

ES-1 Introduction

The purpose of the Executive Summary and impact summary table is to provide the reader with a brief overview of environmental consequences that could potentially result from implementing the proposed Cate School Master Plan Update (Project). The proposed Project would revise the existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Cate School (Applicant).

The County of Santa Barbara (County) Planning and Development Department, as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), has prepared this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000 et seq., the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq., and the County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA. The EIR addresses the potential environmental impacts of the Project.

This EIR is an informational document that is being used by the general public and governmental / regulatory agencies to review and evaluate the Project. The reader should not rely exclusively on the Executive Summary as the sole basis for judgment of the Project and its alternatives. The complete EIR should be consulted for specific information about potential environmental effects and the implementation of related mitigation measures.

ES-2 Project Overview

Cate School operates under Santa Barbara County Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Number 89-CP-062 (as amended under Case Numbers 89-CP-062 AM01, 89-CP-062 SC03, 02AMD-00000-00009, 06RVP-00000-00013, and 07AMD-00000-00009), which governs operation of the school. The existing CUP provides a student enrollment cap of 280 students; a total population cap (including faculty and staff) was removed as part of the last CUP revision. The proposed Project would revise the existing CUP for the Cate School to allow for:

- Expansion and renovation of existing educational and administrative facilities over the life of the Master Plan, including:
 - Demolition of 26,582 square feet (sf) of existing buildings, including the 1925 dormitory, two faculty residences, a business office, the Savage House, and the Hooker Infirmary;
 - Construction of 180,861 sf of new building space, including two student dorms (replacing the existing 1925 dormitory), six faculty residences, a classroom building, a student center/dining facility, a squash pavilion, a multipurpose building, and additions to the arts building and the gymnasium; and
 - Renovation of 41,402 sf of existing building space, including five dormitories, the commons, classroom buildings, the chapel, the arts building, and the gymnasium and community center;
- An enrollment increase from 280 students to 300 students;

- Revisions to the existing onsite childcare center operation to allow Cate School to open enrollment to the local community, as long as 60 percent of enrolled children are affiliated with Cate School; and
- Authorization to use the existing portable Public Address (PA) system for sporting events and school functions.

Although the proposed Project would result in amendments to the CUP that would allow for new development and changes to Cate School operations, the proposed Project would not alter the existing permitted campus use as a private high school and boarding facility.

ES-3 Environmental Impact Report Scope

This EIR examines potential short- and long-term impacts of the Project. These impacts were determined through a rigorous process mandated by CEQA in which existing conditions are compared and contrasted with conditions that would exist once the Project is implemented. The contents of this EIR were established based on the findings in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the EIR Scoping Document and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) that preceded the NOP, as well as public and agency input during the scoping period. This EIR analyzes all resource areas required by CEQA. In order to focus the analysis in the EIR on resource areas identified by the Scoping Document and MND to be of primary concern for the Project, the impact analysis in this EIR is split into two chapters. Chapters 3, *Environmental Setting and Analysis, Primary Issue Areas*, analyzes resource areas identified as primary issue areas (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Fire Protection, and Noise). Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Analysis, Secondary Issue Areas*, analyzes all other resource areas, which were identified as a secondary issue areas.

The significance of each identified impact was determined using either County Thresholds of Significance or CEQA thresholds where there is no County threshold. The following categories are used for classifying Project-related impacts.

- ***Class I - Significant adverse impacts that are unavoidable:*** Significant impacts that cannot be effectively mitigated. No measures could be taken to avoid or reduce these adverse effects to insignificant or negligible levels. Even after application of feasible mitigation measures, the residual impact would be significant.
- ***Class II - Significant but mitigable adverse impacts:*** These impacts are potentially similar in significance to those of Class I, but can be reduced or avoided by the implementation of mitigation measures. After application of feasible mitigation measures, the residual impact would not be significant.
- ***Class III - Adverse but not significant impacts:*** While not required under CEQA to reduce an impact to a level of insignificant, mitigation measure(s) are often applied to an identified adverse but not significant impact to mitigate the impact to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with Santa Barbara County policy.
- ***Class IV - Beneficial impacts:*** Effects that are beneficial to the environment.

For each significant impact identified, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels are identified.

The EIR also presents alternatives to the Project, which include No Project, Reduced Project, and Reconfigured Project. Finally, the cumulative impacts of the Project when added to other local proposed or approved projects were also evaluated in Section 7.0, *Cumulative Impacts*.

ES-4 Notice of Preparation

The contents of this EIR were established based on the findings in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the EIR Scoping Document and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) that preceded the NOP, as well as public and agency input during the scoping period. In accordance with Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the NOP was prepared and distributed to responsible and affected agencies and other interested parties for a 30-day public review. The County distributed a NOP and the public review period began on February 10, 2015, and ended on March 12, 2015. The NOP was also posted in the Santa Barbara County Clerk's office for 30 days and sent to the State Clearinghouse at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to solicit statewide agency participation in determining the scope of the EIR. A copy of the NOP and comments received during the NOP review period are included in Appendix A.

ES-5 Summary of Project Impacts

The significance of each impact resulting from implementation of the Project has been determined according to the County's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* and/or CEQA thresholds. Table ES-1 presents a summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts from implementation of the Project. In summary, the Project would result in potentially significant Project-level and cumulative impacts that would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures related to air quality impacts during construction, noise impacts associated with operation of the PA system, traffic impacts related to increased enrollment, and use of the childcare center by the public and staff, fire hazards associated with limited site access, construction impacts to avocado orchards and other established trees, and potential impacts to local biological species.

ES-6 Summary of Cumulative Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) require that cumulative impacts be analyzed in an EIR when the resulting impacts are cumulatively considerable and, therefore, potentially significant. Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effect of project impacts with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative Impacts are analyzed in each resource section. The list of cumulative projects was compiled through review of the County's Cumulative Project List, as well as consultation with County staff on past, present, and foreseeable future projects. Table 7-1 in Section 7.0, *Cumulative Impacts*, provides a list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects that are considered as part of the cumulative impact analysis within this EIR. The Project's contribution to these cumulative impacts was determined to be less than significant (Class III) for aesthetic and visual resources; agriculture resources; air quality and greenhouse gasses; biological resources; cultural resources; energy; fire protection; geologic processes; hazardous materials/risk of upset; historic resources; land use; noise; public facilities;

recreation; transportation/ circulation; and water resource/ flooding water. There were no cumulative impacts determined to be considerable (Class I).

ES-7 Summary of Project Alternatives

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this EIR considers a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project or to the location of Project elements, which would feasibly achieve most of the basic objectives of the Project (refer to Section 2.3, *Project Objectives*) but would avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the Project.

An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider in detail alternatives that are infeasible or that would not attain most of the basic objectives of the project (Section 15126.6[f]). Further, an EIR need not consider an alternative with an unlikely or speculative potential for implementation or an alternative that would result in effects that cannot be reasonably ascertained (Section 15126.6[f][3]).

The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines also states that “there is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason” (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors [1990] 52 Cal.3d 553 and Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California [1988] 47 Cal.3d 376.).

The alternatives selected for analysis include:

Alternative 1: Redesigned Project. This alternative would analyze the proposed Project with modifications to the faculty housing cluster. Two of the faculty residences at the end of the proposed road spur would be relocated to other areas of the site in order to: 1) address environmental impacts resulting from development on steep slopes in excess of 30 percent; 2) to preserve native vegetation and mature, native specimen trees; and 3) to reduce overall visual impacts.

Alternative 2: Reduced Project. This alternative would consist of reduced development, where three of the five proposed faculty housing units west of Cate Mesa Road would be eliminated, and the remaining two faculty housing units would be converted into a duplex, resulting in a reduced overall size compared to the Project. Individual housing units under this alternative would total approximately 2,000 sf compared to approximately 2,350 sf per unit under the Project. This alternative would incrementally reduce impacts to geology and soils, air quality and GHG emissions, water resources, and aesthetics as a result of the reduced grading and site disturbance, and would reduce impacts to biological resources as a result of preserving additional oak trees and reducing the extent of native vegetation removal.

Alternative 3: No Project. This alternative evaluates Project impacts and benefits of not adopting the Cate School Master Plan Update. This would include a discussion of continued uses under the existing CUP, including the current maximum enrollment, usage of amplified sound, and operation of the childcare center in its permitted form.

The presentation of each alternative in Chapter 6.0, *Alternatives* consists of a description of the alternative followed by a qualitative analysis of potential impacts and a comparison to those impacts associated with the Project. This allows reviewers and decision makers to determine the general significance of impacts (if any) associated with the alternative and their relative severity when compared to those associated with the Project. Any substantial new mitigation measures not included in the analysis of Project impacts are also briefly described.

ES-8 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As required by CEQA, if the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA Section 15126.6 requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. Based on the analyses conducted in the preparation of this EIR, the No Project Alternative, followed by Alternative 2, Reduced Project, was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Alternative 2 would reduce Project-specific geologic process and biologic resource impacts, although both resources would still require mitigation Project-wide. Alternative 2 also meets most of the Project objectives. Therefore, Alternative 2 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1. Impact AQ-1. Increased air emissions from Project construction activities.	MM AQ-1a MM AQ-1b	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact AQ-2. Operational air emissions from the proposed Project.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact AQ-3. Greenhouse gas emission from the proposed Project.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact AQ-4. Increases in odor resulting from the proposed Project.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact AQ-5. Consistency with the Clean Air Plan.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact AQ-6. Consistency with the Energy and Climate Action Plan.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Fire Protection		
Impact FP-1. The risk of fire ignition in a Very High Fire Severity Hazard Zone would increase during construction of the proposed Project.	MM FP-1a	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact FP-2. The proposed Project would incrementally increase demand on fire protection services.	None required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact FP-3. The Project would create potentially adverse impacts to fire safety associated with vegetation and biofuel mass, resulting in potential for structural damage, injuries, or loss of life due to wildland fires.	MM FP-3a MM FP-3b	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact FP-4. The proposed Project would have access to an adequate emergency water supply; thereby reducing the potential for structural damage, injuries, or loss of life due to fires.	None required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact FP-5. The proposed Project would site structures in an area that would expose persons and structures to risk of structural damage, injuries, or loss of life due to wildland fires.	MM FP-5a	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact FP-6. The proposed Project would create potentially adverse impacts to fire safety associated with emergency access and evacuation routes, resulting in potential for structural damage, injuries, or loss of life due to wildland fires.	None required	Less than significant (Class III)

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts (Continued)		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Impact FP-7. The proposed Project could impair implementation of the existing Fire Evacuation Plan. Students and employees that evacuate during wildfire events may be exposed to wildland fire hazards, traffic congestion and associated dangers during emergency evacuation periods, resulting in potentially adverse impacts.	MM FP-7a	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Noise		
Impact NOI-1. Construction activities would result in significant exposure of persons to, or generation of noise levels.	MM NOI-1a MM NOI-1b MM NOI-1c MM NOI-1d	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact NOI-2. Operation of the Project could result in noise generation from special events and school activities.	MM NOI-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact NOI-3. Operation of the Project could result in increases in traffic and associated noise.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact NOI-4. The Project could result in noise generation from the operation of stationary equipment and site maintenance activities.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Aesthetics/Visual Resources		
Impact AEST-1. Buildout of the proposed Project could obstruct scenic vistas, public views, or create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.	MM AEST-1	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact AEST-2. The proposed Project could adversely change the visual character of an area.	MM AEST-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact AEST-3. Construction of the proposed Project could result in the obstruction of a scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.	MM AEST-3	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact AEST-4. The proposed Project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	MM AEST-4	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Agricultural Resources		
Impact AG-1. The proposed Project would convert unique farmland to non-agricultural use or impair agricultural land productivity (whether prime or non-prime).	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts (Continued)		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Impact AG-2. Proposed land uses under the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning and/or conflict with a Williamson Act Contract.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1. Construction activities could result in potential impacts to unique, rare, or threatened plant species and sensitive natural communities.	MM FP-3a MM BIO-1a MM BIO-1b MM BIO-1c MM BIO-1d	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact BIO-2. Construction activities could generate potential impacts to unique, rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife species and/or habitat that supports these species.	MM BIO-1d MM BIO-2a MM BIO-2b MM BIO-2c MM BIO-2d MM BIO-2e	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact BIO-3. Construction activities could result in the introduction or spread of non-native vegetation.	MM BIO-3	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact BIO-4. The construction of the Project could indirectly impact downstream water quality and habitats for aquatic species.	MM BIO-2b MM BIO-2c MM BIO-2d	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact BIO-5. The Project would result in a potential loss of healthy native specimen trees.	No mitigation required.	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact BIO-6. Project would result in a potential loss of habitat associated with the removal of avocado orchard.	No mitigation required.	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact BIO-7. Implementation of the Project would not introduce barriers to movement which would cause impacts to migratory species or patterns.	MM BIO-3	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Cultural Resources		
Impact CULT-1. Ground disturbances by construction of the Project in an area with potential cultural resource sensitivity could generate impacts to archeological resources.	MM CULT-1	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact CULT-2. The proposed Project would not generate an increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging archaeological resources of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic group.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Energy		
Impact EN-1. The proposed Project would generate new energy demands.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts (Continued)		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Geologic Processes		
Impact GEO-1. The Project would not expose people to landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, soil creep, mudslides, ground failure, or other geologic hazards during construction or operation.	MM GEO-1	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact GEO-2. Development of facilities adjacent to steep slopes could result in impacts to erosion and sedimentation.	MM WAT-3b MM WAT-3c MM GEO-1 MM GEO-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset Impacts		
Impact HAZ-1. Construction of the proposed Project could result in potential impacts from the use, storage, or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact HAZ-2. Operation of the proposed Project could result in potential impacts from the use, storage, or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact HAZ-3. The proposed Project would not result in a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (e.g., oil, gas, biocides, bacteria, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact HAZ-4. The proposed Project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact HAZ-5. The proposed Project would not contaminate a public water supply.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Historical Resources Impacts		
Impact HIST-1. The proposed Project would result in adverse physical impacts on structures and property more than 50 years old and of historic significance to the community.	MM HIST-1a MM HIST-1b	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Land Use Impacts		
Impact LU-1. The Project would not result in development and/or land uses incompatible with existing land use.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact LU-2. The Project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact LU-3. The proposed Project would not induce substantial growth or concentration of population and/or result in the extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond the Project site.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts (Continued)		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Public Facilities Impacts		
Impact PF-1. The proposed Project would not require the provision of new or physically altered facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact PF-2. The proposed Project has the capacity to generate significant amounts of solid waste.	MM PF-2a MM PF-2b	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact PF-3. The proposed Project would not require new or altered sewer system facilities.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact PF-4. The Project would require the construction of new storm water facilities.	MM WAT-1 MM WAT-2 MM WAT-3a MM WAT-3b MM WAT-3c MM GEO-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Recreation Impacts		
Impact REC-1. The proposed Project could lead to incremental use of local trails and regional recreational facilities.	MM REC-1	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Transportation/ Circulation Impacts		
Impact TRANS-1. Construction of the Project would temporarily increase vehicle traffic on roadways in the Project area.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact TRANS-2. Operation of the proposed Project would not generate traffic congestion impacts at area intersections.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact TRANS-3. The Project would not require additional road maintenance and off-site parking.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact TRANS-4. The Project would not result in an increased demand for transit services.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact TRANS-5. The proposed Project could create a traffic hazard and impair emergency access during construction.	MM TRANS-5	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact TRANS-6. The proposed Project could create a traffic hazards during operation as a result of increased traffic on roads with sight constraints.	MM TRANS-6	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Water Resources and Flooding		
Impact WAT-1. Use of the drainage systems proposed by the Project would generate less than significant impacts to channelization of storm water flow, however drainage structures could pose a flood risk.	MM WAT-1	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Residual Impacts (Continued)		
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Impact WAT-2. The proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the site.	MM WAT-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact WAT-3. Construction and operation of the proposed Project could result in a discharge of contaminants into a receiving body of water.	MM WAT-3a MM WAT-3b MM WAT-3c MM BIO-2c MM BIO-2d MM GEO-2	Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)
Impact WAT-4. Residential growth by the proposed Project would not generate adverse water demand impacts.	No mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)
Impact WAT-5. Development of proposed Project would result in the removal of vegetation from the buffer zone along Carpinteria Creek.	None mitigation required	Less than significant (Class III)

This page intentionally left blank.