

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
BOARD AGENDA LETTER**



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: 6/27/02
Department: Planning and Development
Budget Unit: 053
Agenda Date: 7/9/02
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 3.5 hours
Continued Item: Yes
If Yes, date from: May 14, 2002
Document FileName: G:\GROUP\Dev_Rev\WP\TM_TPM\1440
0S\14487 - Prov. Landing\board letter 7-
9.doc

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Steven L. DeCamp, Deputy Director

STAFF CONTACT: Larry Appel, Supervising Planner (x6261)
Steve Rodriguez, Planner (682-3413)

SUBJECT: Providence Landing Residential Project, Planning and Development case numbers 99-GP-004, 99-RZ-004, TM 14,487, 99-DP-020, 01DP-00000-00016, 02LA-00000-00004, 02LA-00000-00006 and 02LA-00000-00006.

Recommendations : Consider the Planning Commission's recommendation for project approval and:

1. Adopt the required findings for the project specified in Attachment A of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, including CEQA findings; and
2. Approve the Final Environmental Impact Report 01-EIR-03, and adopt the mitigation monitoring program contained in the conditions of approval as amended at the Planning Commission at their March 13, 2002 hearing; and
3. Approve General Plan Amendment 99-GP-004, to amend the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element COMP-5 by changing the Land Use Designation from RES-4.6 (Residential - 4.6 units per acre) to RES-12.3 (Residential - 12.3 units per acre) on a 6.95-acre portion of the project site to facilitate the development of up to 61 affordable dwelling units, and adopt the Resolution included as Attachment H of the staff report dated March 13, 2002;
4. Approve Rezone 99-RZ-004, to rezone 84.6 acres from "RR-10" to "7-R-1"; 4.0 acres from "RR-10" to "3-E-1"; 6.95 acres from "RR-10" to "DR-10"; 38.3 acres from "RR-10" to "REC"; and 6.6 acres from "RR-10" to "RR-5" and adopt the Ordinance included as Attachment I of the staff report dated March 13, 2002;

5. Approve Vesting Tentative Tract Map 14,487, subject to the conditions included as Attachment B of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Board of Supervisors hearing of July 9, 2002;
6. Approve 99-DP-020, subject to the conditions included as Attachment C of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Board of Supervisors hearing of July 9, 2002;
7. Approve 01DVP-00000-00016, subject to the conditions included as Attachment D of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Planning Commission hearing of March 13, 2002.
8. Approve 02LA-00000-00004, subject to the conditions included as Attachment E of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Planning Commission hearing of March 13, 2002;
9. Approve 02LA-00000-00005, subject to the conditions included as Attachment F of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Planning Commission hearing of March 13, 2002;
10. Approve 02LA-00000-00006, subject to the conditions included as Attachment G of the staff report dated March 13, 2002, as amended at the Planning Commission hearing of March 13, 2002;

The application involves AP Nos. 097-371-21 (project site) and 097-102-01, 97-102-02, 97,104-01, 97-103-10 and 097-103-11 (lot line adjustments), located along the southern portion of Vandenberg Village and north of and adjacent to the Lompoc city limits, Third Supervisorial District.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendation is primarily aligned with actions required by law or by routine business necessity.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

At the May 14, 2002 hearing regarding the Providence Landing project, your Board presented to staff a number of questions and requests for additional information. The information that was requested is provided below. In response to the information requests and changes to the project that are described below, there have been minor changes to several of the conditions of approval that were provided in the March 13, 2002 Planning Commission staff report. The proposed changes to the conditions of approval for the Providence Landing project are provided in Attachment A.

Since your Board's first hearing on this project, the applicant has revised the project's drainage plan. The revisions include the addition of six storm water runoff retardation basins that would be located throughout the project site. The purpose of the additional basins are to: reduce the peak storm water discharges from the project site; to allow runoff to be discharged to existing drainage channels that are located on Vandenberg Air Force Base in a manner that is similar to existing conditions; and to provide runoff characteristics that would allow the Flood Control District to determine that the project does not require drainage easements or other agreements from the Air Force. Six residential units have been removed from the project to accommodate the additional retardation basins. The project now contains 267 single-family residences and 61 attached affordable units. Tract Map 14,487 has also been revised to reflect the proposed changes to the project (Attachment B). Additional information regarding the proposed changes to the project's drainage plan are provided below.

The proposed project includes lot line adjustments that would extend the side and rear yards of 29 residential lots that adjoin the project site. To comply with the requirements of a new state law, however, only five of the proposed lot line adjustments can be considered at this time. Since the last Board hearing on this project, the applicant has filed an application for Tract Map No. TM 14,601 (02TRM-00000-00004), which would adjust the side and rear yards of the remaining 24 adjoining parcels.

Off-Site Drainage. The previous drainage plan that was submitted for the Providence Landing project would have collected storm water runoff from the project site and from the southern portion of Vandenberg Village in two large retardation basins located in the southeast and southwest corners of the site. The collected runoff would have been released from the basins into two drainage channels located on Vandenberg Air Force Base. Since this plan would have resulted in the diversion of runoff from several small drainages that are located south of the central portion of the project site, the Flood Control District required that the project applicant obtain a drainage easement from the Air Force. The requirements of the Air Force to obtain the easements were outlined in a letter dated February 19, 2002 (see Attachment C). The Air Force has indicated that the process to approve the requested easements could take year or longer to complete.

To avoid the time delay associated with obtaining drainage easements from the Air Force, the applicant has revised the proposed drainage plan. The revised drainage plan no longer diverts runoff away from off-site drainage channels, and the basins would reduce peak storm water flows when compared to existing runoff conditions. The revised drainage plan would no longer intercept drainage from the southern portion of Vandenberg Village, and would pass that runoff into existing channels in a manner that is similar to existing conditions. The Flood Control District has determined that the changes to existing runoff characteristics that would result from the revised drainage plan would not require that easements or other agreements be obtained from the Air Force.

Each of the additional retardation basins would be located adjacent to an open space area where collected water would be discharged. Each of the additional basins would also be located adjacent to proposed residences. The location of the additional retardation basins is highlighted on Attachment B.

The design and operation characteristics of each of the additional basins are summarized on Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
Storm Water Runoff Retardation Basins
Design Characteristics

Basin Location	Approximate Surface Area (1)	Depth Below Surrounding Grade	Water Depth/Volume 25-yr storm		Water Depth/Volume 100-yr storm	
			Depth	Vol	Depth	Vol
1. South of Lunar Circle	0.27 ac	8 ft	1.67 ft	0.44 af	7.03 ft	1.05 af
2. East of Mercury Ave, south of Venus Ave	0.11 ac	2 ft	0.60 ft	0.18 af	1.20 ft	0.27 af
3. West of Celestial Way/Enterprise Ave	0.14 ac	4 ft	2.36 ft	0.33 af	3.70 ft	0.51 af
4. Near Celestial Way/Gallifrey Way	0.23 ac	6 ft	3.34 ft	2.10 af	4.60 ft	3.00 af
5. South of Europa Avenue	0.29 ac	8 ft	0.91 ft	0.24 af	6.98 ft	1.07 af
6. East of Moonglow Road	0.22 ac	6 ft	3.04 ft	1.02 af	4.93 ft	1.65 af

Approximate surface area measured at the top of the basin banks.
 af = acre-foot

Table 2
Storm Water Runoff Retardation Basins
Operation Characteristics

Basin Location/Drainage Channel	Existing Storm Flows (cfs)		Post-Development Storm Flows (cfs)		Water Storage Time for a 25-Year Storm (hours)
	25-year storm	100-year storm	25-year storm	100-year storm	
1. South of Lunar Circle	8.9	12.6	1.8	4.0	2.96
2. East of Mercury Ave, south of Venus Ave	21.6	30.6	1.5	3.0	6.82
3. West of Celestial Way/Enterprise Ave	6.5	9.3	1.2	1.0	3.31
4. Near Celestial Way/Gallifrey Way	31.9	45.0	1.7	4.0	3.75
5. South of Europa Avenue	24.2	34.5	20.3	26.0	0.14
6. East of Moonglow Road	21.1	30.0	1.8	3.4	6.83

The proposed retardation basins would reduce peak storm water flows leaving the project site, and runoff would continue to be conveyed off-site in patterns that are similar to existing conditions. By reducing the peak water flows and minimizing water diversions, ongoing erosion that is occurring in areas south of the project site would be reduced and the hydrology that presently exists, and that is necessary to support any wetland or riparian areas adjacent to the project site, would be maintained. One such wetland that has been identified (Althouse and Meade, June 2002) is in an area located on Vandenberg Air Force Base, south of the large eastern retardation basin.

Previous investigations that have been conducted in the project area have concluded that “based on the site survey and the review of available records for California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog it appears that the U.S. Air Force property south of the Providence Landing project site does not contain any suitable breeding habitat for either of these two listed amphibian species” (Collins, June 2002). Due to the absence of suitable breeding habitat for sensitive animal species in the project area, and the minimal water diversions that would occur as a result of the project, the proposed drainage plan would not result in significant impacts to sensitive animal species.

Runoff water that is collected in the proposed retardation basins would be discharge to open space areas through a pipe extending from the basin. This type of water discharge would have the potential to result in significant erosion impacts in the discharge area. Proposed Tract Map conditions of approval No.10 (Erosion Control Plan) and No. 47 (Riparian and Wetland Protection) require the approval and implementation of erosion control measures. The implementation of these conditions would reduce potential erosion impacts from water discharges to a less than significant level, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

There are several known archaeological sites on the Providence Landing property and on Vandenberg Air Force Base in the vicinity of the project site. A recent archaeological resource investigation sponsored by the project applicant also identified artifacts (i.e., chert flakes) within and adjacent to several of the drainage channels where runoff water would be discharged (Gibson’s Archaeological Consulting, June 2002). The revised drainage plan would not require any off-site drainage infrastructure development on Vandenberg Air Force Base, and would not have the potential to adversely affect cultural resources that are located on the Base. The recent archaeological analysis concluded that an increase in erosion as a result of modified drainage characteristics would have the potential to result in significant impacts to identified and unidentified cultural resources. The additional retardation basins, however, would minimize the potential for off-site erosion by reducing peak water flows. Therefore, the revised drainage plan would not have a significant impact on archaeological resources.

Each of the additional retardation basins would be located adjacent to proposed residences. To minimize the potential for environmental impacts and land use conflicts, the applicant has proposed to implement the following design and operation features.

Setbacks. Setbacks between the additional retardation basins and adjacent property lines would conform with the requirements of the County’s Grading Ordinance. At minimum, there would be a five-foot separation between to top of bank/toe of slope and the adjacent residence property line.

Fencing. The applicant has proposed to install a six-foot tall fence around the retardation basins in accordance with the requirements of the Flood Control District. The fencing would be made from a low-maintenance vinyl material and would resemble a wrought iron fence.

Landscaping. Each of the basins would be planted with grass, and native shrubs and trees would be provided around the perimeter of the basins. All landscaping plans for the basins would be

reviewed and approved by the Board of Architectural Review. Conceptual landscaping plans for the basins are depicted on Attachment D.

Maintenance. Maintenance of the basins would be performed by the Homeowners Association and would include activities such as sediment removal, vegetation management and trash removal.

Water Storage. The proposed basins would be designed and operated so that collected runoff water would be drained out of the basins in a relatively short period of time. As depicted on Table 2, the amount of time that water from a 25-year storm would remain in the basins would range from less than one hour to approximately seven hours.

The proposed design, operation and maintenance features of the additional retardation basins would reduce the potential for significant environmental impacts and land use conflicts to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Tract Map condition No. 125 was provided for the Planning Commission's consideration of the Providence Landing project and requires that appropriate drainage easements be obtained by the project applicant from the Air Force prior to a final action on the project by the Board of Supervisors. Condition 125 is no longer required.

Public Access to the Community Park. Access to the community park would be provided by private roads that are to be developed on the project site, and the project's Homeowners Associations would be responsible for the maintenance of the roadways. A question was asked if access by the public along the private roads could be denied or restricted so as to limit access to the community park?

In their condition letter that is dated March 5, 2002, the Public Works Department required that the applicant offer all road right-of-way dedications as shown on the Tract Map as easements to the County. Therefore, the construction, maintenance and operation of the private roadways would occur within a County easement, and the applicant would be required to obtain an encroachment permit before conducting any work within the easement. A requirement of the encroachment permit would be that reasonable public access be provided along the private roadways. Therefore, the Homeowners Association would not be able to deny or restrict reasonable access to the community park. Similarly, the County would be the owner of the community park, which would ensure that the park facilities remain open to the public.

Updated School Impact Data. As requested by the Planning Commission, the applicant has revised the project description so that the 61 proposed affordable units would not be restricted to occupancy by seniors. In response to this change, along with a reduction in the number of single-family units, an updated analysis of potential impacts to the schools that would serve the project was requested. The number of school age children that would be generated by the Providence Landing project, and the capability of nearby schools to accommodate those children is presented on Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3
Lompoc Unified School District
Generation Factors and Student Generation

School	Generation Factor		Number of Students Generated from 267 Single-Family and 61 Attached Units
	Students per Single Family Home	Students per Single-Family Attached Unit (affordable units)	
Elementary (K – 5)	0.276	0.367	96
Middle (6-8)	0.157	0.112	49
High (9-12)	0.171	0.087	51
Total	---	---	196

Source: Lompoc Unified School District, 2002

Table 4
Post-Project Student Enrollment

School	Operating Capacity	March 2002 Enrollment	March 2002 Capacity Utilization	Students Generated by the Project	Enrollment After Project Buildout	Capacity Utilization After Project Buildout
Los Berros Elem. and Buena Vista Elem. Combined	1,100	917	83%	96	1,013	92%
Vandenberg Middle	1,160	1,091	94%	49	1,140	98%
Cabrillo High	1,848	1,340	73%	51	1,391	75%

Source: Lompoc Unified School District, 2002

The Providence Landing Final EIR indicated that the project would generate approximately 172 school-age children and that each of the above schools would have the capacity to accommodate the additional students. Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the project would now generate approximately 196 school age children, and that the nearby schools would have adequate capacity to accommodate the additional students. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to local schools.

Fish and Game Mitigation Requirements. In a letter dated March 11, 2002 (see Attachment E), the California Department of Fish and Game described their concerns and permitting requirements for a variety of biological resources that are located on or adjacent to the Providence Landing project. The Department's requirements are summarized below.

The Department concluded that impacts to sensitive reptiles (coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard) would be reduced to a less than significant level with the payment of a mitigation fee. A mitigation fee program has been established by the Draft Burton Mesa Ecological Preserve Management Plan and the Lompoc Area Land Use Element Interpretive Guidelines. Fish and Game also concluded that the project would not result in significant impacts to California tiger salamander, and that potential impacts to California red legged frog would be reduced to a less than significant level with the provision of adequate buffer areas from wetland habitat areas. Potential impacts to American badger would be reduced to a less than significant level by using the required mitigation fee to install fencing in certain areas around the Burton Mesa Ecological Preserve to reduce impacts that are resulting from off-road vehicle use.

Based on the information that was provided in a letter that was submitted by Dr. Daniel Meade and Dr. Walt Sakai (see Attachment F), Fish and Game concluded that the removal of approximately 63 eucalyptus trees from the Providence Landing project site would not result in significant impacts to monarch butterflies. The Department did request, however, that replacement trees be provided to minimize potential bird nesting and roosting impacts that may occur as a result of the tree removal. Since a large number of the eucalyptus trees would remain in the project area after the implementation of the Providence Landing project, and no evidence has been provided during the environmental and planning review of the project that indicates that the removal of the eucalyptus trees would have a significant impact to nesting and roosting sites, there is not a sufficient "nexus" under CEQA for the County to require the planting of replacement trees as a mitigation measure.

The Department acknowledged that the project has been redesigned to provide 50-70 foot wide buffer areas between development and wetland areas. The buffers would be provided for all existing wetland areas that are to be preserved on the project site and all required wetland creation/restoration mitigation areas. The letter from Fish and Game states that the "buffer distances are subject to review and change by our Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) specialist, who will be preparing an SAA for the project." Any changes to the design of the project that may be necessary to comply with the requirements of the Streambed Alteration Agreement would be subject to review and approval by the County.

Project Objectives. Concern has been expressed in a January 3, 2002 letter from the Citizens Planning Association that the project EIR described the objectives of the project in such a manner (i.e., it is the objective of the project to develop 284 single family units and 72 affordable units) that the ability to implement mitigation measures or project alternatives has been impaired. Staff disagrees with the contention that the project objectives have been defined too narrowly for the following reasons.

The EIR indicates that the development of a specified number of units is an objective of the project applicant, and is not an objective of the County for the project. The intent of specifying the number of units to be provided by the project as an objective statement serves only as a concise summary of the project description.

As a result of the environmental and planning review of the project, the number of single family units has been reduced from 284 to 267, and the number of affordable units has been reduced from 72 to 61. Therefore, the objectives of the project as stated by the EIR have not been interpreted in a manner that has restricted the ability of the County to reduce the number of units when such reductions were the only mechanism available to eliminate or minimize identified impacts.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 states that “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project...” As required by this section, the EIR evaluated six alternatives to the proposed project, including the “No Project” Alternative, two alternatives that would have eliminated units from the project, an alternative project site and a development scenario that would have resulted in clustered development on the project site. Although some of the alternatives that were evaluated could reduce certain environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, it was determined that implementation of those alternatives was not be feasible or necessary. This determination was based on a variety of factors, such as most of the impacts that could be avoided or minimized by the alternatives can also be minimized by proposed mitigation measures. Additionally, certain aspects of the alternatives that were evaluated have been incorporated into the project design. For example, the northeast corner of the project site has been retained in open space and the development of a Burton Mesa Chaparral interpretive center has been omitted from the project. Other alternatives were determined to not be feasible because they would have precluded the development of the proposed community park. None of the alternatives that were evaluated were determined to be infeasible because they would not fulfil the objective of the project to develop a specified number of residential units. Therefore, the project objectives as stated in the EIR have not impeded or limited the ability of the County to minimize the environmental impacts of the project.

Emergency Evacuation. The type of emergency event that would most likely require residents in the project area to leave their homes would be a wildfire. It is not expected, however, that wildfire conditions would necessitate a mass evacuation of Vandenberg Village. A wildfire would most likely approach the project area from the west with prevailing winds, or from the south. It would also be possible that a fire could advance from the east, which has extensive areas with chaparral vegetation. It would not be likely that a wildfire would advance upon the project area from the north, because that area has been extensively developed residential uses. Therefore, it is unlikely that Constellation Road, which extends from the project site to the north, would become impassible during a wildfire. The proposed project would also provide an emergency secondary access that would provide a connection to Route 1. In consideration of the fire risk conditions in the project area, it is the opinion of the Fire Department that Constellation Road provides an adequate evacuation route from the project site. A representative from County Fire will be available at Board hearing to respond to any additional fire safety questions.

Provide Additional Traffic Mitigation. Traffic that would be generated by 267 single-family units, 61 affordable units, the 12-acre community park and the Homeowners Association recreation area

would be approximately 3,690 average daily trips. The project EIR evaluated a slightly higher traffic volume (based on a previous project design that had additional units and a larger community park) and determined that potential traffic-related impacts could be reduced to a less than significant level. Additional mitigation measures that have been suggested to further minimize the effects of the large amount of traffic that would be generated by the Providence Landing project have included: the elimination of proposed units, which would reduce the number of trips generated by the project; and the development of a new road that would provide an additional access route to the project site. The ability of the County to implement these mitigation measures is limited by a variety of land use, environmental and legal constraints.

Land use and environmental constraints that would be associated with the installation of a new road to the project site include the location of the Burton Mesa Ecological Preserve to the east and west of the site, and the Air Force/Penitentiary property to the south. The development of a new general access intersection at Mercury Avenue and Route 1, which is adjacent to the project site has also been suggested. Public Works and Caltrans would not support the development of a new interchange at this location because of its proximity to the Constellation Road/Route 1 interchange (approximately 1,600 feet to the east), which would not be consistent with Caltrans interchange separation requirements.

Legal constraints that could be associated with providing a new access road include: CEQA does not require the implementation of mitigation measures for effects that are not found to be significant; there must be a nexus between the project's impact and a required mitigation measure; and the mitigation must be proportional to the project's impact (*CEQA Guidelines* section 15126.4). The Providence Landing EIR indicated that roads and intersections in the project area would continue to operate in the LOS A/B range, with the exception of Constellation/Route 1 interchange. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measure to install traffic lights at the interchange would reduce traffic volume impacts of the project to a less than significant level. Therefore, a requirement to provide a new access road would not be consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Additional information regarding the installation of traffic lights at the Constellation Rd./Route 1 interchange is provided below.

The feasibility of reducing the number of units provided by the project to minimize traffic impacts would also be subject to the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21085, which requires that housing units shall not be removed from a project as a mitigation measure or alternative if there are other measures that would provide a comparable level of mitigation. Since the mitigation measure to install traffic lights at the Constellation/Route 1 interchange reduces the traffic volume impacts of the project to a less than significant level, it may not be feasible to eliminate additional units from the project for traffic-related reasons.

Another method that has been considered to minimize the effects of increased traffic in adjoining neighborhoods is the installation of traffic calming devices (i.e. speed humps, narrowing roadways, etc). Public Works has indicated that County policies do not support the installation of traffic calming measures on arterial roadways (i.e., Constellation Road), and traffic calming measures on

neighborhood collector streets would not be considered until traffic conditions, such as excessive speed, accidents or capacity, warrant their use. Based on the traffic impact analysis that is provided in the EIR, the roadways in the project area would operate at acceptable levels and the installation of traffic calming measures is not warranted at this time.

In summary, the project would generate a substantial amount of traffic, however, the analysis of potential traffic and circulation impacts has determined that identified impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. Therefore, CEQA and Public Resources Code section 21085, limit the ability of the County to implement additional mitigation measures to further reduce the effects of the additional traffic.

Traffic Lights at Constellation Road/Hwy 1. To reduce project-related traffic volume impacts at north and southbound ramps at the Constellation Road and Route 1 interchange, the project EIR recommended that two new traffic signals be installed and road restriping improvements be provided prior to occupancy of any units in the third project phase. A question has been asked if the required improvements could be installed prior to the third phase of the project.

The required traffic signals would be installed at two intersections: the Constellation/southbound Route 1 ramps, which are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans; and the Constellation/Apollo intersection, which is under the County’s jurisdiction. Caltrans has indicated that “after construction and occupancy of Phase 1 it is likely that the traffic signal would be justified based on volumes and delay. Therefore, we would allow the traffic signal at our intersection (Constellation/Southbound Route 1 ramps) to be installed between phases 1 and 2.” (see Attachment G). Public Works has indicated that the signals should be installed simultaneously and that if Caltrans allows the traffic signal at the Constellation/Southbound Route 1 intersection to be installed before the second phase, the County would allow the installation of the signal at the Constellation/Apollo intersection at the same time. A summary of the Constellation/Route 1 intersection operation characteristics is provided on Table 5.

**Table 5
 Traffic Impacts at the Constellation Road/Route 1 Intersection**

Intersection	Existing (delay/LOS)		Existing + Project (delay/LOS)		Existing + Project/ mitigated (delay/LOS)		Cumulative (delay/LOS)		Cumulative + Project (delay/LOS)		Cumulative + Project/ mitigated (delay/LOS)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Constellation/Apollo – Route 1 NB	2.4/A	1.5/A	25.8/D	>50/F	9.8/A	12.9/B	3.1/A	3.6/A	33.2/D	>50/F	9.6/A	12.6/B
Constellation/Route 1 SB	2.0/A	1.7/A	37.0/E	>50/F	15.8/B	11.1/B	12.8/B	7.7/A	>50/F	>50/F	17.1/B	11.6/B

All delay values are in seconds
 LOS = Level of Service

Traffic Impacts at the “Y”. The EIR that was prepared for the Providence Landing project evaluated the potential for impacts to roadways and intersections the are located throughout the project area, including the intersection of Route 1/Harris Grade Road/La Purisima Road. This intersection is commonly referred to as the “Y”. A summary of the project-related and cumulative traffic impacts at the “Y” intersection are provided on Table 6. This analysis indicates that the “Y” intersection would operate in the level of service “A” and “B” range after the addition of project and cumulative traffic, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 6
Traffic Impacts at the “Y” Intersection
(Route 1/Harris Grade Road/La Purisima Road)

Existing Condition (V/C and LOS)		Existing + Project (V/C and LOS)		Cumulative (V/C and LOS)		Cumulative + Project (sec. Delay/LOS)	
AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
V/C 0.52	V/C 0.53	V/C 0.54	V/C 0.58	V/C 0.55	V/C 0.60	V/C 0.57	V/C 0.65
LOS A	LOS A	LOS A	LOS A	LOS A	LOS A	LOS A	LOS B

V/C = volume to capacity ratio
 LOS = level of service

Park Improvement Bond Requirements. In comments provided to your Board at the May 14, 2002 hearing, Ms. Jennifer Briggs indicated that the County Park Commission recommended that a change be made to a section of proposed condition of approval No. 100. That condition now requires that:

“Prior to recordation, the applicant shall post a bond acceptable to the County and sufficient to allow park and recreational improvement and revegetation of the excavated portions of the adjacent property.”

The addition requested by the Commission would require that the bond also provide for the construction of the trails and bike path that would be provided outside of the park area on the project site. Staff would support the Commission’s request provided that a provision is added to the bond requirement that the trails and bike path are to be provided at locations approved by Planning and Development and the Parks Department, rather than where they are now depicted on the proposed tract map and grading plan. This additional statement is needed to avoid the potential for extensive grading throughout the project site, including grading in and around sensitive habitat areas, that would be necessary to install the trails and bike path if the remainder of the project was not developed by the project applicant.

The Park Commission also requested that the project provide signage along Route 1 that directs the public to the park. Staff supports this request with the provision that the County review and approve the design and location of the signs. Approval of the sign locations may also require Caltrans approval.

Cumulative Impacts to Groundwater. Information regarding the evaluation of project specific and cumulative impacts to the Lompoc Groundwater basin that would result from the Providence Landing project is provided in a May 13, 2002 memo from Brian R. Baca, County Geologist (see Attachment H). A description of the methodology that is used by the County to evaluate cumulative impacts to groundwater resources is provided on pages 5 and 6 of the memo. The memo concluded that ground water use by the Providence Landing project would result in a significant and unavoidable project-specific impact, and that the project's cumulative water use would be cumulatively considerable. The project, however, would be consistent with the requirements of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy No. 4 because the project's water use would not cause the available storage within the Lompoc Groundwater Basin to drop below the 75-year threshold that has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Status of the Burton Mesa Ecological Preserve Management Plan. The 5,125-acre Burton Mesa Ecological Preserve is owned as sovereign land by the State of California, and is represented by the California State Lands Commission. The Preserve is presently leased by the Lands Commission to the State Department of Fish and Game under a 49-year lease. A public draft of the Management Plan (prepared by Santa Barbara County Planning and Development for the State Lands Commission) was the subject of a public workshop and considered by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing in 1994.

After obtaining additional funding to revise the Plan and conduct CEQA review, an Administrative Draft of the Proposed Final Management Plan and an Administrative Draft EIR were prepared by P&D for the State Lands Commission in 1998. Those documents narrowed the scope of some of the recreational activities proposed for the Preserve (e.g., eliminated a recommended campground), included environmental review of the proposed improvements to the now-publicly owned Little League fields, updated land ownership information (e.g., the addition of 27 acres to the Preserve), provided detailed trails planning, and provided environmental review of the County Fire Department's proposed fuel break program around Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, and Mesa Oaks.

In 1998, P&D delivered the Administrative Draft documents to the State Lands Commission, as required by an agreement between the State and the County, which required that the documents not be released for public review without the authorization of the State Lands Commission. Just at that time, the leasing agreement between State Lands and Fish and Game was being discussed. Since then, the property was leased to the Department of Fish and Game for 49 years, but no further action on the Plan has occurred. To finalize the plan, the Proposed Final Management Plan and Draft EIR must be circulated for public review and comment, but this can only be done with authorization of the State Lands Commission, working in concurrence with the Department of Fish and Game.

Feasibility of Installing Fuel Breaks on the Preserve. Fire Protection Goal A-1 of the *Lompoc Area Goals Interpretive Guidelines* states that fuel modification zones for new development are to

occur on private land rather than on the Preserve. The Providence Landing project would be consistent with this requirement by providing fuel management zones on the project site.

Existing residential development located in Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills, however, is adjacent to high fire hazard chaparral vegetation and adequate fuel management zones have not been provided. The County Fire Department has been an advocate of implementing a fuel break project within the Preserve and obtained funding from FEMA to create the fuel modification zone, but has not been successful at obtaining the necessary approvals from other agencies.

Existing Housing Constraints. Mr. Jeff Carlovsky, the Principal at Cabrillo High School, has stated at several public hearings and meetings that additional housing is needed in the Lompoc area to make it feasible for new teachers at Cabrillo High School to live in the vicinity of the school. A letter submitted by Mr. Carlovsky is provided as Attachment I.

Housing Development Potential in the City of Lompoc /Agricultural Conversions in the Lompoc Area. In January 2002, the *Regional Growth Forecast Study* was released which showed Lompoc having 2,200 potential residential units on properties currently zoned for residential use within the City limits (Arlene Pelster, City of Lompoc). This level of future residential development seemed inconsistent with the public testimony that has recently been presented regarding the severe lack of housing in the Lompoc area. Upon further review of the housing data provided by the *Regional Growth Forecast Study*, it appears that approximately 1,600 of the potential units are “theoretical” in nature and were identified by evaluating underdeveloped lots within the City. For example, if a parcel was large enough for two homes, but only one existed, regardless of whether there was physically enough room for the second home, credit was given for one additional dwelling. If the 1,600 possible “infill” units are deducted from the development estimate, approximately 600 units remain available for development. Of those remaining units, the City is currently building or processing applications for 450+ units. The remaining land, approximately 24 acres near the former Grefco plant contains the balance of the available units. A General Plan Amendment application has been submitted to change this area to non-residential uses, so the dwelling unit potential of this parcel may be lost. Other development has been proposed which could yield upwards of 800 units, but the land for one of these preliminary projects lies outside the City limits and the other was denied inclusion in the City Sphere of influence by LAFCO in 2000 because the proposal involved conversion of prime agricultural land to urban uses. The City’s planning staff has indicated they would support the project requiring annexation north of the City.

Mandates and Service Levels:

The proposed project includes eight companion discretionary cases. Pursuant to §35-292d of the Article III Zoning Ordinance, jurisdiction over two or more applications relating to the same development project rests with the highest level decisionmaker for any of the individual applications. As the Rezone and General Plan Amendment applications fall under the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors pursuant §35-325.4.3 of Article III, the final decisionmaker for the project is your Board.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

Several aspects of the proposed project would limit the potential for adverse fiscal impacts to the County. Roadways that would be developed to serve the project would be private streets and would be maintained by the two Homeowner's Associations that would be formed by the project. The project would also be responsible for the formation of a Community Facilities District, which would assess all of the new detached single family homes created by the project for the cost and operation of the community park.

Any outstanding permit processing fees will be paid by the applicant prior to P&D sign-off of the final map.

Special Instructions:

The Clerk of the Board shall forward a copy of the Minute Order to Planning and Development, Hearing Support Section, Attn: Cintia Mendoza.

Planning & Development will prepare all final action letters and otherwise notify all concerned parties of the Board of Supervisor's final action.

Concurrence:

County Counsel
Treasurer-Tax Collector Housing Finance & Development
General Services Property Management

Attachments:

Attachment A	Revised Conditions of Approval Errata Sheet
Attachment B	Tract Map No. 14,487
Attachment C	Letter from U.S. Air Force, dated February 19, 2002
Attachment D	Retardation Basin Conceptual Landscape Plans
Attachment E	Letter from CA Dept. of Fish and Game, dated March 11, 2002
Attachment F	Letter from Drs. Sakai and Meade, dated February 18, 2002
Attachment G	Letter from Caltrans, dated May 20, 2002
Attachment H	Memo from Brian R. Baca, dated May 13, 2002
Attachment I	Letter from Mr. Jeff Carlovsky, dated June 17, 2002