April 14, 1975

Don Trent
Director
Facilities Development
Santa Barbara Community College District
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, California 93109

CITY COLLEGE EIR RECOMMENDATIONS

Submitted herewith are comments from the Transportation Division regarding your draft EIR. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

[Signature]
R. W. Puddicombe

cc: Bruce Thompson, Planning Director
    John Jostes, Environmental Analyst
DATE: April 7, 1975
TO: Transportation Engineer
FROM: Transportation Planning Engineer
SUBJECT: SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE MASTER PLAN DRAFT EIR - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT REVIEW

I have reviewed the Santa Barbara City College Master Plan EIR with respect to the transportation element. It is a large document of 317 pages and is extremely large in scope. In fact the project is so large in scope and takes place over such a long period of time that is difficult to evaluate this project. The Master Plan and the EIR are positive steps in planned development and each does an excellent job in evaluating the problems and issues. However, there are so many issues and smaller projects involved that further review of these points will be necessary before they are built. For instance, we now go through an involved environmental review process and a public input process for a minor street widening project, but the SBCC Master Plan EIR proposes street widening measures that double the size of some existing streets (i.e. Loma Alta from 2 to 4 lanes). Surely this EIR, which hardly mentions the Loma Alta widening cannot substitute for the environmental process we now go through. Similarly, the Planning Commission went through a lengthy process to set a population limit in the City so that we can "maintain our existing quality of life", such as uncongested streets, but expansion of SBCC would have the same effect on congestion as a population increase.

Consequently, it appears that it would be premature for the Transportation Division to endorse or disapprove of the SBCC Master Plan based on the EIR.

Some specific comments on the EIR follow:

1. All of the comments and concerns of the Transportation Division were either addressed or at least mentioned in the EIR.

2. The EIR was in general very comprehensive.

3. Like most EIR's the mitigation measures are just suggestions that are not very detailed and are not part of the actual proposal.
4. The total number of parking spaces that would be built for the maximum capacity plan is approximately 1700. The large number of parking spaces would be of concern to the Environmental Protection Agency (re: Parking Management Regulations), Coastal Commission and the City Transportation Division. At this time, I feel uneasy about recommending so much parking for students when we are trying to encourage a modal split.

5. The street widenings suggested are not planned or budgeted and might never occur.

6. Although lack of space and pedestrian conflict are legitimate concerns, I believe too little space was designated to the bicycle, especially in view of the 1700 automobile parking spaces and suggested street widenings. Bike parking and a bikeway connecting the two campuses are recommended.

7. An area wide transportation study and plan should be undertaken in the SBCC area. A total approach to the transportation problem has not been taken in this EIS, and before I endorse this SBCC Master Plan, I would like to see more of an attempt at an overall transportation plan. Perhaps SBCC and the City could jointly work on or fund such a study and plan.

8. My recommendation is that each plan be presented as a separate plan for review, beginning with the 1975 Plan, but having the Master Plan as a general guide. The two major transportation impacts in the 1975 plan are:

   (1) The West Campus parking lot of 483 spaces.
   (2) A pedestrian bridge over Loma Alta.

There is a question concerning the review process of this project. SBCC held a hearing on the draft EIR on April 3, 1975 and will compile the final EIR by May 1, 1975. I strongly believe that further study and City input into this project at all stages is desirable. SBCC seems to believe that their hearings are adequate. I have asked John Jostes, the City Environmental Analyst, to determine what is the review process for this project.

Peter J. Clark
Transportation Planning Engineer

PJC:ns
April 23, 1975

City of Santa Barbara
Public Works Department
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, Calif. 93102

Attention: R. W. Puddicombe, Director

Dear Mr. Puddicombe:

I would like to acknowledge receipt of comments from the Transportation Division, regarding our Master Plan Draft EIR. I have forwarded the comments to Dr. Goodar, Secretary-Clark/Board of Trustees, and to Dr. Orrin Sage, EIR Consultant, for inclusion in the EIR, and for response. Please be informed that our Board of Trustees will meet on May 1, 1975, to consider EIR Consultant evaluations on comments reviewed from the community.

I have not discussed your letter with Dr. Sage, but I would like to comment on the degree of specificity on the EIR. As we discussed in our meetings preliminary to the EIR regarding the Master Plan, it is not possible to have the type of information that is generated in working drawings and specifications in a Master Plan concept. The College could not afford the architectural or engineering services necessary for that type of detail at this time for all projects that are to be contemplated in the future. Also, many of the EIR mitigating factors and the continual dialog between City College and the City, will directly affect both the timetable and degree of work necessary for any part of the Master Plan to be implemented.

I would like to invite any of the City staff that would be interested to attend our May 1st meeting in which the Board will be evaluating the EIR Consultant’s review of public comments. In regards to the review process, I considered review procedures with Paul Boustead, CEGO, District adopted guidelines, and the EIR Consultant, Dr. Sage. Your concern for an area-wide transportation study and plan in the Santa Barbara City College area, I believe is valid. I discussed with Mr. Leffler on December 13, 1974, prior to the completion of the Draft EIR, such a possibility. I indicated at that time that a transportation plan might be more appropriate if it involved more of the contributors to the traffic problems than just the City College. I indicated that I would like to be a part of such a joint committee, representing the College. It was my understanding that Mr. Leffler would study the possibility of such a committee, perhaps on an informal level to begin with. Since college students come from areas beyond Goleta and Carpinteria, they involve City, County and Metropolitan District jurisdiction. At our Public Hearing on the Draft EIR, April 3, 1975, I was directed by one of the Board members
to explore this possibility further, and I indicated that I would contact Mr.
Leffler regarding such a joint committee. With this letter, I would like to ex-
press my willingness to be involved in any type of South Coast transportation
committee that the City Transportation Division might feel appropriate. I firmly
believe that this is a problem that has not been solved by any of the school dis-
tricts or City agencies, and warrants our joint efforts. Therefore, it cannot be
resolved independently by the District in the Master Plan.

In addition to studies that have been made by the traffic consultant, Master Plan
architects, and staff, our students currently are very active in exploring alterna-
tives to the traffic problems at City College. I would welcome the opportunity to
discuss the formation of a transportation committee with Mr. Leffler at the earliest
possible date.

Sincerely,

Don Trent
Director
Facilities Development

cc: Clint Leffler
    Paul Hefstead
    Bruce Thompson
    Dr. Sage
    Dr. Cooper
    Dr. Sorensen
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: ☐ Secretary for Resources
    1416 Ninth Street, Room 1311
    Sacramento, California 95814

    County Clerk
    County of Santa Barbara

    P.O. Drawer CC
    Santa Barbara, California 93102

FROM: (Lead Agency)

Santa Barbara Community College District
720 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, California 93109

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21103 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Santa Barbara City College Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Clearinghouse Number (If submitted to State Clearinghouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Don Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>721 Cliff Drive - Santa Barbara, California 93109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description: The SBCC Master Plan is for the development of facilities necessary to meet District educational goals and objectives for existing and projected enrollment. The rate of development of the multi-phased plan will reflect actual enrollment needs of the community. Development will be accommodated on the existing 42.69 acre campus and 33.47 acre adjacent site recently purchased by the District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is to advise that the Santa Barbara Community College District (Lead Agency) has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project has been ☑ approved by the Lead Agency.
   ☐ disapproved

2. The project ☐ will have a significant effect on the environment.
   ☑ will not

3. ☑ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   ☐ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. A copy of the Negative Declaration is attached.

Date Received for Filing

Signature Dr. Glenn G. Gooder
Secretary/Clerk to the Board of Trustees
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I. LIST OF PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES COMMENTING ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1. Community Development Department
   City Hall, De La Guerra Plaza
   Santa Barbara, California 93102

2. Sidney R. Frank
   Santa Barbara City College
   Board of Trustees Member
   721 Cliff Drive
   Santa Barbara, California 93109

3. Peter J. Clark, Transportation Planning Engineer
   Public Works Department
   City of Santa Barbara

4. Mrs. Kathryn Alexander, President
   SBCC Board of Trustees

5. Mr. C. D. Platt
   1009 Del Sol
   Santa Barbara, California 93109

6. Mr. Eric Mankin, Reporter
   Santa Barbara News and Review

7. Mr. Sidney R. Frank
   SBCC Board of Trustees
   (Comments from EIR Public Hearing)

8. Ms. Miriam Hawthorne
   Commission on the Status for Women

9. Mrs. Ann Gutshall, Vice President
   SBCC Board of Trustees

10. Mr. Robert Vickery, employee
    Santa Barbara City Transportation

11. Mr. Benjamin P. J. Wells
    SBCC Board of Trustees

12. Mr. Don Trent, Director
    SBCC Facilities Development

13. Mr. Steve Sullivan, Reporter
    Santa Barbara News Press
II. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FOR DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Comment: The road from Plaza del Mar-Pershing Park should be very carefully designed and constructed so that the least possible damage is done to its wooded environment and the historic stone wall. If portions of the wall must be disturbed, then they should be replaced with the same stones so the wall's integrity is preserved. We question the use of the word "none" on P. 181 under "history".

Response: Proper road design and careful replacement of any disturbed stones should mitigate any unavoidable adverse impacts.

Comment: At Capacity 5040, Figure 14 shows 706 parking spaces in Pershing and Leadbetter Parks, which would evidently be provided in a parking structure. We strongly question the advisability of placing a large structure of this type in a City park. It would be out of character with use of the area. Another important point is that the structure appears to be located immediately in front of the new Old Spanish Days Carriage Museum, thus completely blocking the museum from view and preventing access for floats housed in the museum.

Response: Adoption of mitigation measures to assure a shift in travel mode away from the automobile should eliminate the long-term need for the parking structure.

Comment: On pages 34-36 "Architectural Character" there is only slight reference to designing the campus buildings in context with the "Santa Barbara Character". Some of the newer structures on the east campus have seriously lacked this recognition of the unique community in which the college is located. Many architecturally sensitive members of the community have been disappointed with this tendency and hope that the Board of Trustees corrects this deficiency in plans for all future buildings. We agree with statements on pages 127 and 195.

Response: Campus Buildings should be designed in context with the "Santa Barbara Character" type of architecture.

Comment: On pages 41-42 the report should emphasize that the outdoor lighting fixtures should be designed and located so as to prevent intrusion of lighting glare into residential areas. Avoid offensive light sources in general.

Response: Page 42 states that "Fixtures should be selected and positioned to minimize glare on surrounding areas".

Comment: A correction on p. 79, first line under "history"--Cabrillo was a Portuguese exploring for Spain, but not a Spaniard. Also, the Portola expedition was 227 years later, not 225. It is highly regrettable that this same paragraph makes no mention of the Santa Barbara Presidio as the origin of the
city—founded in 1782. It was one of only four such forts in California. On Page 80 "Dibblee" and "Hunt-Stambach" are misspelled. Also on p. 136.

Response: Thank you for pointing out these oversights.

Comment: On p. 127, No. 4, the words "and hotel" should be placed after "residential" in the first line.

Response: Agreed

Comment: We appreciate the comments on pages 131-133 with respect to air quality, view protection, and lighting.

Response: None

Comments: On page 136 under "Archeology" mention is made of disturbance to archeological materials when the access road is improved. However, the extent of the improvements and the disturbance are not given. (also p. 181)

Response: It is stated that the nature of these remains are presently unknown. Therefore, under mitigation measures, it is concluded that "any uncovered archaeological remains are to be left as undisturbed as possible until the faculty archeologist and staff can properly remove the archaeological materials." Access road improvements will require a minimum width of twenty feet with an inside radius on the turns of at least thirty-five feet.

Comment: Under "history" on p. 136 no mention is made of the site of the castillo for the Presidio, an artillery bastion with earthen embankments which existed in the southeasterly portion of the east campus. It served as a defense from naval attack for the Spanish Presidio. The approximate location is an important historic site.

Response: The southeasterly portion of the east campus will be almost completely unaffected by the Master Plan. (p. 25)

Comment: On pages 146-147 mention is made of future street improvements to accommodate increased traffic congestion from increased enrollment. However, there is no indication of the extent of the improvements needed. Also, it should not be assumed that the City will widen any of the streets in the area of the campus.

Response: Pages 189 to 191 mention specific street improvements as suggested by Crommeline-Pringle. No assumption was made that the City will widen any of these streets.

Comment: We do not agree with the statement in the second paragraph of page 178 that beach users would be willing to use the parking structure in Pershing Park.
Response: They may be willing to use this if it was the only area available. If mitigation measures are adopted to promote a change in travel mode, then the parking structure may not be necessary.

Comment: Page 183 contains a very broad estimate of additional water needs, and we believe the Public Works Department should speak to this matter.

Response: Please see response to comments of Sidney R. Frank.

Comment: Page 184, the last sentence states that pressures on beach parking will be substantial. We feel this is an avoidable impact with adequate provision for parking on-campus.

Response: These pressures on beach parking can also be avoided if changes in travel modes are implemented.

Comment: The adverse impact on City parks and on the Carriage Museum by the proposed Pershing Park parking structure is not mentioned in the report. Also, the 1980 plan shows parking in the museum's driveway.

Response: Implementation of alternative travel modes should alleviate the need for the parking structure. A large parking structure adjacent to the park and museum would create adverse aesthetic impacts.

Comment: We regret the plan's lack of policies and programs which might be devised by City College to promote travel to and from the campus by some other means than automobile. The need is mentioned, but no programs offered.

Response: See mitigation measures for the traffic section. The Santa Barbara City College Board of Trustees will need to adopt specific plans that can assure a change in travel mode away from the automobile.

2. SIDNEY R. FRANK

Comment: The Summary (p.141) statement totally ignores the calculations showing that the emissions from mobile sources due to the proposed action will decrease from 1973-1990 for CO (-68.8%), HC (-50%), and NO (-50%). Particulates and Sulfur Oxides will increase by 30% (incorrectly shown as constant on the table) however the actual amount is negligible: Particulates increasing from 34 to 44 lbs and Sulfur Oxides from 11 to 15 lbs annually.

Response: Page 87 and page 90 states that Environmental Protection Agency emission standards "indicates a steady downward trend in emission rates during the period 1975-1990 due to projected more effective anti-pollution devices on highway vehicles".
It is agreed that increased particulates and sulfur oxides would be negligible when compared to overall area quantities.

Comment: The comparison with the total emissions on the South Coast is only valid for the 1973 amounts since there is no valid way of predicting whether or not the South Coast mileage will be proportional to the projected SBCC mileage at any time in the future. Hence, the conclusion should be that the current contribution of SBCC to the South Coast emissions of about 2% will not be exceeded by the proposed action if both are equal.

Response: The projected value of a 2.5% contribution of SBCC to the South Coast emissions will probably be reduced if alternative travel modes are implemented. As stated above, it is not possible to predict an exact percentage of emissions in the future.

Comment: Finally, it should be emphasized that the summer vacation months of June, July and August are the months of highest incidence of smog and, accordingly, there would be negligible contribution from SBCC induced traffic. This factor should also be introduced in the sections devoted to the air quality background analysis of South Coast.

Response: SBCC summer enrollment for 1974 amounted to 1991 students. This was approximately 27 percent of the overall normal school year average daily attendance that would contribute to local emissions.

Comment: The emphasis on the entire South Coast water situation overshadows the actual impact due to SBCC expansion. The method of determining the gallons per day usage per student factor—dividing the annual SBCC water use by number of students—is crude since it does not allow for the water used by other than students. The value of 35 gpd termed "LOW" is, therefore, actually a high value.

Response: The determination of actual water usage was based on available data by dividing total water usage by the number of full time students. The value of 35 gpd per student for future enrollment was considered a reasonable figure for expansion since a whole new set of facilities and landscaping will be constructed on the west campus. The 35 gpd estimate was to include all water uses as stated on page 117.

Comment: The most elevating factor in the water use projections is the assumption of new faculty, staff and students and their families as residents in the Santa Barbara Water District. The use of the residential user factor of 183 gpd adds some 70% to the estimate of water use by 1990. Since there is no way of knowing the actual number of new people or where they will live relative to the Santa Barbara Water District,
the figure of 153 acre feet additional water need must be considered highly problematical.

Response: Figure 3J on page 160 does assume that new residents live within the City Water District. As noted in the above comment, this assumption does greatly increase the amount of projected water usage.

Comment: If one relates water use strictly due to the increase number of students at SBCC expanded campus using the gross factor of 35 gpd per student, one finds that the increase water use would amount to 90 acre feet—less than 25% of the stated current safe yield surplus. Hence, the conclusion that "unless the City of Santa Barbara is prepared to commit half of its entire current safe yield surplus..." is not only negatively phrased but is highly speculative, based as it is, on other than actual water use by students on campus.

Response: Concluding statement at the bottom of page 162 should read that "It is predicted that the Santa Barbara City College Master Plan will utilize approximately 25 per cent of the current safe yield water supply of the City of Santa Barbara."

Comment: Finally, no mention is made of the fact that only a small number of students will be on campus during the dry summer months when water supplies are most critical.

Response: Approximately 1991 students were enrolled for summer session 1974. Water would be consumed by those students during the summer session period. Landscaping and other use of the facilities by full time staff would also occur. However as stated in the above comment water usage would be reduced during the summer. Water supply shortages could however, be most acute during the latter part of September and October, before the fall rains. Fall semester courses normally would begin sometime during the month of September which would cause an increase in water usage.
3. PETER J. CLARK, TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ENGINEER, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

Comment: I have reviewed the Santa Barbara City College Master Plan EIR with respect to the transportation element. It is a large document of 317 pages and is extremely large in scope. In fact, the project is so large in scope and takes place over such a long period of time that it is difficult to evaluate this project. The Master Plan and the EIR are positive steps in planned development and each does an excellent job in evaluating the problems and issues. However, there are so many issues and smaller projects involved that further review of these points will be necessary before they are built. For instance, we now go through an involved environmental review process and a public input process for a minor street widening measures that double the size of some existing streets (i.e. Loma Alta from 2 to 4 lanes). Surely this EIR, which hardly mentions the Loma Alta widening cannot substitute for the environmental process we now go through. Similarly, the Planning Commission went through a lengthy process to set a population limit in the City so that we can "maintain our existing quality of life", such as uncongested streets, but expansion of SBCC would have the same effect on congestion as a population increase.

Consequently, it appears that it would be premature for the Transportation Division to endorse or disapprove of the SBCC Master Plan based on the EIR.

Response: The EIR focuses on the overall impacts of the SBCC Master Plan based on present environmental considerations. Since the Master Plan covers a broad expanse of time it is impossible to predict the environmental considerations at a point several years in the future. Future environments procedures for specific street widening projects would be done at the time the widening occurs. On the other hand, the SBCC Master Plan EIR points out that widening could be necessary if traffic congestion continues to increase in the future. Hence, the overall impacts are identified, and special emphasis is placed on establishing a joint planning process between SBCC and the City Transportation Department.

Comment: All of the comments and concerns of the Transportation Division were either addressed or at least mentioned in the EIR.

Response: None

Comment: The EIR was in general very comprehensive.

Response: None
Comment: Like most EIR's the mitigation measures are just suggestions that are not very detailed and are not part of the actual proposal.

Response: The mitigation measures suggest approaches to alleviate environmental impacts. Specific adoption of mitigation measures would be done by the SBCC Board of Trustees. More detailed study of the implementation and development of mitigation measures would need to be done by SBCC staff and the City, and then adopted by the Board. The EIR gives a choice of some of the measures that could be adopted and developed.

Comment: The total number of parking spaces that would be built for the maximum capacity plan is approximately 1700. The large number of parking spaces would be of concern to the Environmental Protection Agency (re: Parking Management Regulations), Coastal Commission and the City Transportation Division. At this time, I feel uneasy about recommending so much parking for students when we are trying to encourage a modal split.

Response: If a modal split or a shift away from the automobile is achieved by the time of the Maximum Capacity Plan, then the proposed parking spaces would not be needed.

Comment: The street widenings suggested are not planned or budgeted and might never occur.

Response: The street widenings discussed under mitigation measures were made even though they have not been budgeted or may never be budgeted. Once again, future trends, plans, and budgets are difficult to predict hence the street widening measures are possible suggestions that may be implemented at a later date.

Comment: Although lack of space and pedestrian conflict are legitimate concerns, I believe too little space was designated to the bicycle, especially in view of the 1700 automobile parking spaces and suggested street widenings. Bike parking and a bikeway connecting the two campuses are recommended.

Response: A campus bikeway and parking plan should be adopted as suggested in the Master Plan. This utilization of bicycles should coincide with the overall City bikeway plans for the SBCC area.

Comment: An area wide transportation study and plan should be undertaken in the SBCC area. A total approach to the transportation problem has not been taken in this EIS, and before I endorse this SBCC Master Plan, I would like to see more of an attempt at an overall transportation plan. Perhaps SBCC and the City could jointly work on or fund such a study and plan.

Response: Such a study is beyond the scope of the EIR. The EIR pointed out the potential impacts that could occur if an SBCC and City transportation plan was not worked out. The EIR also suggested that such a plan be implemented.
Comment: My recommendation is that each plan be presented as a separate plan for review, beginning with the 1975 Plan, but having the Master Plan as a general guide. The two major transportation impacts in the 1975 plan are:

(1) The West Campus parking lot of 483 spaces.
(2) A pedestrian bridge over Loma Alta.

Response: SBCC's willingness to work with the City as the Master Plan development occurs is public record. The two major transportation impacts for the 1975 plan should be reviewed and discussed with the City as the beginning of an on-going planning process throughout the effective life of the Master Plan.

Comment: There is a question concerning the review process of this project. SBCC held a hearing on the draft EIR on April 3, 1975 and will compile the final EIR by May 1, 1975. I strongly believe that further study and City input into this project at all stages is desirable. SBCC seems to believe that their hearings are adequate. I have asked John Jostes, the City Environmental Analyst, to determine what is the review process for this project.

Response: Approval of the EIR, does not mean approval of all factors of the SBCC Master Plan. The purpose of the EIR process is to allow the public, governmental bodies, and the review agency an opportunity to observe the predicted impacts of the Plan. Approval of certain factors of the Plan come at a later date by the issuance of permits and obtaining go-ahead from the SBCC Board of Trustees. The public hearing was with regard to obtaining public input to the EIR. SBCC has stated that future City public - SBCC input is necessary in the ongoing development of their facility via the Master Plan. Actual review procedures were implemented from discussions with Mr. Paul Nefstead, City Environmental Hearing Officer, and from SBCC District adopted guidelines based on the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. The public hearing was advertised in local newspapers and copies of the draft EIR were distributed to the State Clearinghouse and the local governmental agencies and libraries.

4. MRS. KATHRYN ALEXANDER, PRESIDENT SBCC BOARD OF TRUSTEES (Public Hearing Comments)

Comment: In the section 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.

Response: 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.

Statistics from the College Information Office suggest that public use of the SBCC campus is an ongoing occurrence with demand actually greater than available facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*COLLEGE YEAR</th>
<th>FACILITIES RESERVATION DATES REQUESTED BY ON-CAMPUS STAFF OR STUDENT CLUBS</th>
<th>FACILITIES RESERVATION DATES REQUESTED BY OFF-CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>504 (73%)</td>
<td>323 (213%)</td>
<td>827 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1972 desk audit showed time needed to complete facilities reservations was at least 65%; percentage of Senior Secretary's time needed for same function now estimated at 80%+.)

In addition to completed facilities reservations, in the months of September and October (1974), 56 individuals, organizations, etc., requested use of our facilities; requests were either canceled by the requesting party after initial request was made or by SBCC because of lack of facilities, etc.

Data also indicate that approximately 20% of all requests for specific dates are for use of more than one room.

Each "date" request can vary from a minimum of two or three telephone calls to as high as 25 calls to clear, confirm and arrange for facilities usage.

*Figures do not include requests for Summer (middle of June to beginning of September).
5. MR. C. D. PLATT, 1009 DEL SOL, SANTA BARBARA. (Public Hearing Comments)

Comment: 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.

Response: None.

Comments: I was wondering what measures were taken to publicize the existence of this (EIR Public Hearing).

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

In addition, copies were sent to various agencies in the city that work with SBCC's planning effort which includes Public Works, Traffic Engineer, Development of Community Services. In addition, copies were sent to the consultants who worked on it (EIR) and the Master Plan architect.

Comments: What steps taken beyond legal requirements and public advertisement to let people know this (SBCC Master Plan and EIR) was available.

Response: A well publicized open house was held approximately a month and a half ago on the Master Plan called the "Look of Tomorrow", in which, every word that was included in the document was on display. SBCC had a very good public turnout for that event. The EIR was also advertised.

Comment: 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.

Response: There was legal advertising and also a discussion at the last two Board meetings which set the agenda for the Public Hearing.

Comment: But there was no announcement sent out that the thing was available?

Response: The Santa Barbara News & Review receives a copy of the agenda of each meeting and those items have been included there. (EIR Public Hearing date).
Comment: 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.

Response: Anyone who reads the agenda, and the agendas are distributed to the press, would have known of the public hearing. This would have been a method for finding out about the Public Hearing.

Comments: For example, when a freeway project comes up what often happens is it just appears in the newspaper, and it is hard to know if it is available in a library, etc. I don't remember seeing it (SBCC EIR availability) in this case.

Response: Probably four news releases have been done and they have all been sent to the Santa Barbara News. You are welcome to obtain copies after the meeting.

Comments: 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 (parking) space on campus. It occurs that there should be alternate forms of transportation.

Response: 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. Under mitigation measures in the EIR, it was strongly suggested that alternative transportation modes be implemented and one of the mitigation measures was to facilitate, or help facilitate, bikeways.

Bikeways and bike parking are included on the campus, as there would also be pedestrian paths. There would be parking areas for bikes located as conviently close as possible, as stated in the Master Plan. It (SBCC Master Plan) did say they would not cross the pedestrian bridge into areas where there would be congestion or possibility of accident with pedestrians.

Comment: Concerning the proportion of parking to students - is that greater or less?

Response: The parking study was made by Robert Crommelin, consultant, and the Master Plan architects. They did a considerable amount of study on other community colleges, UCSC, and came out with the proportional member of students and also included contingencies in the Master Plan. Also recommended in the EIR was that SBCC study alternate means of having students come onto campus.
Comment: If in the future it is crucial to minimize adverse effects of traffic congestion outside the campus, and to encourage alternate ways of getting there, then why are all these parking places being constructed?

Response: The Master Plan gave this contingency and states that if there are not alternative (transportation) 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 (EIR) that we study alternate means.

Comment: So the college presently has no plans to construct any parking phases?

Response: Yes, plans to construct the first phase for 355 cars -- are on the drawing boards right now.

It would be helpful to note, that in the Master Plan there are 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 can be anticipated, 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. There was an effort to be realistic about that, so that decision could be made as time goes on about which level of parking will have to be implemented.

Parking lots that are now being constructed or planned for construction will, of course, alleviate the present environmental impact of congestion for parking, which is a very serious problem here, and this was considered under the no-project alternative (of the EIR).

Comment: 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 --

Response: Mitigation Measures are included in the Master Plan and EIR to take care of the erosion.

Comment: 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.
Response: That gets back to the reason why the District bought the property. The purchase was an alternate to the project that was proposed which was the apartment complex. The no-project alternative means that the facilities plan and the Master Plan would not occur.

Comment: 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.

Response: 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. 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.

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 that was very clearly presented to the public. At the time, it was their will that they prefer that City College develop the property to the alternative they had at the time.

Comment: 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?

Response: 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. That means the District must provide educational facilities.

It's going to take resources for those students wherever they are provided in this District, and it appeared to be the wish of the people in this community, after they studied the issue very carefully, that it was in their best interests, financially and otherwise, that they be provided across the street rather than somewhere else. It should be indicated that on the water issue, SBCC is not creating a service, but providing a service. People will be using the water wherever they happen to be within the SBCC District, in Goleta Valley, or in Carpinteria. 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.

Comment: It seems like the only alternative to the adverse impact is either build on or have the land erode. The EIR statement is supposed to be examining alternatives.
Response: In the EIR the no-project alternative was making the assumption that the physical land area of "west campus" would remain as is. If it remains as is, there will be severe erosion, and siltation and flooding problems, as currently is happening. Would the City College go in there and do the erosion control and then just let the land sit after erosion control measures were taken gets down to budgeting problems. If no project did happen and the City College owned the land, then the budgetary matters would have to be taken as to where erosion control measures would be supplied. or the land would just continue to erode away.

The money that is being used to provide present development of that property and the erosion control is money that the people of the entire District voted for by 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 it for the purpose of college buildings which is half-way in between the two alternatives. Another alternative for the school district, if there was no project there, would be to look around for someplace else for a project and that's the other alternative discussed in the EIR.

7. Mr. Sydney R. Frank, SBCC Board of Trustees (Public Hearing comments).

Comment: I just would like to make one comment 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. 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.

Response: 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 it was felt that the 35 gals. per day was a least in the ball park as a realistic figure was because the west campus area will be expanded, it will
be landscaped, it will be built on, and additional water will
be needed for development of its west campus facility. 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 or
facilities. It is an estimate and it is the best estimate that
can be made with the available data.

8. Ms. Miriam Hawthorne, Commission on the Statue for Women (Public
Hearing comments).

Comment: 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?

Response: Design of future buildings are based on SBCC input to the
architect including water conservation measures. Also, the
Master Plan has a Master Landscape Plan which includes a plant
list which are basically native materials.

Comment: 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?

Response: 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 a building plan program is written 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 one sits down with the architect
and starts specifying the particular fixtures. SBCC 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.

9. Mrs. Ann Gutshall, Vice-President, SBCC Board of Trustees.

Comment: 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?

Response: Once the questions are transcribed in a typed form, then they
will be responded to. 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 assure that readers will look at the addendum first to be
sure that they are not reading the draft, instead of the
final EIR, out of context.
Comment: I guess what I am asking is will there by 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?

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

Comment: Mr. Trent, you said something about two years ago that it had been suggested there be a committee of the city transportation people and SBCC in regards to transportation planning and nothing has happened.

Response: Discussions with Mr. Lefler (City of Santa Barbara Transportation) about traffic in general resulted in SBCC Master Plan review suggestions for a Southcoast region committee. The committee has not been set up and it is just an idea generated within the last two months.

Comment: Who then should carry through with this idea?

Response: It is SBCC's understanding that it would be the traffic engineering department and SBCC would be invited.

Comment: What if we start it and invited them:

Response: SBCC doesn't have the expertise to do it. In their (City of Santa Barbara Transportation) office they have the expertise in these types of things and SBCC would like to be in a position to be of help.

Comment: 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?

Response: A letter can be sent to begin setting up meetings with appropriate agencies. It is really a joint venture since area wide planning must encompass both SBCC and the City of Santa Barbara.

Comment: Are you saying that we will be asking the appropriate agencies to now start a feasibility study on an alternate system for students to get to the campus?
Response: SBCC could send a letter to Mr. Lefler and ask him if it might be possible for some type of response in order to get together and talk about our common needs.

Comment: 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 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.

Response: SBCC is programmed to have 365 new spaces for parking. Construction can start about two months after this (EIR) process is over.

10. Mr. Robert Vickery, employee, Santa Barbara City Transportation (Public Hearing comments).

Comment: 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 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.

Response: The EIR, has suggested certain mitigation measures for this. These measures would have to be adopted by City College or an alternative series of measures which would essentially achieve this. Modal split some time in the future.

SBCC staff have had many conversations in the past couple of years with Mr. Clint Lefler of the City. They have discussed 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. SBCC staff would like very much to be involved in that committee so they can pull together some type of program. A lot of information is already available which could be supplemented with other information. SBCC alone can't provide a plan for a transit system, or a plan for solving the problem that the transit district plans to solve by this date but SBCC would like to participate. The plan is not something that SBCC can develop alone but instead, it must be considered a joint effort.

Comment: 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.

Response: The detail for that type of planning is dependent on SBCC cooperation with other agencies and vice-versa. As suggested under the EIR Mitigation Measures, alternative means of travel to SBCC should be implemented with the cooperation of SBCC and the City of Santa Barbara.

11. Mr. Benjamin P. J. Wells, SBCC Board of Trustees (Public Hearing comments).

Comment: Now along that line, too, on the bus system, 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.

Response: That is part of the idea of a joint meeting in order to discuss this need - want relationship and to determine what types of information are necessary.

12. Mrs. Joyce H. Powell, SBCC Board of Trustees (Public Hearing comment).

Comment: The Board on occasion has talked about parking fees 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.

Response: Actually this is mentioned in the EIR report, and it is pointed out that community colleges are supposed to be freely available to people. Suppose SBCC charges $100 for a parking sticker and thereby excluded a sizeable portion of the people who might otherwise be coming. The matter has to be thought about in long-range planning.

Comment: It could be that anybody on financial aid would have their parking fee waived, or something like that.
Response: Automobile disincentives can also be done in concurrent with an alternative transportation development system, such as a minibus or shuttle system.

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

Response: Automobile disincentives should be developed over a period of time. The Master Plan identified existing need by today's standards but recommended that SBCC conduct studies and enter into long-range planning. For instance, concepts on traffic and bicycles have changed drastically in just the past year and even more so in the last two years.

Comment: 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.

Response: The EIR report is really only as good as the review agency that is responsible for it. If SBCC really wants to follow the mitigation measures in the EIR, then it is up to the Board to implement some of these mitigation measures that would alleviate the adverse environmental impacts.

12. Mr. Don Trent, SBCC Facilities Development Director (Public Hearing comment).

Comment: 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.

Response: In generalities as far as mitigation measures go, let's say for water consumption, the Board can state that the water conservation issues 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 - the specific means of water conservation measures would be included within the bid.


Comment: I wondered if there was an additional period of 10 days, or 30 days, for public dissemination of the report?
Response: The meeting being attended today is the Public Hearing for the SBCC Master Plan EIR as required by law. 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 comments from State and local agencies.
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