan would not occur.

Mr. Mankin: I guess I would be wondering then why there was not a plan prepared for just, for example, to control and check the erosion on the west campus.

Dr. Sage: Primarily because of the fact that if the no-project plan was implemented, the expansion of SBCC would essentially stop, and therefore the west campus would remain as is. And whether or not the City College would want to spend the money on erosion control measures is a questionable financial effort as far as being able to go into an area you're not going to now use at all, and do erosion control measures on it.

Mrs. Alexander: Dr. Gooder?

Dr. Gooder: Mrs. Alexander, I think that goes back to the fact that in April, 1973, essentially the people of this community asked this District to provide an alternate to what appeared to be an inevitable development of apartment houses and the people of this community by a better than 70% vote approved the acquisition of that property by the District. It did not approve the acquisition of that property just to have it for control of erosion. They approved it to complete the facilities of this District. It seems to us that was very clearly presented to the public. At the time, it was their will that they preferred the City College develop that property to the alternative they had at that time. So I really think the no-construction alternative is no alternative at all.

Mr. Mankin: The other question that was raised about the availability of water. What would happen if the District found out they could not get water? For whatever reason, it was decided the growth was not advisable?

Dr. Gooder: The District is in an unusual position. The District is required by law to admit any applicant who is 18 years of age or older who can profit from instruction. Now that means the District must provide educational facilities. I don't know that the law has ever been tested to the point where it simply wasn't possible to admit students but that is the mandate to this kind of an institution - a public institution. It seems to us - at least it seems to me - I am not speaking for anyone but myself right now - we are required by law to provide facilities to do that insofar as we are financially able to do that. And it seems to me that it is very much in the best interests of the people of this community that those facilities be provided adjacent to this campus.
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It's going to take resources to provide for those students wherever they are provided in this District, and I think it was the wish of the people in this community, after they studied the issue very carefully, that it is in their best interests, financially and otherwise, that they be provided across the street rather than somewhere else.

Mrs. Alexander: Isn't there a law also that we can only hold a piece of land for a certain period of time and then we must put a building on it?

Dr. Gooder: You must pay taxes on it, if you hold it for a certain length of time.

Dr. Sorsabal: I think it should be indicated that on the water issue, we are not creating a service at the college. We are providing a service. These people will be using the water wherever they happen to be within our District, in Goleta Valley, or in Carpinteria. They are going to be drinking water, or flushing toilets, or watering their lawns some place in this community. The question has to be where the water is being used and it happens to be here in the city which is one of the problems.

Dr. Sage: Eric, to get back to your initial question, I know that what you are saying: in the EIR the non-project alternative was making the assumption that the physical land area over there would remain as is. If it remains as is, there will be severe erosion, and silitation and flooding problems, as currently is happening. Anyhow, the thing you question has been voted on. Could the City College go in there and do the erosion control and then just let the land sit after erosion control measures were taken - now that gets down to budgeting problems and things like that. I think that was what you were driving at, wasn't it?

Mr. Mankin: Yes, that was it, it seems like the only alternative to the adverse impact either build on or have the land erode. The EIR statement is supposed to be examining alternatives.

Dr. Sage: Right. In this case, we felt since we are dealing with the City College Master Plan land usage of an area that to go half-way between -- well, to take a no-project is one extreme, but then to say, well, okay, we are not going to expand but then we should have another alternative, and if expansion does not occur, the City College should go in and landscape the area as half an alternative, or something. It's a difficult thing to come across, but certainly if no project did happen and the City College owned the land, then the budgetary matters would have to be taken up where erosion control measures would be supplied, or the land would just continue to erode away.

Mrs. Alexander: The money that is being used to provide the present development of that property and erosion control is money that the people of the City, or the people of the entire District, voted for the purchase of acquiring land upon which to build buildings. It would not be proper for the Board of Trustees to use bond money for some other purpose, such as developing a park, which is essentially what you would be doing if you kept the property, landscaped it, put in erosion control and did not use if for the purpose of building college buildings which I think is the half-way
in between the two alternatives. The alternative for school district would be, if there was no project there, I think, to look around for some place else for a project and that's the other alternative discussed in the EIR. Are there any other questions or comments?

Mr. Frank: I just would like to make one comment and as I indicated in my written comment regarding the water service. The point I wanted to make was while recognizing the problems on the south coast that we do not have a firm figure on the actual consumption on campus per student. That is very difficult to get because one has to scan out of the total usage what is actually due to each individual student, and this means excluding support staff who are here 12 months of the year versus the students who are here for 9 months, for example. If one takes a gross figure and uses that as a factor for an increase in students, net result would be that you would be including a similar expansion of all the support services which would not be necessarily expanding at the same rate and would not be included on the constant usage. So that the end product certainly has a great deal of variability so far as the projection of the total number of students. So that, I think, without a real base figure we don't know the extent of water use on campus. I would tend to consider a project of one-quarter of the estimated surplus yield is probably a large figure. As with all projects, we would have to base it on something, and so the figure that is used is as good as can be derived. I can't seem to think of this as one of a series of factors that is included here.

Dr. Sage: The 35 gals. per day estimate was, of course, obtained by dividing the number of students into the amount of gallons of water that was used on campus. The reason was we felt that the 35 gals. per day was at least in the ball park as a realistic figure. The west campus area will be expanded, it will be landscaped, it will be built on, and additional water will be needed for that west campus facility. That was the reason we chose 35 gals. per day as our figure to work with. On the other hand, if City College expansion was just limited to the existing facilities, where you added on some buildings or some space for the students, and you had more students coming in, then we felt 35 gals. per day would be quite a high figure, because you are not increasing the landscaping. You are not increasing the overall needs of the new facilities. Mr. Frank is right. It is an estimate and it is the best estimate that we can make with the available data that we have.

Miriam Hawthorne, Commission on the Status for Women
I have been receiving agendas and I am sorry to say I was not aware that the reports were available ahead of time. Are there plans for the new building to have water-saving plumbing? and low water-usage landscaping to be installed?

Mrs. Alexander: Mr. Trent, do you want to answer the question on buildings?

Mr. Trent: Design of future buildings are what we ask the architect to do. If we ask for water conservation measures, it is included. Also, the Master Plan has a Master Landscape Plan which includes a plant list which are basically native materials. We do have a basic erosion control that is already under contract with an architect with this in mind.
Ms. Hawthorne: I am aware that technology allows us to flush toilets with much less water than is being used currently and that valves can be installed on sinks that have a timer built in. Are these things in the Master Plan?

Mr. Trent: No. That type of detail is not in the Master Plan. The Master Plan is a conceptual plan; where the buildings will be; and then we write a program as the buildings come in line. For instance, one of the buildings, a possible library would not be constructed until 1979. The plan itself is conceptual, the specifications are programmed when the building is put together, when you sit down with the architect and start specifying the particular fixtures. And we can request these types of things but we will be relying heavily on our architects for water-saving, energy-saving, circulation, etc. items. This is conceptually mentioned in the EIR.

Mrs. Alexander: Any other questions or comments? If not, then I will declare the Public Hearing portion of this meeting closed and the Board has to consider how these two critiques we have received will be incorporated into the EIR. Is it the wish of the Board to insert them point by point, or should we add them as an addendum, and the comments that were made today.

Perhaps Dr. Sage would like to make some comment on this, or some advice to the Board on this question. Is it customary to include these an an addendum or insert them?

Dr. Sage: Customarily, I would say it is easier to include them as an addendum. Otherwise you would have to go through the entire printing job, production job, over again. We can put them in at the end as an addendum, point by point, with a response to them, and that would suffice.

Mrs. Alexander: Also, then we would include an as addendum the comments that were brought to this meeting.

Dr. Sage: Right, these should be typed up with the person's name, we will make a list of names, a list of comments, and then address these comments.

Mr. Frank: I will move that we follow that procedure and adopt the comments as an addendum to the draft Environmental Impact Report.

Dr. Dobbs: I second the motion.

Mrs. Alexander: Is there any further discussion at this point?

Mrs. Gutshall: Not in regards to that, but the suggestions that have been made, for example, from Mr. Frank and the Community Development Dept. -- they are going to be added but then what's going to happen to them? Is someone going to try to correct some of the things -- answer some of them -- the lighting? -- Pershing Park situation? how are these things going to be handled?

Dr. Sage: Once the questions are included in a particular form, then we are, my team, will respond to these questions. Now some of the questions by the Community Development Dept. were already answered in the Master Plan.
We can allude to this, such as lighting; Master Plan especially discussed the lighting impacts. As far as the other comments, we can respond to that right after the question. So someone reading through the final environmental impact report, can look to the addendum as far as specific questions that they might have. A cover letter will say to please look at the addendum first to be sure that you are not reading the draft, the final EIR, out of context.

Mrs. Gutshall: I guess what I am asking is will there be any action taken on any of these items? Just to write them down is not action. If something in here should really be done, then will that be done?

Mrs. Alexander: I think that is our problem.

Mrs. Gutshall: It's that, too, that I am getting to - when this is included as an addendum to the EIR, then we go through these things and find out whether they are feasible? whether they are not, if it's been answered on page #, that type of thing?

Dr. Sage: Yes, the Board of Trustees will review the questions and the responses based on the comments received. After you are satisfied that responses answered the questions or comments satisfactorily, then it is your job to make the draft EIR a final report. Then as far as implementing some of the mitigation measures, this is up to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Gooder: Mrs. Alexander, if I could, for example, the recommendation that Miriam Hawthorne made about the plumbing - there is no reason at all why if it was the Board's decision, they could incorporate that into the obligation they assume for the development. This is a very good suggestion, although it wasn't one that wouldn't have been followed anyway. This then could become a policy of the Board that future buildings will include this type of plumbing. That's the kind of thing I think we are talking about.

Mrs. Powell: That's what I wonder; that kind of a statement as a philosophy of the Board would be helpful if we were committed to using less water, less energy, building less parking lots and fewer parking structures.

Dr. Gooder: It is my understanding, Dr. Sage, correct me if I am wrong, as we reflect the reactions to the various comments, it will be the staff's responsibility, also, hopefully to suggest ways in which we can meet some of the mitigating suggestions that have been made, and that will all be part of what will be brought to you, and things that you will be wrestling with in the final report.

Dr. Sage: Getting on to something philosophical, the EIR report is really only as good as the review agency that is responsible for it. If you really want to follow the mitigation measures in the EIR, then it is up to the review agency to implement some of these mitigation measures that would alleviate the adverse environmental impacts, as pointed out.

Mrs. Alexander: Mr. Trent.

Mr. Trent: Just a point, I would assume from the comments that we should be looking into other means of transportation - something like that is a statement
in itself. Now with plumbing, for example, we might be able to find an American Standard that did that and include that into our recommendations, but that would then mean that we had to use that and maybe something better will come along and maybe the statement that we should be using this type of plumbing would be something that would solve the problem as far as the EIR is concerned, that type of information is up to the District to use the best that is available.

Dr. Sage: As Mr. Trent just said, in generalities as far as mitigation measures go, let's say for water consumption, we can state that the water conservation issue should be followed. Now if the Board wishes to implement that mitigation issue, then as these contracts are bid upon -- in the overall spec sheets of the contract -- then the specific means of water conservation measures would be included within the bid and then this would have to be approved by the State when you can show that the original statements in the EIR were being followed even maybe 20 years in the future.

Mrs. Alexander: Any more questions? Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Steve Sullivan, reporter, Santa Barbara News Press: I wondered if there was an additional period of 10 days, or 30 days, for public dissemination of the report?

Dr. Gooder: It is my understanding, Mr. Sullivan, that this is the Public Hearing. We have sent this to the State Clearinghouse which distributes it to 15 or 20 agencies. So we will be hearing from them as well, and it looks to me that the time schedule is such -- they have until the 1st, or the end of this month. It looks to me that the final draft should be brought to the Board probably at a Special Meeting on May 1st, which will incorporate the results of this Public Hearing, and the critiques we have heard. It is not anticipated that there is further time for Public Hearing. We now await responses from the 15 or 20 State agencies. That is my understanding.

Mrs. Alexander: Are you ready for the question? (Directed to Board members) Now that we have a motion and a second, all in favor? A unanimous vote of 'Yes'. Opposed? None. So ordered. No further business?

Dr. Gooder: None, Mrs. Alexander.

Mrs. Alexander: I declare the meeting adjourned. (Time: 5:05 p.m.)
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