

4.5 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Both the DFPMP and Off-Leash Dog Park Locations Study Initial Studies (Appendices A and B) discuss the following transportation and circulation issues: vehicle trips, hazards to safety from design features, access, parking capacity, and hazards and barriers for pedestrians and bicyclists. The Off-Leash Dog Park Locations Study Initial Study found that impacts to vehicle trips and parking capacity are potentially significant, while the DFPMP IS found less than significant impacts to these same issue areas. In both Initial Studies, no impacts were found for all other transportation and circulation issue areas. Therefore, the following discussion is limited to the potential impacts to vehicle trips and parking capacity as a result of implementation of the various dog-use alternatives at the DFP, Hale Park, and the Shoreline Beach Area, as well as from implementation of the DFPMP. The information is based on the Traffic and Parking Assessments for each site prepared by Penfield & Smith (August 2002) and the user survey prepared by Rincon Consultants (March 2002) (both found in Appendix 1, separately bound), which are incorporated by reference.

4.5.1 Setting

a. Street Network. The existing street network and intersection operations are described below for the DFP, Hale Park and Shoreline Beach Area sites.

Douglas Family Preserve. The DFP has four community pedestrian access points: the south side of the intersection of Las Positas Road and Cliff Drive; the far west end of Borton Drive; Mesa School Lane; and Medcliff Road. The main roadways surrounding the DFP are Las Positas Road (SR 225), Cliff Drive (also SR 225), and Mesa Lane.

Las Positas Road is a two-lane roadway that is the main north-south connection between Highway 101 and Arroyo Burro Beach. A Class II (on-street) bike lane currently exists on both sides of Las Positas Road. Between Cliff Drive and Modoc Road there is no sidewalk on Las Positas Road. Parking is not permitted anywhere on this road. To the south, Las Positas Road terminates at the intersection of Cliff Drive. The intersection currently operates with a three-way stop control and flashing beacon. Pedestrian access to the DFP is located on the south side of this intersection. A bus stop is located just north of this intersection in the shoulder on the east side of Las Positas Road.

Cliff Drive provides one of the main east-west connections between downtown Santa Barbara and the Mesa. A Class II bike lane currently exists on Cliff Drive west of Las Positas Road. East of Las Positas Road, an “alternate route” for bicyclists exists, meaning it is neither signed nor striped for bicycles. An asphalt sidewalk is located on the southern side of Cliff Drive east of Las Positas Road. West of Las Positas Road, a dirt path along the south side of Cliff Drive provides pedestrian access to the Arroyo Burro Beach County Park parking lot and the Douglas Family Preserve. Parking is not permitted anywhere on this road. Borton Drive, Mesa School Lane, and Medcliff Road are all accessed off of Cliff Drive (via Mesa Lane).

Mesa Lane is a two-lane residential street, which provides the main access to the three DFP access points on the Mesa. Sidewalks are provided on the east side of the street.

In March 2002, Rincon Consultants, Inc. conducted 400 park-user surveys at the DFP to determine not only dog refuse pick up compliance and park user opinions regarding dogs off-leash, but also to establish park use patterns and determine circulation issues. It should be noted that the survey only included people who actually use the DFP. There is likely a population that would like to visit the DFP, but are discouraged from doing so because they are not comfortable with dogs off-leash; this population was not represented in the survey.

The survey concluded that most users live within 6 miles from the DFP (84 percent); of these 84 percent, about 54 percent live within 2 miles of the site. Most enter the Preserve from Medcliff Road (61 percent), followed by 22 percent via the Mesa School Lane entrance. Most respondents traveled to the site by driving alone (43 percent), with another 34 percent carpooling, and most parked on streets near the Medcliff Drive entrance (52 percent), followed by the Mesa School Lane entrance (14 percent). About 70 percent of those surveyed indicated that they visit the DFP more than once per week. About 66 percent stay at the Preserve less than one hour, with 33 percent staying between 1-2 hours. More than half (58 percent) of the visitors to the DFP typically arrive sometime between 3:00 PM and 6:00 PM, followed by 16 percent between 9:00 AM and 12:00 PM.

Table 4.5-1 below summarizes the Level of Service (LOS) information for the main, potentially affected intersections, based on the intersection capacity utilization model (ICU). As shown in Table 4.5-1, two of the three study area intersections operate within acceptable limits, that is, LOS A, B or C, or are expected to in the near future. LOS A represents the highest level of service, followed by B and then C.

TABLE 4.5-1: LOS for Key Intersections

| Location | Intersection Control | PM Peak Hour Volume to Capacity Ratio/LOS | Date of Traffic Counts |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Cliff Dr. at Las Positas Rd. | 3-way STOP | 0.66/LOS B or 79.59 seconds /LOS F | April 2001 |
| Cliff Dr. at Mesa Lane | Signal | 0.45/LOS A | September 2003 |
| Cliff Dr. at Meigs Rd. | Signal | 0.66/LOS B | March 2002 |
| Cabrillo Blvd. at Castillo St. | Signal | 0.55/LOS A | March 2002 |

As shown in the above table, using the Highway Capacity Software (HCS), the Los Positas Road and Cliff Drive intersection has a LOS of 79.59 seconds of delay (LOS F). [Table 4.5 indicates that the Cliff Drive and Mesa Lane intersection has a volume to capacity ratio \(V/C\) of 0.45 or LOS A.](#) Using the ICU method, the intersection has a

LOS V/C of 0.66 or LOS B. The ICU method is used when there is a signalized intersection. Since the intersection is not currently signalized, the HCS method is more applicable. The City has recently obtained funding for improvements to this intersection, which would include either a signal or a roundabout. Construction is estimated to begin in Fall 2004. With the roundabout or signal, the intersection is forecast to operate at LOS A during the P.M. peak hour.

Hale Park. Hale Park is bounded by Eucalyptus Hill Drive to the southwest, Camino Viejo Road to the southeast, and Eucalyptus Hill Road and El Rancho Road to the north. Camino Viejo is a narrow and windy two-lane roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour (MPH). The speed limit is 20 MPH near the park entrance due to a sharp curve in the road. Camino Viejo provides the main access to Hale Park, with the formal park entrance sited here. Eucalyptus Hill Road is also a narrow and windy two-lane road. Although no formal access exists on Eucalyptus Hill Road, visitors occasionally access the site from this road. No data on the capacity of intersections around Hale Park is available.

The park users survey (Rincon, March 2002) concluded that 82 percent of the users live within 2 miles of the site. Most (76 percent) enter the site from the Camino Viejo entrance. About half (52 percent) of the respondents walked to the site, reinforcing the character of the site as a neighborhood park. Forty percent traveled to the site alone by vehicle, and another 8 percent carpooled. Twenty-three of the 24 respondents traveling by car parked at the Camino Viejo entrance. About 48 percent of those surveyed indicated that they visit the site once per week, followed by 32 percent visiting more than once per week, and 10 percent visiting between 1-3 times per month or less. Most users (96 percent) stay at the park for less than 1 hour, while the remaining 4 percent stay between 1-2 hours. The majority of the respondents (88 percent) visit the site between the hours of 3:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. Approximately 10 percent visit between noon and 3:00 P.M..

Shoreline Beach Area. The SBA is located below the bluffs at Shoreline Beach Park and Shoreline Drive, and then continues westerly past the DFP bluffs and Arroyo Burro Beach County Park to the City limits. Access to the beach exists at five main points: Shoreline Park Stairs, Leadbetter Beach, Thousand Steps, Mesa Lane Stairs and Arroyo Burro Beach County Park. Additionally, access is available from the beach west of the City limits. Table 4.5-1 above also summarizes the levels of service for key intersections in the SBA area.

Cliff Drive provides one of the main east-west connections between downtown Santa Barbara and the Mesa. A Class II bike lane currently exists on Cliff Drive west of Las Positas Road. East of Las Positas Road, an “alternate route” for bicyclists exists, which is neither signed nor striped for bicycles. An asphalt sidewalk is located on the southern side of Cliff Drive east of Las Positas Road. West of Las Positas Road, a dirt path along the south side of Cliff Drive provides pedestrian access to the Arroyo Burro Beach County Park parking lot and the Douglas Family Preserve. Parking is not permitted anywhere on this road.

Shoreline Drive is a two-lane roadway with a center two-way left turn lane, and a posted speed limit of 30 MPH. Shoreline Drive provides a main east-west connection along

Santa Barbara's waterfront and the main access to Shoreline Beach. A class II bike lane is provided along Shoreline Drive from Cliff Drive south and then east to Leadbetter Beach. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of Shoreline Drive. The City is planning to improve Shoreline Drive by adding a parkway, landscaping, and improved bicycle paths and lanes, along with some roadway configuration changes. However, no changes that would result in a reduction of LOS are proposed. No construction date has yet been set.

The results of the Rincon survey indicate that 88 percent of the 50 respondents live within 6 miles of the site. The majority (66 percent) lives within 2 miles, while 22 percent live between 3-6 miles from the site. Exactly 8 percent live between 6-10 miles, and 4 percent live more than 10 miles away. Those entering the site from the Shoreline Park or Mesa Lane steps totaled 28 percent, followed by 16 percent from either Leadbetter Beach or Arroyo Burro Beach County Park, and 12 percent from Thousand Steps. Half (50 percent) of those surveyed drove to the site alone, while 34 percent arrived by carpool, and 14 percent walked. Most parked at Shoreline Park (24 percent), followed by 20 percent at an "other" location. These responses came mostly from those who entered via the Mesa Lane Steps, so it is assumed that they parked on Mesa Lane or near there. Users also parked at the site's bordering beaches, 16 percent at Leadbetter Beach and 14 percent at Arroyo Burro Beach. Approximately 46 percent visit the SBA more than once weekly, and 30 percent visit about once a week. About 16 percent visit the site between 1-3 times per month, with 8 percent visiting less than once per month. Most stay at the site between 1-2 hours (66 percent), with 22 percent staying less than 1 hour, and 10 percent staying 2-3 hours. Most surveyed (86 percent) visit the site between noon and 6:00 P.M.. Approximately 46 percent visit between noon and 3:00 P.M. and 40 percent between 3:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M.. Roughly 12 percent visit the site between 9:00 A.M. and noon.

- b. Parking.** The existing parking supply is identified below for each site.

Douglas Family Preserve. The closest parking available for the Cliff Drive entrance is located in the Arroyo Burro Beach County Park parking lot. The Arroyo Burro Beach parking lot has 210 spaces, plus additional room for RV/trailer parking. It should be noted, however, that in order to park at Arroyo Burro Beach and enter at the Cliff Drive entrance, visitors must cross a bridge and then walk along Cliff Drive for a minimum of 500 feet. Based on the results of the user survey, only 6 percent of the park visitors entered via the Cliff Drive entrance, and for those who drove, only 5 percent parked either near this entrance or at the Arroyo Burro Beach lot.

Parking for the three additional entrances is provided on-street in the surrounding neighborhood. Between the Borton Drive entrance and Linda Road, there are approximately 19 on-street spaces. The survey found that approximately 11 percent entered the site from the Borton Drive entrance and of the total people who drove to the DFP, 11 percent stated that they parked near this entrance. Within the vicinity of the Mesa School Lane entrance there are a total of 29 on-street parking spaces (6 on-street spaces on Mesa School Lane, 13 on-street spaces on Murrell Road, and 10 on-street spaces on Linda Road, between Mesa School Lane and Murrell Road). About 22 percent of the people surveyed stated that they entered via the Mesa School Lane entrance, and of

those who drove to the DFP, 18 percent said they parked near this entrance. Near the Medcliff Road entrance, there are 20 on-street spaces on Medcliff Road between Selrose Lane and La Jolla Drive and 22 spaces on Selrose Lane, for a total of 42 on-street spaces. Approximately 61 percent of the visitors entered from the Medcliff Road entrance and of those who drove to the DFP, 66 percent reported parking within the vicinity of this entrance.

The peak parking demand found at each entrance is summarized in Table 4.5-2 below.

TABLE 4.5-2: DFP Existing Peak Parking Demand Observed¹

| Day | Arroyo Burro Beach Lot (210 spaces) | | | Borton Drive Entrance (19 spaces) | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 159 | 76% | 3:30 PM | 10 | 53% | 3:30 PM |
| Sunday | 210 | 100% | 3:30 PM | 14 | 74% | 2:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 161 | 77% | 6:00 PM | 10 | 53% | 5:30 PM |
| Thursday | 204 | 97% | 3:00 PM | 15 | 79% | 6:30 PM |
| Average | 184 | 87% | - | 12 | 64% | - |

| Day | Mesa School Lane Entrance (29 spaces) | | | Medcliff Road Entrance (42 spaces) | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 13 | 45% | 1:00 PM | 26 | 61% | 1:30 PM |
| Sunday | 13 | 45% | 2:00 PM | 30 | 71% | 1:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 12 | 41% | 3:00 PM | 16 | 38% | 5:00 PM |
| Thursday | 12 | 41% | 6:30 PM | 18 | 43% | 6:30 PM |
| Average | 13 | 43% | - | 23 | 55% | - |

¹The counts were collected from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM on a Saturday and Sunday, and from 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM on a Wednesday and Thursday (July 21, 22, 24, 25, 2002).

At present, there is an unpaved vehicle parking space provided near the caretaker's trailer on the DFP. Maintenance workers park at the DFP entrances along the street or the edge of driveway outside of the Preserve.

Hale Park. Only on-street parking is available at Hale Park, on the shoulder of Camino Viejo, El Rancho Road, and Eucalyptus Hill Road. At the site entrance on Camino Viejo, there is room for 4 vehicles. Just north of the entrance, on El Rancho Road, there is room for 10 vehicles on the shoulder on the west side of the street. Additional parking along the road is available further up the hill to the northwest. At the north end of the park, on the west shoulder of Eucalyptus Hill Road, there is room for 8 vehicles to park.

Based on the survey results, 76 percent of the site visitors entered at the Camino Viejo entrance and 22 percent entered off of Eucalyptus Hill Road. One person entered from “another” unspecified location. Of the 24 people who drove, all but one stated that they parked at the Camino Viejo entrance.

The peak parking demand found on the streets surrounding Hale Park is summarized in Table 11-3 below.

TABLE 4.5-3: Hale Park Existing Peak Parking Demand Observed¹

| Day | Camino Viejo Entrance (4 spaces) | | | El Rancho Road (10 spaces) | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 1 | 25% | 3:30 PM | 4 | 40% | 1:30 PM |
| Sunday | 1 | 25% | 3:30 PM | 4 | 40% | 1:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 2 | 50% | 4:30 PM | 6 | 60% | 3:00 PM |
| Thursday | 2 | 50% | 3:00 PM | 4 | 40% | 3:00 PM |
| Average | 2 | 38% | - | 5 | 45% | - |

| Eucalyptus Hill Road (8 spaces) | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 1 | 13% | 1:30 PM |
| Sunday | 1 | 13% | 1:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 0 | 0% | - |
| Thursday | 0 | 0% | - |
| Average | 1 | 6% | - |

¹The counts were collected from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM on a Saturday and Sunday, and from 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM on a Wednesday and Thursday (July 21, 22, 24, 25, 2002).

Maintenance vehicles usually park on the street near Hale Park.

Shoreline Beach Area. The closest available parking for the Shoreline Park steps is at Shoreline Park, where two parking lots and on-street parking are provided. One lot is located at each end of the park. Parking for 50 vehicles is provided in the eastern lot, and parking for 53 vehicles is provided in the western lot. Additional on-street parking for 13 cars is available along the ocean side of Shoreline Drive, near the intersection of Shoreline Drive and La Marina, for a total supply of 116 spaces. Based on the survey results, 28 percent of the beach goers entered from the Shoreline Park steps and 29

percent of the total that drove to Shoreline Beach parked at Shoreline Park. Parking for the Thousand Steps entrance is available on-street on Santa Cruz Boulevard. Between the Thousand Steps entrance and Shoreline Drive, there are 6 on-street spaces on Santa Cruz Boulevard. North of Shoreline Drive, on Santa Cruz Boulevard, there are 7 on-street spaces, for a total of 13 on-street parking spaces in the Thousand Steps entrance area. The survey found that 12 percent of the beach visitors entered at this location and 10 percent of the total beach visitors parked at this location. In general, parking is fairly limited in the immediate vicinity of this entrance.

Parking for the Mesa Lane steps is available on-street on Mesa Lane. Between Medcliff Road and the steps there are 12 on-street spaces on Mesa Lane. Ample on-street parking is also available on Mesa Lane north of Medcliff Road. About 28 percent surveyed reported entering from the Mesa Lane steps, and 24 percent of those surveyed parked on or near Mesa Lane.

The parking lot at Arroyo Burro Beach County Park has 210 parking spaces. Sixteen percent of the respondents entered from Arroyo Burro County Beach, and 17 percent of the total surveyed that drove to the beach stated that they parked at this beach.

Two parking areas are located near Leadbetter Beach. West of the Shoreline Beach Café, 269 parking spaces are provided. Fronting the Café, 19 spaces are provided. It was found that 16 percent of the visitors entered the beach from Leadbetter Beach and 19 percent of the total that arrived via car parked at this beach.

The peak parking demand found at the four entrances to the Shoreline Beach Area is summarized in Table 4.5-4 below.

TABLE 4.5-4: Shoreline Beach Area Existing Peak Parking Demand Observed¹

| Day | Leadbetter Beach | | | Shoreline Park (116 spaces) | | |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 288 | 100% | 1:00 PM | 103 | 89% | 3:30 PM |
| Sunday | 114 | 39% | 3:30 PM | 107 | 92% | 3:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 288 | 100% | 6:30 PM | 111 | 96% | 2:30 PM |
| Thursday | 91 | 31% | 6:30 PM | 104 | 90% | 6:30 PM |
| Average | 196 | 68% | - | 106 | 92% | - |

| Day | Thousand Steps (13 spaces) | | | Mesa Lane Steps (12 spaces) | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day | Peak Demand | Percentage of Spaces Occupied | Time of Day |
| Saturday | 5 | 38% | 1:00 PM | 9 | 75% | 3:00 PM |
| Sunday | 8 | 62% | 2:30 PM | 12 | 100% | 3:30 PM |
| Wednesday | 8 | 62% | 5:30 PM | 11 | 92% | 5:30 PM |
| Thursday | 11 | 85% | 6:00 PM | 12 | 100% | 3:00 PM |
| Average | 8 | 62% | - | 11 | 92% | - |

¹ The counts were collected from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM on a Saturday and Sunday, and from 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM on a Wednesday and Thursday (July 21, 22, 24, 25, 2002).

Based on the results of the parking demand study, and Table 4.5-2, the peak parking demand at Arroyo Burro Beach County Park parking lot during the study period occurred on Sunday between 3:30 P.M. and 4:00 P.M., when 100 percent of the lot was occupied. On Saturday, it occurred at 3:30 PM when 76 percent of the lot was full. The peak parking demand on Wednesday occurred at 6:00 P.M. when 77 percent of the lot was occupied, and the peak demand on Thursday occurred between 3:00 P.M. and 3:30 P.M. when 97 percent of the lot was full.

Currently, maintenance trucks utilize the Shoreline Park parking lot and sometimes the park itself. Maintenance vehicles also use the Arroyo Burro Beach County Park parking lot for activities around this area.

4.5.2 Policy

The Circulation Element of the City General Plan, the Coastal Act, and the Local Coastal Plan contain project-specific policies regarding transportation and parking. Policies relevant to this project include the following from Section 30212.5 of the Coastal Act, and Policy 9.2 of the Circulation Element, respectively:

Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area. (Coastal Act, Section 30212.5)

The City shall maintain, improve, consolidate, and promote the efficient use of parking supplies in the Coastal Zone. (Policy 9.2, City Circulation Element)

The second policy listed above also includes considering reducing parking requirements for non-residential uses that share parking facilities. The general concept of shared parking has the potential to apply to public recreational facilities as well.

There are also City transportation standards and parking standards that apply to this project, as detailed below.

4.5.3 Impact Analysis and Mitigation

a. Significance Thresholds. The City's project specific intersection level of service (LOS) threshold states that if a project would cause the vehicle to capacity (V/C) ratio at an intersection to exceed 0.77 (LOS C), or if the project would add any traffic to an existing impacted intersection, the project's impact is considered significant. The City's intersection LOS cumulative impact threshold states that if a project would add traffic to an intersection that is forecast to operate above a V/C ratio of 0.77, with cumulative traffic volumes, the project is considered a significant contribution to a cumulative impact.

If the project would increase the demand for parking such that, combined with other existing parking demand, more than 85 percent of parking within easy walking distance of the project would be utilized, a significant parking impact would result. The parking areas within easy walking distance are those considered in the survey by Penfield & Smith, as described below. For parking areas already at or in excess of 85 percent utilization, any contribution to increased demand for parking would result in a significant impact.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation. The following text describes the transportation and circulation impacts, as well as parking impacts, for each of the three sites and the DFPMP.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Impact Tran-1 | Implementation of the DFPMP or various dog-use alternatives at the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area may add traffic to an existing impacted intersection or cause the V/C ratio at the intersection to exceed 0.77. |
|----------------------|--|

Douglas Family Preserve Management Plan. The DFPMP proposes habitat restoration and various maintenance activities that would necessitate the use of trucks, cars or other vehicles. Currently, staff visits the DFP at least once daily to maintain the dog waste dispensers and empty the disposal containers. With the Plan, Parks and Recreation staff members, along with any potential volunteer assistants, are expected to visit the site up to an average of two times per day for maintenance work (in addition to the existing one visit daily) with 1-2 vehicles per visit, except for special activities such as annual vegetative fuels management in the summer. Fuels management would likely generate three to four visits daily (1-2 vehicles per visit) while pruning and mowing take place, usually 1-2 times yearly. Restoration activities at the DFP would likely entail some limited small truck trips to transport materials to and from the site on a periodic basis until the Plan has been fully implemented. However, for both the restoration and ongoing maintenance activities, vehicle trips would primarily occur in off-peak traffic hours, and would not be sufficient in number to contribute to a traffic impact. Therefore, traffic trip impacts to intersection capacity would be *less than significant* for the periodic restoration efforts and ongoing maintenance of the DFP, as identified in the DFPMP.

A permanent caretaker's residence and a single facility restroom are identified in the DFPMP for potential construction. A temporary residential trailer for the caretaker currently exists on-site. The existing daily vehicle trips generated by the caretaker are minimal. There is not expected to be a change in vehicle trips associated with the permanent caretaker's residence from what now exists with the current caretaker's trailer. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* with regard to caretaker traffic trips and intersection capacity. The restroom is to serve the users of the DFP, and would not generate any traffic trips.

Off-Leash Dog Park Locations. Penfield & Smith (P&S) (August 2002) prepared an assessment of traffic and parking for the DFP, Hale Park and Shoreline Beach Area sites. It was anticipated that by using the information gathered from the existing intersection conditions and the results of the park user survey (Rincon, March 2002), the future park use at the three sites under the various dog use alternatives could be estimated, thereby determining traffic and parking impacts. However, upon further review, it was determined that predicting an increase or decrease in park use under each dog use alternative, and the corresponding change in traffic trips, with any degree of accuracy is not technically possible. For a given site, some park users may choose to continue visiting the site, while others may shift to another park site. Without knowing the future trip generation or distribution of each of the three sites, a reliable traffic impact analysis at the key intersections cannot be prepared.

With designation of any of the dog use alternatives at each of the three sites, it is likely that some of the users would choose to go somewhere else, some new visitors would be attracted to the site due to their preferences, and some visitors would likely continue going to the site regardless of the change in use to occur. Additionally, if the City establishes more than one off-leash dog park, or the County establishes such facilities in the general area (see Section 7.0 ALTERNATIVES), the number of off-leash dog visitors may be reduced at any given site. As discussed in Section 2.4 PROPOSED PROJECT, it is assumed that Alternatives A (off-leash dogs only) and C-F (off-leash dogs only with some restrictions on days and times of use) would result in a substantial increase in dog use. With Alternative B (on-leash dogs only) dog use would remain about the same. It is not possible to determine with any certainty whether an increase in the user group of dogs and their owners correlates with an overall increase in traffic trips, and to what quantifiable extent. However, it would be unlikely that trips generated by dog owners would be substantially different from other users.

Overall, park usage is assumed to remain about the same. Therefore, there would probably not be a substantial change in traffic trips, and impacts would likely be less than significant for each of the alternatives for the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area sites. In any case, the major intersections within the study area are either currently operating at acceptable levels of service or are expected to with planned improvements, and so could accommodate some increase in traffic. This conclusion is, however, still *too speculative to make a definitive determination regarding level of significance*.

Mitigation measures Air-1 through Air-4 and Air-6 listed in Section 4.1 AIR QUALITY, MM Water-6-5 listed in Section 4.6 WATER RESOURCES, and MM Safety-2 in Section 4.4 SAFETY would require a substantial increase in dog-related maintenance activity at the three sites. These mitigation measures have the potential to lead to secondary traffic trip impacts. However, for the DFPMP, it is likely that some of the activities in these mitigation measures would be combined with other existing and proposed maintenance work for the sake of efficiency, and so travel to and from the site would be minimized. Maintenance under these mitigation measures may result in one additional site visit per day at the DFPMP with one vehicle. These mitigation measures may result in up to two visits per day with likely one vehicle per visit at Hale Park and also at the Shoreline Beach Area, in addition to the existing daily visit at portions of the Shoreline Beach Area. Therefore, secondary traffic trip impacts from implementation of these air quality and water resources mitigation measures would be minor and *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures. For the park user-generated impacts, since the level of significance cannot be determined, no mitigation measures are provided. Since the non-dog related DFPMP impacts and the secondary impacts from the mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 and AQ-6, as well as Water-6-5 and Safety-2, are less than significant, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact. For the park user-generated impacts, as impacts are speculative and no mitigation measure is provided, an estimation of residual impacts cannot be made. For the secondary impacts from implementation of the air quality and water resources

mitigation measures and the non-dog related DFPMP impacts, no mitigation measures are required, so residual impacts would be less than significant.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Impact Tran-2 | Implementation of the DFPMP or the various dog-use alternatives at the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area may increase the need for vehicle parking, and combined with other existing parking demand, may result in the utilization of more than 85 percent of parking within easy walking distance of each of the sites. Or, the DFPMP or alternatives may contribute to an increased demand for parking in parking areas within easy walking distance of each of the sites that are at or exceeding 85 percent utilization. |
|----------------------|--|

Douglas Family Preserve Management Plan. With construction of the permanent caretaker's residence, there would continue to be a parking space provided for the caretaker's use only. Since sufficient parking space would be available near the residence, there would be no increase in demand for parking in the area surrounding the DFP from the residence. The additional visits to the DFP to conduct maintenance activities may require one or two additional parking spaces at any given time, but this minor demand would likely be accommodated in the areas surrounding the Preserve entrances, where there is capacity. Temporary restoration activities may result in several trips each day for a distinct time period until restoration is complete, and a consequent demand for parking. This demand would likely be met by the available parking surrounding the DFP, as well as on-site at the DFP. Hence, impacts to parking demand resulting from the caretaker's residence and maintenance and restoration activities outlined in the DFPMP would be *less than significant*.

Off-Leash Dog Park Locations. Based on the parking counts conducted in the vicinity of the DFP, Hale Park and the Shoreline Beach Area, an increase in the parking demand could be accommodated at most of the entrances. Nonetheless, the exact future parking impacts (e.g., how many more parking spaces may be needed) cannot be determined due to the lack of specific data on the future visitor use of the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area, and associated vehicle trips. Alternatives A (dogs off-leash only) and C-F (dogs off-leash with certain restrictions on days and times of use) are expected to result in an increase in the amount of dog use. As previously discussed, it is not possible to determine with any certainty whether an increase in the user group of dogs and their owners correlates with an overall increase in traffic trips and therefore parking demand, and to what quantifiable extent. However, there is not expected to be a substantial change relating to these different user groups; overall, park usage is assumed to stay at current levels at each of the three sites, regardless of the dog use alternative selected, for the same reasons enumerated under the discussion of Impact Tran-1, above. Consequently, parking impacts to the DFP, Hale Park, and the Shoreline Beach Area under each of the alternatives would probably be less than significant. However, this conclusion is still *too speculative to make a definitive determination regarding level of significance*.

For the same reasons as iterated in the discussion of Impact Tran-1 regarding secondary traffic trips, the secondary parking impacts due to implementation of mitigation measures Air-1 through Air-4, Air-6, Water-6.5 and Safety-2 are expected to be minimal. Any additional parking needed is expected to be minor (ranging from 1-2 spaces at any given time) and infrequent (up to 2 visits per day), and able to be accommodated at the existing parking areas identified for the DFP, Hale Park and the Shoreline Beach Area. Therefore, secondary parking impacts are expected to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures. For the park user-related impacts, since the level of significance cannot be determined, no mitigation measure is ~~provided~~required. For the secondary parking impacts deriving from non dog-related DFPMP elements, and from implementation of the air quality and water resource mitigation measures, parking impacts would be less than significant, so no mitigation measures are necessary.

Recommended Mitigation Measures. Although not required for impacts that are determined to be too speculative, the following mitigation measure is recommended for all park locations at which off-leash dog use is allowed:

MM Parking-1 Parking at DFP, SBA, and Hale Park shall be monitored within 1,250 feet of park entrances (except for Arroyo Burro County Park entrance to DFP). The monitoring shall identify any entrances where parking demand exceeds 85% of supply and shall trigger formation of a residential parking permit program would be established, if area residents agree. The residential permit parking program may restrict the time of day that non-residents may park near the park entrances. Off-street parking at DFP and Hale Park shall also be considered.

Residual Impact. For the park user-related impacts, as impacts are speculative and no mitigation measure is provided, an estimation of residual impacts cannot be made. Since the remaining impacts are not significant, no mitigation measures are required, and there would be less than significant residual impacts.

c. Policy Consistency. The project would be consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element and Coastal Act policies pertaining to parking. The amount of parking provided for the caretaker's residence would be minimal, and designed appropriately and solely for the use of the caretaker. The project would utilize existing parking in the vicinity of the site entrances, maximizing the efficient use of available parking, and continuing to share parking with other surrounding uses. Also, parking opportunities would be spread among various areas.

d. Congestion Management Program. A discussion of the project's consistency with the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' (SBCAG) Congestion Management Program (CMP) is provided below.

Impact Tran-3 Implementation of the DFPMP or the various dog-use alternatives at the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area may add traffic to an intersection or roadway that would be inconsistent with the Congestion Management Program, and result in significant impacts on the regional CMP system.

The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) has developed a set of traffic impact thresholds to assess the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on regional transportation facilities located within the Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadway system. The following guidelines were developed by SBCAG to determine the significance of project-generated traffic impacts on the regional CMP system:

1. For any roadway or intersection operating at Level of Service (LOS) A or B, a decrease of two levels of service resulting from the addition of project-generated traffic.
2. For any roadway or intersection operating at LOS C, project-added traffic that results in LOS D or worse.
3. For intersections within the CMP system with existing congestion, the following table defines significant impacts:

| Level of Service | Project-Added Peak Hour Trips |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| LOS D | 20 |
| LOS E | 10 |
| LOS F | 10 |

4. For freeway or highway segments with existing congestion, the following table defines significant impacts:

| Level of Service | Project-Added Peak Hour Trips |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| LOS D | 100 |
| LOS E | 50 |
| LOS F | 50 |

Traffic trips generated by secondary impacts from implementation of the mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, AQ-6, Water-65, and Safety-2 from implementation of the maintenance and restoration activities, and the caretaker’s residence and public restroom called for in the DFPMP, would be minimal and *less than significant* according to the SBCAG guidelines. Consequently, these elements would be consistent with the CMP, and so impacts would be *less than significant*.

As previously noted, it is not possible to predict an increase or decrease in park use under each dog use alternative at each of the three sites, and the corresponding change in traffic trips, with any degree of accuracy. Without knowing the future trip generation or distribution of park users at each of the three sites, a reliable traffic impact analysis cannot be made. However, overall, park usage is assumed to remain about the same. Therefore, there would probably not be a substantial change in traffic trips, and impacts pertaining to the Congestion Management Program would likely be less than significant for each of the alternatives for the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area sites. However, this conclusion is still *too speculative to make a definitive determination regarding level of significance*.

Mitigation Measures. For the park user-generated impacts, since the level of significance cannot be determined, no mitigation measure is provided. As the remaining impacts are less than significant, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact. For the park user-generated impacts, as impacts are speculative and no mitigation measure is provided, an estimation of residual impacts cannot be made. Since the remaining impacts are less than significant, no mitigation measures are required, and there would be less than significant residual impacts.

e. **Cumulative Impacts.** The following discussion describes the potential for cumulative traffic and circulation impacts from the proposed project.

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Impact Tran-4 | Implementation of the DFPMP and the various dog-use alternatives at the DFP, Hale Park, and Shoreline Beach Area may add traffic to an intersection with a V/C ratio exceeding 0.77, considering cumulative traffic volumes. |
|----------------------|---|

The secondary cumulative impacts from the air quality and water resources mitigation measures, as well as parking and traffic impacts from the DFPMP maintenance and restoration activities, caretaker's residence and public restroom are considered *less than significant*, and so these project elements would not substantially contribute to a cumulative impact. The project-specific analyses from the dog use alternatives at all three sites indicate that it would be too speculative to make a determination regarding level of significance for park user-generated parking and traffic impacts. Likewise, *to estimate cumulative traffic and circulation impacts would be speculative*. Nonetheless, only one project, consisting of 29 dwelling units near the intersection of Cliff Drive and Las Positas Road, is being proposed in the general areas of the three sites, for which the project might provide a considerable cumulative contribution to traffic and circulation impacts. Nonetheless, the intersection of Cliff Drive and Las Positas Road, currently operating at LOS F, is scheduled for improvement starting in late 2004, so that a LOS A is realized in the P.M. peak hour. These improvements are scheduled to occur prior to the proposed residential project being constructed. All other intersections identified in Table 4.5-1 are operating above acceptable City levels of service, and may be able to accommodate this and additional projects.

Mitigation Measures. For the park user-generated impacts, since the level of cumulative significance cannot be determined, no mitigation measure is provided. As the remaining cumulative impacts are less than significant, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact. For the park user-generated cumulative impacts, as impacts are speculative and no mitigation measure is provided, an estimation of residual impacts cannot be made. Since the remaining cumulative impacts are less than significant, no mitigation measures are required, and there would be less than significant residual impacts.