REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS/PROPOSALS

For

Plans, Specifications, and Estimates, Environmental, and Right-of-Way Engineering and Acquisition Services

For

The Old Town Sidewalk Infill Project

February 17, 2017

Submit Qualifications/Proposals to:

City of Goleta
Public Works Department
c/o James Winslow
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA  93117
(805) 961-7500

Qualifications/Proposals Due by:  4:00 p.m.
Monday, March 13, 2017
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SECTION ONE – GENERAL

The City of Goleta (City) is issuing this Request for Qualifications/Proposals (RFQ/P) for environmental, right-of-way (ROW), final design and community outreach for the Old Town Sidewalk Infill (OTSW) Project (Project).

The City is soliciting statements of qualifications and proposals from consultant teams, referred to herein as “Consultant,” to provide:

All services necessary for the production of environmental document and obtain permit clearance, Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E), right-of-way (ROW) and community outreach support for the Project.

The Project includes construction of a network of sidewalks on at least one side of the streets in the Project areas in Old Town Goleta. The OTSW Project will provide curb, gutter, sidewalk and American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps for safe and effective pedestrian travel in Old Town Goleta. One pedestrian route of travel will be provided on at least one side of each street to create a fully connected sidewalk network for the community. Improvements will include minimum four-foot-wide sidewalks, curb ramp improvements, parallel and possibly angled parking in certain locations, associated driveway and cross gutter improvements, drainage, and lighting.

Upon review of proposals, the City will review and rank all responsive Consultants. At that time, the CITY may consider interviewing the top ranked firms. The City will then enter into negotiations with the top ranked Consultant team.

Proposals should be prepared as described under Description of Services (Section Four) and Proposal Content and Organization (Section Five). Person hours are requested as part of the proposal.

Evaluations of proposals and ranking of Consultants will be performed as described under Consultant Selection Process (Section Six).

SECTION TWO – ORGANIZATION

City is the sponsoring agency for the Project. City will contract all services required for Project.

- The Project is within the jurisdiction of City.
- City staff will review all Consultant deliverables.
- Consultant will take direction from City.
- An organization chart follows:
SECTION THREE – THE PROJECT

Background

Incorporated on February 1, 2002, the City of Goleta is situated on the south coast of Santa Barbara County along the US-101 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridors. Old Town Goleta is located in the heart of the City, bounded by Fairview Avenue, US-101/UPRR, and State Highway 217. The residential area of Old Town Goleta, where the project is located, has a population of approximately 3,094 and is a mixed use area with the majority of the residential area north of Hollister Avenue and on Pine Avenue. Small and large retail and service businesses are primarily located along Hollister Avenue and to the South, including some large commercial and industrial operations.

The OTSW Project will construct curb, gutter and sidewalk to create a network of sidewalk access throughout the project area in the residential neighborhoods north of Hollister Avenue and along Pine Avenue, south of Hollister Avenue. These neighborhoods currently lack consistent accessible sidewalks. The area is characterized by older neighborhoods with narrow streets, limited sidewalks, and private encroachments into the ROW) Design standards have significantly changed since Old Town Goleta was originally built. Therefore, many streets do not have sidewalks and the ROW width is insufficient and not consistent with current urban roadway design standards. Over the years, as development infill occurred, some areas were required to install sidewalks, but most areas are still lacking sidewalks. In many areas encroachments into the ROW have occurred leaving sidewalks to abruptly end or to not align.

Old Town Goleta, the City’s historic downtown, is certified as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the US Department of Water Resource (DWR). Hollister Avenue, the primary arterial in Old Town Goleta, provides the main connection for residents of the Old Town area to access nearby centers of employment and education.
The City received a California Active Transportation Grant (ATP) grant in 2015 for the environmental, ROW, final design and construction phases of the Project. The funding is State-only funding.

**Purpose and Need**

The project will provide for pedestrian access within Old Town Goleta by completing missing sections of sidewalk. These links will connect residents to and from Hollister Avenue or points south of Hollister to the commercial and light industrial areas.

**Project Description**

The OTSW Project is one of the City’s top priority projects. The Project includes removing pedestrian access barriers and improving walkability for connections to businesses and alternative modes of transportation by installing a network of sidewalks on at least one side of the streets in the Project areas in Old Town Goleta. The OTSW Project will provide curb, gutter, sidewalk and American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps for safe and effective pedestrian travel in Old Town Goleta. One pedestrian route of travel will be provided on at least one side of each street to create a fully connected sidewalk network for the community. Attachment A shows the Project location map. Improvements will include constructing the following:

- Removing existing sidewalks,
- Installing new 4-foot-wide sidewalks on at least one side of each street,
- Maximizing vehicle travel lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalk widths (where applicable),
- Installing ADA accessible ramps,
- Reconfiguring parking in the public ROW to include parallel and angled parking where appropriate and removal of head-in parking and parking in the dirt shoulder areas (outside the ROW),
- Restriping,
- Adjusting the location of utility conflicts – Southern California Edison power poles and above ground vaults, Goleta Water District meter boxes and vaults, etc.
- Removing private encroachments in the public ROW where necessary,
- Constructing curb and gutter on both sides of the street to improve drainage and stormwater run-off quality,
- Installing potential new connections to the existing storm drain system, and
- Improving street lighting where applicable.

**Project Goals**

The OTSW Project’s main goal is to enhance pedestrian conditions for residents in Old Town Goleta to improve walkability, safety, accessibility/ ADA compliance, and provide appropriate travel widths for pedestrians.
This will further related City goals and General Plan policies including:

- Expand Old Town Goleta’s transportation options by making the street safer for all travel modes (including walking, bicycling, public transit, and driving) and for all road users (including seniors, children and disabled persons);
- Provide safe and convenient multi-modal connections to employment, educational, and recreational centers within and adjacent to Old Town;
- Enhance community health by encouraging active forms of transportation and reducing polluting automobile travel;
- Improving street drainage; and
- Improving street lighting.

**Preliminary Engineering**

Cannon Engineering (Cannon) performed the conceptual phase/initial preliminary engineering for the Project. Additional preliminary engineering may be required to complete the environmental phase. Cardenas & Associates Surveying performed initial surveying for the Project. Cannon performed additional surveying work for the conceptual/preliminary plans. The conceptual/preliminary plans are included as Attachment B.

**Environmental**

The consultant team will review the project and determine the steps necessary to prepare the CEQA certification for City review and approval. The consultant team will prepare the CEQA documents based on the City’s template (Attachment C). The consultant team will analyze the potential environmental effects of the project to determine whether the project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The project most likely requires an Initial Study (Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration). The City will be the lead agency and the consultant team will prepare the Initial Study, assuming it is required. The consultant team will assist with at least three revisions to the documents prior to releasing the documents for public review. Consultant will assist the City with two revisions to the document during the following the public circulation period. The work will include public outreach and up to two workshops in both English and Spanish during the preliminary CEQA phase as well as a Public Hearing during the document circulation for comment phase.

**Permits**

The Project may require a State Water Resources Control Board Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and may be subject to the Central Coast Post-construction Stormwater Management Regulations.

**Right-of-Way**

The project potentially includes the City acquiring the rights to private property, requesting encroachments in the public ROW to be vacated, easements for utilities, or rights of entry and temporary construction easements. The consultant team shall coordinate with the City staff on these ROW negotiations. Two to three public workshops are anticipated for the ROW phase of work as identified in the Public Outreach section below. Attachment D lists the potential ROW conflicts for the sidewalk project.
Public Outreach

The Consultant team will assist City staff with public engagement. Because of the diverse and competing interests in this area, we expect the public engagement to be challenging. The OTSW Project is a high priority project for which the City received a $2.224 million ATP grant to complete the work. Council has expressed their support for as a top priority project. Public outreach will include preparing and assisting with public workshops and public notifications in English and Spanish. Staff anticipates up to two public workshops for the CEQA process. In addition, outreach will be required for the ROW, design and initial construction phases of work. The Consultant team should plan on four to six public workshops for the design, ROW and initial construction phases. The Consultant team will prepare the outreach materials, submit them for staff review, and revise the documents for publication. The City uses a number of methods for communicating information to the public on daily, weekly and monthly basis: Email and text notifications, City website, Facebook, Twitter, Monarch Press (monthly email/print newsletter), postcards, mailings, and neighborhood meetings.

Design

The Consultant team will prepare final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) for the Project. Two to three public workshops are anticipated for the design and initial construction phases of work as identified in the Public Outreach section above.

Project Challenges

The conceptual/preliminary engineering work identified several challenges to successfully completing the design and construction of the project. This include, but are not limited to the following:

- Working with substandard road widths from ROW to ROW,
- Increasing legal parking spots while head-in parking is removed,
- Evaluating the drainage and potential ways to improve drainage,
- Coordinating with utilities on relocations given the roadway constraints,
- Coordinating ROW acquisitions, easements, and private encroachments, and
- Conducting public outreach in a disadvantaged community.

SECTION FOUR – DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

Scope of Work

The CONSULTANT’S Scope of Work may include but is not limited to the following:

Task 1. Management

- Management, administration, coordination, quality control, quality assurance.
- In addition to the City, interface with other involved agencies as necessary and only with City direction.
- Attend project development meetings.
- Assist City Project Manager in preparing and maintaining Project history file.
Task 2. **Environmental** [the project most likely requires an Initial Study (Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration)]

- Prepare the CEQA documents based on the City’s template (Attachment C).
- Analyze the potential environmental effects of the project to determine whether the project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment.
- Prepare the Initial Study, assuming it is required.
  - Perform the required technical studies for a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
  - Assist with at least three revisions to the documents prior to releasing the documents for public review.
  - Assist the City with two revisions to the document during the following the public circulation period.
- Assist with preparing the two public notices for the Notice of availability and the public hearing for adoption of the CEQA document. Public notices must be bilingual to serve the Spanish speaking community members.
- Assist the City with the formal Public Hearing and up to two outreach events at the Community Center during the preliminary data gathering period. The public outreach aims at educating the community on the purpose of the OTSW Project and involves the community in identifying issues, goals, objectives, vision, needs, and priorities. It will also be used to seek the community’s feedback on the impacts. Outreach efforts must be bilingual to serve the Spanish speaking community members.
- Prepare the final CEQA documents, likely a Mitigated Negative Declaration, and supporting resolutions and draft notices of determination for City review and City Council authorization.

Task 3. **Surveying**

- Provide supplemental surveying as necessary to ensure sufficient base mapping for PS&E development.

Task 4. **ROW**

- Conduct surveys of existing easements, property lines and other topographic feature.
- Acquire full title reports.
- Prepare contract negotiation documents.
- Prepare rights of entry and temporary construction easement document as required.

Task 5. **Public Outreach**

- Develop key messages and collateral materials for public outreach for CEQA process including two workshops
- Develop key messages and collateral materials for two to three workshops for the ROW coordination.
- Develop key messages and collateral materials for two to three workshops for the final design and initial construction phases.
- Develop specific outreach strategies for reaching Spanish-speaking community.
- Assist staff with preparing for three City Council meetings.
- Prepare materials in English and Spanish. Revise based on staff edits.
• Provide English and Spanish translator for the workshops.

**Task 6. 35% PS&E**
• Prepare 35% Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and respond to agency comments.

**Task 7. 65% PS&E**
• Prepare 65% Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and respond to agency comments.

**Task 8. 95% PS&E**
• Prepare 95% Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and respond to agency comments.

**Task 9. Final Contract Package**
• Prepare final bid package.
• Prepare resident engineer file and documentation.

**Task 10. ROW Engineering**
• Assist staff with preparing materials for Council presentation on approach to Project ROW needs – acquisitions, vacate encroachments, construction process.
• Prepare ROW appraisal maps.

**Task 11. ROW Appraisals, Acquisitions, and Construction Easements**
• Prepare appraisals for potential acquisitions or construction easements.

**Task 12. Utility Coordination**
• Identify all utilities within the Project area and identify conflicts.
• Assist staff in coordinating utility kick-off meeting.
• Assist staff in coordinating relocating impacted utility facilities.
• Coordinate with utility companies regarding placement of new facilities within Project improvement areas.

**Task 13. Bidding and Award**
• Assist staff in responding to contractor requests for information (RFIs) during bidding.
• Assist staff in reviewing bids.

**Task 14. Design Support During Construction**
• Provide design support services during construction.
• Respond to contractor RFIs during construction.
• Review potential change orders for field design alternatives or value engineering.

**Task 15. Record Drawings and Project Closeout**
• Prepare Record Drawings from As-built redline drawings.
• Assist staff with Project Closeout.

Design Support during Construction may be authorized through a contract amendment prior to start of construction.

**Exhibits to Agreement**

1. A detailed Scope of Work based on the above tasks shall be developed by Consultant and included in the proposal. This Scope of Work will be refined during final negotiations
between selected Consultant and the City and will be incorporated into the agreement between City and Consultant (See sample agreement in Attachment E).

2. A Project schedule will be included in the agreement between the City and Consultant.

CONSULTANT Requirements

1. The Project Manager and Engineer must hold California Professional Engineers (PE) licenses.
2. The Consultant team will be responsible for accuracy, completeness and correctness of all submittals and in compliance with the Quality Management Plan (QMP) for the Project.
3. The Consultant shall submit a copy of their QA/QC plan.
4. The successful Consultant and Subconsultants will not be eligible to bid on the construction contract or provide construction management and inspection testing services for Project.
5. The successful Consultant must be available through construction of Project to address design questions.

Standards

1. All deliverables shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Goleta standards followed by the newest Caltrans Design Manual, the 2010 Caltrans Standard Specifications and Standard Plans, Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM), Caltrans Right of Way Manual, Caltrans Environmental SER, AASHTO, 2010 CAMUTCD or most recent updates if they are legally necessary.
2. All deliverables will be in English units.

Work Performed by Others

1. **Permitting.** City staff will take the lead role in securing all Project permits, if any. Consultant will provide technical support to the City.
2. **Project Review.** City will perform review and approval of all Project deliverables.
3. **Public Outreach.** The Consultant team will prepare the public outreach documents for staff review. Consultant team will revise based on staff input. City staff will lead all community outreach efforts during Project with Consultant team support. Consultant shall prepare exhibits and be available for public workshops/open houses as well as providing translation services for Spanish – oral and written.
4. **Right of Way.** City will provide legal services necessary should Eminent Domain proceedings be required.
SECTION FIVE – PROPOSAL CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

Consultant teams shall submit three (3) copies of their proposal limited to up to fifteen (15) sheets that are double-sided exclusive of cover letter, resumes, and references. The proposal shall be organized in the following format and shall include the information in the below outline:

A. Cover Letter
The cover letter must be signed by an officer of the firm authorized to execute a contract with the City. The primary contact should be identified and a phone number, email and mailing addresses provided.

B. General Qualifications
Provide a summary of the consultant team’s qualifications, general information about the firm(s), location of office(s), years in business and areas of expertise such as traffic engineering, design and public outreach. In addition, provide a brief description of projects that involved a similar scope of services. Include the following information with each “similar design project” description:
   a. Name of the firm(s) involved in project
   b. Description of project
   c. Total constructed project cost
   d. Project start date and completion date
   e. Description of services provided
   g. Total value of services provided
   h. Budget and schedule performance
   i. Subconsultants involved
   j. Name, telephone number, email and address of the client representative for project

In addition to the information listed above, provide a matrix that displays proposed Consultant team members (specific individuals) against the listed “similar design projects” as identified above. Preference will be given to Consultant team that demonstrates experience with complex projects, tight grant deadlines, complex ROW (preferably in disadvantaged communities), and a proven record of successful public outreach.

C. Key Staff & Subconsultants
Identify key staff and include a description of their abilities, qualifications and experience. Attach resumes of key staff that will be assigned to this project. Include a proposed project management structure, organizational chart, and availability to work on this project.

Identify any portion of the scope of work that would be subcontracted. Include firm qualifications (brief) and key personnel, telephone number, email address and contact person for all subcontractors. The City reserves the right to approve or reject all consultants, internal staff performing consulting services, or subconsultants proposed by the Consultant.

D. Project Workplan
Consultant team shall describe its understanding of the project, detailed work approach and methodology. Consultant team shall recommend expanding on the scope of work if
appropriate to accomplish the overall objectives of the project and provide suggestions or recommended approaches which might enhance the results. Include assumptions about the number of meetings needed with City staff and other project stakeholders to complete the Scope of Work. Consultant team shall provide an example of a similar projects prepared by the firm or proposed team. Consultant team shall also include a schedule of work, including benchmarks, milestones, and staff titles (not names) and hours (not rates) for accomplishing the tasks. Design recommendations for addressing project challenges identified above will be taking into account in the scoring process.

E. References
Consultant team shall provide a list of references for the firm and any subconsultants, including the names, addresses, email addresses and telephone numbers of recent clients, preferably other public agencies for which Consultant team has done similar work. Include a list of specific projects associated with each reference, date work was performed, cost and key personnel involved.

F. Budget
The cost proposal shall include all labor costs, overhead costs, subconsultant costs, and an itemized list for direct expenses. Costs must be shown in a matrix format detailed by tasks along with associated personnel hours per task and labor rates. The cost proposal shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope.

The City has an ATP grant with the following grant funding amounts listed below. This funding will cover the Consultant team as well as staff time, recordation or permit fees, and other project related costs. Funds not entirely used or needed in one phase will be reallocated to the design or construction phases per Caltrans requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>ATP Grant Funding</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Phase</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Phase</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E Phase</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>$1,721,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$2,151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,224,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$555,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,779,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Insurance
Consultant team shall submit a copy of their existing commercial liability insurance detailing their current level of coverage. Please be advised that the selected Consultant team shall be required to provide the following insurance coverage prior to the City issuing a Notice to Proceed:

Commercial general liability at least as broad as ISO CG 0001 (per occurrence) ............................................ $1,000,000

(General aggregate).................................................................................................................. $2,000,000

Commercial auto liability at least as broad as ISO CA 0001 (per accident) ............................................ $1,000,000
Errors and omissions liability
(per claim and aggregate)$....................................................1,000,000

Workers’ compensation Statutory ........................................ $1,000,000

I. CAD Equipment

Consultant must provide a brief description of the CAD system to be used in developing engineering plans. Final CAD plans must be available in AutoCAD 2015 for production of As-Built Plans.

J. Professional Conflict of Interest

Notwithstanding any other provision of this RFQ/P, it is the practice of City to preclude specific firms from providing engineering services to City on Project. These firms are identified as follows:

Any firm, individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity currently retained for professional services by an owner or developer or any other representative of a real property interest adjacent to, or coincident with, Project. For purposes of this discussion, "currently retained" shall mean any professional services contract in force on the due date of this technical proposal for Project, or during the term of the Project.

SECTION SIX – CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS

Through the Consultant Selection Process a consultant selection panel, drawn from qualified professionals, will be formed to evaluate consultant proposals. After reviewing the proposals, the Consultant Selection Panel will meet to determine the Consultant team rankings. At that time the panel may elect to invite firms to interview. The panel will recommend the first and second ranked Consultant teams for selection to the Public Works Director. The top ranked Consultant team will be invited to participate in contract negotiations with the City. If these negotiations should fail, the second ranked Consultant team will be invited to participate in contract negotiations.

SECTION SEVEN – GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Agreement

The Consultant team shall enter into agreement with the City using the City of Goleta Standard Agreement used by City for Professional Services (Sample provided as Attachment E).
B. Proposal Submission
Consultant team shall submit three (3) copies of their proposal limited to fifteen (15) sheets that are double-sided exclusive of cover letter, resumes, and references, (1) copy should be an unbound reproducible copy. Proposals shall be received no later than **4:00 p.m. on Monday, March 13, 2017**, at the following address. Please note that late submittals will be rejected and returned.

City of Goleta
Public Works Department
Attn: James Winslow
130 Cremona Drive, Ste. B
Goleta, CA 93117

C. Proposed Project Schedule
The following proposed schedule is subject to reasonable change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFQ/P Issue</td>
<td>February 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Proposal Submissions</td>
<td>March 13, 2017 by 4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants Selected for Interviews (anticipated)</td>
<td>March 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants’ Interviews</td>
<td>Week of March 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection and Finalization of Scope</td>
<td>April 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Staff Report on City Website</td>
<td>May 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Award of Contract</td>
<td>May 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Schedule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Documents and signatures due</td>
<td>May 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>May 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Project, project description, data collection</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft CEQA documents</td>
<td>June 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Draft IS/MND</td>
<td>July 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Review starts</td>
<td>July 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 day public review ends</td>
<td>August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and edits to Final CEQA documents</td>
<td>August 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final for public hearings</td>
<td>August 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council hearing</td>
<td>September 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit CEQA certification</td>
<td>September 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Design/ROW Phase**                                                 |                                |
| CTC authorization                                                    | January 2018                   |
| Public Outreach                                                      | Feb. – Oct. 2018               |
| Acquisition, Easement negotiations/documents                          | Feb. – Jan. 2018               |
| PS&E                                                                | Jan. 2018-Nov. 2018            |
| Public Outreach                                                      | May – July 2018                |
| Final Design                                                         | July – Oct. 2018               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Phase</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Qualifications/Proposal Property
   All Statements of Qualifications/Proposals become the property of the City upon submission.

E. Non-Commitment of the City
   This RFQ/P does not commit the City to select a Consultant team, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a proposal for this request, or to produce or contract for services. The City reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals received as a result of this request, or to modify or cancel in part or in its entirety the RFQ/P if the City determines it is in the best interest of the City to do so.

F. Inquires
   All inquiries concerning this RFQ/P shall be made in writing and directed to: James Winslow, Senior Project Manager, who can be reached via Email: jwinslow@cityofgoleta.org. Response to questions will be in writing and transmitted to all consultants that showed interest, or posted on the City’s web site. The City reserves the right to amend the RFQ/P by addendum. If necessary the proposal submittal deadline will be extended to allow proposers additional time to respond to an RFQ/P addendum.

G. Notification and Debriefing of Unsuccessful Proposers
   City will notify all of the proposers of the selection panel’s recommendation. Consultants desiring a debriefing will be allowed to make an appointment with the City. Debriefings will not be scheduled until the City Council has acted on the recommendations of staff.
Attachment A – Project Location Map
Old Town Goleta Sidewalk Network Project – Network Plan

Legend:
- Existing sidewalks
- Proposed sidewalks

- Orange – proposed sidewalk on East side
- Fairview – proposed SW on East side
- Magnolia – proposed finishing last northern section
- Magnolia – existing sidewalk on East side
- Magnolia – proposed finishing last northern section
- Alondra and Mallard – existing sidewalk on both sides
- Armitos – proposed sidewalk, new curb on South side
- Aguila – proposed sidewalk on North side
- Gato – proposed sidewalk on North Side
- Tecolote – grade, ROW, setback and developer issues
- Tecolote – existing sidewalk on both sides
- Pine – proposed sidewalk on East side
- Mandarin – proposed SW on North side
- Nectarine – proposed sidewalk east side
- Mandarin – existing sidewalk on North side
- Hollister Ave.
Attachment B – Conceptual/Preliminary Engineering Plans
OLD TOWN SIDEWALKS INFILL - SHEET 14

ARMITOS AVE - EXISTING CONDITION
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"

ARMITOS AVE - PROPOSED CONDITION
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"
Attachment C – City of Goleta Draft Initial Study and Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration Checklist
1. **PROJECT TITLE:**

2. **LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:**
   City of Goleta
   Planning and Environmental Review
   130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
   Goleta, CA 93117

3. **CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:**

4. **APPLICANT:**          **AGENT:**

5. **PROJECT LOCATION (WITH AERIAL OF LOCATION):**

6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

7. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

8. **APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:**
   Typical Agencies Include:
   Central Coast Regional Water Board
   Santa Barbara County Fire Department
   State Fish and Wildlife
   US Army Corp of Engineers
9. SITE INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Use and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Uses/Zoning North: South: East: West:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Existing: Proposed:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

11. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist and analysis on the following pages.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
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☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

12. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this environmental checklist/initial study:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier environmental impact report or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier environmental impact report or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration document, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

________________________________________________________________________
Jennifer Carman, AICP, Director                                         Date

3
13. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

(a) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

(b) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

(c) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

(d) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (e) below, may be cross-referenced).

(e) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
2) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
3) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
(f) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

(g) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

(h) Lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected. The explanation of each issue should identify:

1) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
2) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
14. ISSUE AREAS:

AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures
If mitigation measures are warranted, the mitigation measures needs to clearly identify the purpose and the action, the timing, and the responsible party for carrying out the measure and verifying it.
If no impact and/or no mitigation measures are needed, use the following language (applicable throughout the document): Based on the above analysis, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual Impact
AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study
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**Thresholds of Significance**
A significant impact to Agriculture and Forest Resources would occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, according to the City of Goleta's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it converts prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impairs the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
### AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**Meteorological Setting**

The project site is located on the coastal plain in the City of Goleta (City). The climate in and around the City of Goleta, as well as most of Southern California, is dominated by the strength and position of the semi-permanent high-pressure center over the Pacific Ocean near Hawaii. It creates cool summers, mild winters, and infrequent rainfall. It drives the cool daytime sea breeze, and it maintains a comfortable humidity range and ample sunshine after the frequent morning clouds dissipate. However, the same atmospheric processes that create the desirable living climate combine to restrict the ability of the atmosphere to disperse the air pollution generated by the population attracted in part by the desirable climate.

Temperatures in the Goleta area average 59 degrees annually. Daily and seasonal oscillations of mean temperature are small because of the moderating effects of the nearby oceanic thermal reservoir. In contrast to the steady temperature regime, rainfall is highly variable. Measurable precipitation occurs mainly from early November to mid-April, but total amounts are generally small. Goleta averages 18 inches of rain annually with January as the wettest month.
Based on typical wind patterns, locally generated air pollutant emissions are carried offshore at night, and toward inland Santa Barbara County by day. Dispersion of pollutants is restricted when the wind velocity for nighttime breezes is low. The lack of development in inland Santa Barbara County, however, causes few air quality problems during nocturnal air stagnation. Daytime ventilation is usually much more vigorous. Both summer and winter air quality in the project area is generally very good.

Existing Air Quality

The project site is located in the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The SCCAB encompasses San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties. The site is located in Santa Barbara County. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) operates ambient air monitoring stations that measure pollutant concentrations throughout the SCCAB. The nearest monitoring stations to the project site are: the Goleta monitoring station, located at 380 North Fairview Avenue, which monitors ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen oxides (NOₓ); and the Santa Barbara station, located at 700 East Canon Perdido, which measures inhalable particulate matter (PM-10), and fine particulate matter (PM-2.5). Data from the monitoring stations have been published for the last five years. The following conclusions can be drawn from this data:

1. Photochemical smog (ozone) levels infrequently exceed standards. The State 1-hour ozone standard has not been exceeded in seven years, and the State and Federal 8-hour standards were each exceeded once in 2009.

2. CO measurements in Goleta have remained at a low level since 2008. Federal and State CO standards have not been exceeded in the last five years. Maximum 1-hour CO levels at the closest air monitoring station are currently less than 25 percent of the most stringent standard because of continued vehicular improvements. This data suggests that baseline CO levels in the project area are generally healthful and can accommodate a reasonable level of additional traffic emissions before any adverse local air quality effects would be expected.

3. PM-10 levels occasionally exceed the State standard, but the Federal standard is very rarely exceeded. Between 2008 and 2012, the State PM-10 standard was exceeded on less than 4 percent of all days, while the more lenient Federal standard has not been exceeded in the past 5 years.

4. A substantial fraction of PM-10 is comprised of ultra-small diameter particulates capable of being inhaled into deep lung tissue (PM-2.5). Even with the revision of the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) to 35 µg/m³, the frequency of days exceeding the standard is minimal. PM-2.5 measurements have only exceeded Federal standards once in the past 5 years.

5. More localized pollutants such as NOₓ, lead, etc. are likely very low near the project site because background levels never exceed allowable levels based on APCD’s monitoring of measured pollutants according to federal standards. There is substantial excess dispersive capacity to accommodate localized vehicular air pollutants such as NOₓ without any threat of violating the applicable standards.
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Regulatory Framework

Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS)

Federal and state law regulates Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, state regulations have stricter standards than those at the federal level. AAQS are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate federal and/or state ambient air quality standard.

Federal standards are established by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and are termed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The State standards are established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and are called the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The region generally has good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards. The APCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that Federal and State air quality standards are being met.

Air Quality Planning

State and federal laws require jurisdictions that do not meet clean air standards to develop plans and programs that will bring those areas into compliance. These plans typically contain emission reduction measures and attainment schedules to meet specified deadlines. If and when attainment is reached, the attainment plan becomes a "maintenance plan."

In 2001, the CARB developed an attainment plan that was designed to meet both federal and state planning requirements. The federal attainment plan was combined with those from other statewide non-attainment areas to become the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) was adopted as the County portion of the SIP, designed to meet and maintain clean air standards. The 2013 CAP, adopted by the APCD Board, incorporates updated data and is currently the most recent Clean Air Plan for meeting the state ozone standard.

Santa Barbara County is designated as a federal ozone attainment area for the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (the 1-hour federal standard was revoked for Santa Barbara County). The County is also considered in attainment for the state one-hour standard for ozone as of 2010. "Attainment" means those areas of the country where air pollution levels are persistently below the national ambient air quality standards. A new California 8-hour ozone standard was implemented in May 2006, which the County has violated. The County also continues to violate the state standard for PM-10, therefore Santa Barbara County is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and for PM-10. The County is in attainment for the federal PM-2.5 standard and is designated “unclassified” for the State PM-2.5 standard, and is designated “attainment” or “unclassified” for other state standards and for all federal clean air standards. “Unclassified” means that there is currently no quantifiable data to measure ambient air quality standards in that area. Those jurisdictions that are designated both as “attainment” or “unclassified” are considered to be in attainment of
ambient air quality standards even though there is currently no quantifiable data to measure its specific ambient air quality levels.

Thresholds of Significance—Criteria Pollutants
A significant air quality impact could occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

In addition, pursuant to the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, a significant adverse air quality impact may occur when a project, individually or cumulatively, triggers either of the following:

a) Interfere with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NOX (nitrogen oxides) and ROC (reactive organic compounds; same as reactive organic gases [ROG]). Thresholds are 25 pounds/day of either NOX or ROC;

b) Equals or exceeds the state or federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling);

c) Results in toxic or hazardous pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population;

d) Causes an odor nuisance problem impacting a considerable number of people.

Cumulative air quality impacts and consistency with the policies and measures in the City’s General Plan and the Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) should be determined for all projects (i.e., whether the project exceeds the AQAP standards).

The following significance thresholds have been established by the APCD (*Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents*, SPCAPCD, 2011). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these APCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for the impact analysis.

**APCD Operational Impacts Thresholds**

Based on APCD Thresholds, a project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

e) Emit 240 pounds per day or more of ROG and NOX from all sources;

f) Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicle trips only;

g) Emit 25 pounds per day or more of unmitigated NOX from any motor vehicle trips only;

h) Emit 80 pounds per day or more of PM-10;

i) Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);

j) Exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk); or

k) Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.
The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (SBCAPCD 2013).

i) Due to the County’s non-attainment status for ozone and the regional nature of ozone as a pollutant, if a project’s emissions from traffic sources of either of the ozone precursors (NO\textsubscript{X} or ROC), exceed the operational thresholds, then the project’s cumulative impacts are considered significant.

m) For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2013 Clean Air Plan growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

**APCD Construction Impacts Thresholds**

Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term emissions. However, CEQA requires that the short-term impacts such as exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generation during grading must be analyzed. The APCD recommends that construction-related NO\textsubscript{X}, ROC, PM-10, and PM-2.5 emissions, from diesel and gasoline powered equipment, paving, and other activities, be quantified.

n) APCD uses 25 tons per year for NO\textsubscript{X} and ROG as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts.

Under APCD Rule 202 D.16, (APCD, Rule 202, 2012), if the combined emissions from all construction equipment used to construct a stationary source which requires an Authority to Construct permit, have the potential to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant, except carbon monoxide, in a 12-month period, the permittee shall provide offsets under the provisions of Rule 804 (APCD, Rule 804, 2012) and shall demonstrate that no ambient air quality standard will be violated.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Construction Period Impacts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table AQ-1**

**Total Short-Term Construction Unmitigated Emissions**

**Fugitive and Exhaust Sources**

(tons/ year)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions</th>
<th>Thresholds</th>
<th>25 tons/year</th>
<th>25 tons/year</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>25 tons/year</th>
<th>25 tons/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod v. 2013.2.2 model

Operational Impacts:

Discuss the project impacts and include the below information regarding Table AQ-2.

The operational mobile, area, and energy source emissions for the project were calculated using the CalEEMod computer model (version 2013.2.2). The model was used to calculate unmitigated area emissions from the operation of the additional trips of the new freestanding antenna and the resulting vehicular operational emissions for the monthly trips to/from the site. The model assumes that operation of the project would begin in 20XX. The results are shown below in Table AQ-2.

Table AQ-2

Project Operations – Unmitigated Mobile and Area Source Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions (lbs./day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SBCAPCD Threshold 25/55 a 25/55 a N/A N/A 80 N/A

Exceed Threshold Yes/No Yes/No N/A N/A Yes/No N/A
Cumulative Impacts – The below for suggested analysis. Modify/revise as appropriate.

The significance thresholds used for air quality analysis on a project level (25 lbs per day of NOx or ROG from transportation sources only) are also intended to address cumulative air quality impacts. The project’s operational emissions as outlined in Table AQ-2 would/would not exceed these thresholds; therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts are considered less than significant.

A project’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP), the County’s plan to achieve attainment status of the ozone standard, is based on consistency with growth forecasts used in developing the CAP. The 2013 CAP was adopted by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) Board on March 19, 2015, and is the most recent applicable air quality plan. The 2013 CAP used Santa Barbara’s County Association of Government Regional Growth Forecast 2010-2014 (adopted December 2012), to project population growth. This forecast is based on development anticipated by general plans, including the Goleta General Plan. The Goleta General Plan denotes the land use for the entire City, including this project site, and based on the adopted General Plan Land Use Plan anticipates an increase of xxxx (insert what every the appropriate land use is proposed such as units, commercial square footage, industrial square footage etc.) by the year 2030. Add here the project’s consistency (if applicable) with the adopted General Plan.

Although the project would increase/decrease/ no change (insert what is appropriate) the number of trips generated at the site, and thus associated air emissions, the assessment of consistency is based on whether the project would result in an increase beyond that anticipated by the General Plan. Continued use of the site for XXX was anticipated as part of the General Plan’s build out.

Additionally, the assessment of consistency is based on whether the project would result in an increase in total population that would exceed the forecast population. The project, an xxxx, and its projected XXX employees/residents (use what is appropriate) are/ are not (use what is appropriate) anticipated to result in an increase in the City’s residential population that exceeds the forecasts used in the 2013 CAP. Therefore, the project is/is not accounted for in the 2013 CAP growth projections and would/would not result in an
inconsistency with the current CAP. The project’s contribution to regional cumulative air quality impacts is considered less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**Thresholds of Significance**
A significant impact on Biological Resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition the City of
Goleta’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual defines the following thresholds of significance:

1. **Types of Impacts to Biological Resources**
   Disturbances to habitats or species may be significant, based on substantial evidence in the record, if they substantially impact significant resources in the following ways:
   
   a. Substantially reduce or eliminate species diversity or abundance.
   b. Substantially reduce or eliminate quantity or quality of nesting areas.
   c. Substantially limit reproductive capacity through loss of individuals or habitat.
   d. Substantially fragment, eliminate, or otherwise disrupt foraging areas and/or access to food resources.
   e. Substantially limit or fragment range and movement (geographic distribution of animals and/or seed dispersal routes).
   f. Substantially interfere with natural processes, such as fire or flooding, upon which the habitat depends.

2. **Less Than Significant Impacts**
   The *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* provides examples of areas in the City of Goleta where impacts to habitat are presumed to be less than significant, including:
   
   a. Small acreages of non-native grassland if wildlife values are low.
   b. Individuals or stands of non-native trees if not used by important animal species such as raptors or monarch butterflies.
   c. Areas of historical disturbance such as intensive agriculture.
   d. Small pockets of habitats already significantly fragmented or isolated, and disturbed or degraded.
   e. Areas of primarily ruderal species resulting from pre-existing man-made disturbance.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study

Project Name

Date

CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Ethnographic and Historic Setting

Historically, settlement in the vicinity of the project site was defined by three periods: the Mission Period (AD 1769 to 1830), the Rancho Period (AD 1830 to 1865), and the American Period (AD 1865 to 1915). The first European contact to the Santa Barbara coastal region was by Portuguese explores in 1542, followed by the Spanish in 1602. At the time of this first European contact in 1542, the Goleta area was occupied by a Native American group speaking a distinct dialect of the Chumash Language (GP FEIR). This group later became known as the Barbareno Chumash. The Chumash were hunters and gatherers who lived in areas surrounding the much larger prehistoric Goleta Slough. The prevalent Chumash population at the time of Spanish contact, had at least 10 Chumash villages in the Goleta Area and immediate vicinity (GP FEIR).

As provided in the City’s General Plan Final EIR (Section 3.5, Cultural Resources), the City is known to contain prehistoric, ethnographic, historical and paleontological resources. The City’s General Plan Final EIR (GP FEIR) (Figure 3.5-1, Historic Resources), shows areas containing sensitive historic/cultural resources, identifying 46 historic resource locations. The proposed project site is within an existing research business park which was originally constructed in the 1950s. As part of that original development the entire project site was graded, including the proposed project location.

No known unique paleontological resource or site has been identified onsite. Additionally, the project site does not contain any unique geologic features or historic resources.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on cultural resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The City’s
adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it results in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
# GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The underlying geologic structure of the proposed project site is of Recent Quaternary Age Younger Alluvium (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.6-1, September 2006). The soils on site consist of Camarillo fine sandy loam. (GP/CLUP FEIR Figure 3.2-3, September 2006). In the area where the antenna is proposed, the area slopes from the west to the east towards Castilian Drive. There is approximately one foot of fall, creating a gentle slope along the northern portion of the site.
The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California that has experienced ground motion in response to earthquakes in the past. All of the City of Goleta is located within Seismic Zone D as designated by the California Uniform Building Code.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on geology/soils would occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual stipulates that a proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts related to geology have the potential to be significant if the project involves any of the following characteristics:

a. The project site or any part of the project is located on land having substantial geologic constraints, as determined by the City of Goleta. Areas constrained by geology include parcels located near active or potentially active faults and property underlain by rock types associated with compressible/collapsible soils or susceptible to landslides or severe erosion.

b. The project results in potentially hazardous geologic conditions such as the construction of cut slopes exceeding a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical.

c. The project proposes construction of a cut slope over 15-feet in height as measured from the lowest finished grade.

d. The project is located on slopes exceeding 20% grade.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting
Describe project site specifically in a few sentences.

Climate Change Background

Parts of the Earth’s atmosphere act as an insulating “blanket” for the planet. This “blanket” of various gases traps solar energy, which keeps the global average temperature in a range suitable for life. The collection of atmospheric gases that comprise this blanket are called “greenhouse gases,” based on the idea that these gases trap heat like the glass walls of a greenhouse. These gases, mainly water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), ozone (O3), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), all act as effective global insulators, reflecting visible light and infrared radiation back to earth. Most scientists agree that human activities, such as producing electricity and driving internal combustion vehicles, have contributed to the elevated concentration of these gases in the atmosphere. As a result, the Earth’s overall temperature is rising.

Climate change could impact the natural environment in California by triggering, among others things:
- Rising sea levels along the California coastline;
- Extreme-heat conditions, such as heat waves and very high temperatures, which could last longer and become more frequent;
- Increase in heat-related human deaths, an increase in infectious diseases, and a higher risk of respiratory problems caused by deteriorating air quality;
- Reduced snow pack and stream flow in the Sierra Nevada mountains, affecting winter recreation and water supplies;
- Potential increase in the severity of winter storms, affecting peak stream flows and flooding;
- Changes in growing season conditions that could affect California agriculture, causing variations in crop quality and yield; and
- Changes in distribution of plant and wildlife species due to changes in temperature, competition from colonizing species, changes in hydrologic cycles, changes in sea levels, and other climate-related effects.
According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. This absorption traps heat within the atmosphere creating a greenhouse effect that is slowly raising global temperatures. California law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) (Health and Safety Code, § 38505(g)).

The effect each GHG has on climate change is measured as a combination of the volume of its emissions, and its global warming potential (GWP), and is expressed as a function of how much warming would be caused by the same mass of CO2. Thus, GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of CO2 equivalents (CO2e), and are often expressed in metric tons of CO2 equivalents (MT CO2e) or millions of metric tons of CO2 equivalents (MMT CO2e).

Global climate change issues are addressed through the efforts of various federal, state, regional, and local government agencies as well as national and international scientific and governmental conventions and programs. These agencies work jointly and individually to understand and regulate the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and resulting climate change through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of programs. The significant agencies, conventions, and programs focused on global climate change are listed below.

Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
California Air Resources Board
California Executive Order S-3-05
California Executive Order S-13-08
California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006 (AB 32)
Senate Bill (SB) 97. SB 97, enacted in 2007
State of California Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan
Senate Bill (SB) 375. SB 375
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
City of Goleta Energy Efficiency Standards

Thresholds of Significance
The State Natural Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for GHG emissions that became effective on March 18, 2010. These new CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. According to the amendments made to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact if it would:

A. Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or

B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

The adopted CEQA amendments require a lead agency to make a good-faith effort based, to the extent possible, on scientific and factual data in order to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. They give discretion to the lead agency in whether to:
1. Use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; and/or
2. Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

In addition, a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment:

1. The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and
3. The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The amendments call on Lead Agencies to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions.

Currently, neither the State of California nor the City of Goleta has established CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions. Indeed, many regulatory agencies are sorting through suggested thresholds and/or making project-by-project analyses. This approach is consistent with that suggested by California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in its technical advisory entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through the California Environmental Quality Act Review (CAPCOA; 2008):

…In the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other specific data to clearly define what constitutes a ‘significant project’, individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.

In June 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) became the first regulatory agency in the nation to approve guidelines that establish thresholds of significance for GHG emissions.¹ These thresholds are summarized in Table GHG-1.

¹ In March 2012, an Alameda County Superior Court (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (March 5, 2012) Alameda Super. Ct. Case No. RG1--548693) ruled that BAAQMD needed to comply with CEQA before adopting its 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines, which included significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and GHGs. On August 13, 2013, the Court of Appeals (California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 1171, rev. granted) reversed the lower court’s decision and upheld the BAAQMD Guidelines. That decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted review on November 26, 2013. On December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court made a partial ruling, but remanded the substantive question, i.e., whether the 2010 Air Quality CEQA Guidelines were valid, back to the Court of Appeals for a decision (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369).
Table GHG-1
Bay Area Air Quality Management District GHG Thresholds of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Source Category</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential (land use projects)</td>
<td>1,100 Metric Ton (MT) CO$_2$e/yr. or 4.6 MT CO$_2$e/SP/yr. $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources $^b$</td>
<td>10,000 MT CO$_2$e/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^a$ SP = Service Population (residents + employees).

$^b$ Stationary Sources include stationary combustion sources (industrial-type uses) regulated by the APCD.

On June 10, 2010, the Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department produced a memorandum “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,” which states, “While Santa Barbara County land use patterns differ from those in the Bay Area as a whole, Santa Barbara County is similar to certain Bay Area counties (in particular, Sonoma, Solano, and Marin) in terms of population growth, land use patterns, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, and average commute patterns and times. Because of these similarities, the methodology used by BAAQMD to develop its GHG emission significance thresholds, as well as the thresholds themselves, have applicability to Santa Barbara County and represent the best available interim standards for Santa Barbara County.” In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15064.4(b)(2), and 15064.7(c), the City has consistently relied upon Santa Barbara County’s “Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards,” as the expert recommended threshold for establishing greenhouse gas impacts of a project.

The City of Goleta is located in Santa Barbara County and shares meteorological attributes, as well as similar land use patterns and policies, and thresholds deemed applicable in Santa Barbara County would also reasonably apply to projects within the City Goleta. In addition, the City of Goleta would rely upon the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), as a commenting agency, to review the GHG analysis, and these thresholds would represent a consistent approach and uniformity for impact determinations for City and County projects under the District’s review. Therefore, this analysis uses the BAAQMD/Santa Barbara County Interim Thresholds of Significance to determine the significance of GHG emissions related to this project, based on the 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/year or 4.6 MT CO$_2$e per service population per year threshold for commercial and residential land uses. There is no BAAQMD threshold of significance for construction emissions.

According to the applicable thresholds for this project, the project would result in a significant impact if it:

---

Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study

Project Name
Date

A. Generates operational emissions in an amount more than 1,100 MT CO$_2$e/yr., and/or results in significant construction or operational GHG emissions based on a qualitative analysis.

B. Fails to employ reasonable and feasible means to minimize GHG emissions in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of AB 32.

It is also noted that the use of the BAAQMD threshold does not imply that it is a threshold that the City has formally adopted or should adopt as a GHG emissions significance threshold.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**Thresholds of Significance**
A significant impact with regards to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Thresholds Manual addresses public safety impacts resulting from the involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification to facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or non-hazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. Since the project is not a hazardous materials facility, the City’s risk based thresholds are not applicable.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study

**Project Name**

**Date**

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study

Project Name
Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Thresholds of Significance

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
### LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant land use and planning impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study

**MINERAL RESOURCES**

| Would the project:                                                                 | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |                                |                                               |                             |           |                  |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? |                                |                                               |                             |           |                  |

**Existing Setting**
No known mineral resources have been identified on the project site nor would the project result in the loss of locally important mineral resources.

**Thresholds of Significance**
A significant impact on mineral resources would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts in the checklist above.

**Project Specific Impacts**

- a,b) The proposed project would not result in the loss of mineral resources that are of value to the region or the state and would not otherwise interfere with or preclude access to mineral resources as none have been mapped within the city by the State of California Department of Conservation. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to mineral resources.

**Cumulative Impacts**
The project would have no impact on any cumulative loss on mineral resources or resource recovery sites.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**
No mitigation measures are warranted.

**Residual Impact**
The project would not result in any residual impacts on mineral resources.
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NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Describe setting of the site.

Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The measurement of sound takes into account three variables: 1) magnitude, 2) frequency, and 3) duration.

Magnitude is the measure of a sound’s “loudness” and is expressed in decibels (dB) on a logarithmic scale. Decibel levels diminish (attenuate) as the distance from the noise source increases. For instance, the attenuation rate for a point noise source is 6dB every time the distance from the source is doubled. For linear sources such as Highway 101 or the railroad tracks, the attenuation is 3 dB for each doubling of distance from the source.

The frequency of a sound relates to the number of times per second the sound vibrates. One vibration/second equals one hertz (Hz). Normal human hearing can detect sounds ranging from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz.
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Duration is a measure of the time to which the noise receptor is exposed to the noise. Because noise levels in any given location fluctuate during the day, it is necessary to quantify the level of variation to accurately describe the noise environment. One of the best measures to describe the noise environment is the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). CNEL is a noise index that attempts to take into account differences in the intrusiveness of noise between daytime hours and nighttime hours. Specifically, CNEL weights average noise levels at different times of the day as follows:

Daytime—7 am to 7 pm  Weighting Factor = 1 dB
Evening—7 pm to 10 pm  Weighting Factor = 5 dB
Nighttime—10 pm to 7 am  Weighting Factor = 10 dB

The Noise Element in the GP/CLUP sets the noise and land use standards for the maximum noise exposure to certain land uses. For example, pursuant to Table 9-2 in the Noise Element, noise exposure levels such as 50-67.5 A-Weighted Level Decibel (dBA) are considered normal and acceptable for commercial related uses. Figures 9-1 and 9-3 display the existing and future (2030) roadway noise levels for the project site and both the existing and future noise levels are projected not to exceed 65 dBA, which meets noise and land use compatibility criteria in Table 9-2.

Additionally, the project site is located within the approach zone of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBMA). GP/CLUP Noise Element Figures 9-2 and 9-4 display the existing and future (2030) airport noise levels for the project parcel and both the existing and future noise levels are projected to not exceed 65dBA, which meets the land use compatibility criteria in GP/CLUP Noise Element Table 9-2 for airport related noise.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, based on the City of Goleta’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, Section 12 Noise Thresholds, the following thresholds are used to determine whether significant noise impacts would occur:

1. A development that would generate noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL and could affect sensitive receptors would generally be presumed to have a significant impact.

2. Outdoor living areas of noise sensitive uses that are subject to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL would generally be presumed to be significantly impacted by ambient noise. A significant impact would also generally occur where interior noise levels cannot be reduced to 45 dBA CNEL or less.

3. A project would generally have a significant effect on the environment if it would increase substantially the ambient noise levels for noise sensitive receptors in adjoining areas. Per Threshold 1 above, this may generally be presumed to occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are increased to 65 dBA CNEL or more. However, a significant affect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dBA CNEL, as determined on a case-by-case level.
4. Noise from grading and construction activity proposed within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including schools, residential development, commercial lodging facilities, hospitals or care facilities, would generally result in a potentially significant impact. According to the US EPA guidelines, the average construction noise is 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source. A 6 dB drop occurs with a doubling of the distance from the source. Therefore, locations within 1,600 feet of the construction site would be affected by noise levels over 65 dBA. Construction within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors on weekdays outside of the hours of 8:00AM to 5:00PM and on weekends would generally be presumed to have a significant effect. Noise attenuation barriers and muffling of grading equipment may also be required. Construction equipment generating noise levels above 95 dBA may require additional mitigation.

With regard to Threshold 3, the term “substantial increase” is not defined within the Thresholds Manual. The limits of perceptibility by ambient grade instrumentation (sound meters) or by humans in a laboratory environment is around 1.5 dB. Under ambient conditions, people generally do not perceive that noise has clearly changed until there is a 3 dB difference. A threshold of 3 dB is commonly used to define “substantial increase.” Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, an increase of +3 dBA CNEL in traffic noise would be a significant impact. Increases of +3.0 dB require a doubling of traffic volumes on already noise-impacted roadways. Projects usually do not, by themselves, cause traffic volumes to double. Offsite traffic noise impacts are, therefore, almost always cumulative in nature rather than individually significant.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
### Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study
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#### POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**  
Describe setting of project.

As of January 2016, California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that City has a population of 31,235 people, has approximately 11,844 housing units, and has an average household size of 2.80 people per household. Upon build out of the GP/CLUP (anticipated to occur by the year 2030), the City's population is expected to reach 38,100.

**Thresholds of Significance**  
A significant impact on population and housing would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

**Project Specific Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**Residual Impact**
PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of these public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other public facilities?

Existing Setting

**Fire Protection**

The project site is located within the urban area, in a central portion of the City of Goleta. Fire services would be provided by Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) under contract to the City. The closest fire station to the project site is Station #11 located on 6901 Frey Way (approximately .85 miles away). The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and SBCFD identify the following three guidelines regarding the provision of fire protection services:

1. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons is the ideal goal. However, one firefighter for every 4,000 persons is the absolute maximum population that should be served.
2. A ratio of one engine company per 12,000 persons, assuming three firefighters per station (or 16,000 persons assuming four firefighters per station), represents the maximum population that should be served by a three-person crew.
3. A five-minute response time in urban areas.

The mandated California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) requirement for firefighter safety, known as the “two-in-two-out rule”, is also applicable. This rule requires a minimum of two personnel to be available outside a structure prior to entry by firefighters to provide an immediate rescue for trapped or fallen firefighters, as well as immediate assistance in rescue operations.

The SBCFD has implemented a dynamic deployment system, for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station’s engine is “in house”. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already
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on the road for emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area”, as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered “in-service” and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer. The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out.”

Station 11 has an engine company with a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, and firefighter. Fire Station 11 currently does not meet the NFPA and SBCFD guidelines, as follows (City of Goleta, GP/CLUP Final EIR, Table 3.12-1; 2006):

1) The current ratio of firefighters to population at Fire Station 11 is 1: 7,198.
2) Fire Station 11 currently serves a population of 21,594 (2000 Census), which is above the ratio of one engine company (three-person solely Station 11’s first-in district crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 9,594 people.
3) Response time from Fire Station 11 is typically within 5 minutes, although the western edge of the City and some northern neighborhoods may experience a longer response time. The Fire Station 11 is approximately 0.8 miles by road to the southeast of the project site and well within a five-minute response time.

Police Protection
Police services are provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department under contract with the City of Goleta (City). The City is divided into 3 patrol units, with 1 police car assigned to each unit. Additional police services are available from Santa Barbara County to supplement City police in an emergency. City police operate from three locations: the City offices at 130 Cremona Drive, an office located in Old Town on Hollister Avenue, and a third location at the Camino Real Marketplace.

Schools
Public education services are provided by the Goleta Union School District (GUSD) and the Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD). In general, enrollments in the area school system have been declining for the past several years and area schools serving the project vicinity are operating below capacity. These schools include Foothill Elementary School at 711 Ribera Drive, Kellogg Elementary School at 475 Cambridge Drive, Goleta Valley Junior High at 6100 Stow Canyon Road, and San Marcos High School at 4750 Hollister Avenue.

Parks
A more detailed discussion of parks is provided below under Recreation. The City currently contains approximately 16 acres of public parks. City parks are considered in combination with open space to provide recreational opportunities and encompass
approximately 526 acres, and an existing ratio of 17 acres per 1,000 residents (Goleta GP/CLUP 2006).

Libraries
Services at the Goleta Public Library are provided by contract with the City of Santa Barbara in a facility owned by the City at 500 North Fairview Avenue. The 2-acre library site includes a 15,437 square foot (SF) building and parking areas. The facility provides services to the City and nearby unincorporated areas. In Fiscal year 2013/2014, there were approximately 297,000 library visits and circulation was 606,741. In Fiscal Year 2014/2015, services were provided by 6 full-time and 14 part-time employees.

Thresholds of Significance
A significant impact on public services would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include thresholds of significance for potential impacts on area schools. Specifically, under these thresholds, any project that would result in enough students to generate the need for an additional classroom using current State standards would be considered to result in a significant impact on area schools. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual notes current State standards are: Grades K-2, 20 students per classroom; Grades 3 -8, 29 students per classroom; and Grades 9 – 12, 28 students per classroom.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
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### RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**a.** Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

**b.** Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

### Existing Setting

As of 2005 as identified within the GP/CLUP, the City of Goleta has 16 public parks, 4 private parks, and 18 public open spaces areas comprising a total of 526 acres. This is approximately 17 acres per thousand residents. The City has adopted a goal of providing 4.7 acres of parkland (open space lands whose primary purpose is recreation) per thousand residents. The City’s single recreation center is the Goleta Valley Community Center.

### Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on recreation would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

### Project Specific Impacts

### Cumulative Impacts

### Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

### Residual Impact
### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant project generated traffic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City’s Thresholds Manual and include the following:
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1) The addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or sends at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E or D, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>INCREASE IN V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Including the project)</td>
<td>(Greater than)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR THE ADDITION OF

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

3) Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with a substantial increase in traffic (e.g. rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use, etc.) that would become potential safety problems with the addition of project or cumulative traffic.

4) Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection(s) capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service (A-C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.81) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 for intersections which would operate from 0.80 to 0.85 and a change of 0.02 for intersections which would operate from 0.86 to 0.90, and 0.01 for intersections operating at anything lower.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

**Wastewater Treatment**

*Water Sources, Supply, and Demand*  
The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor for the City of Goleta and surrounding areas. The GWD service area is located in the southern portion of Santa Barbara County with its western border adjacent to the El Capitan State Park, its northern border along the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Los Padres National Forest, the City of Santa Barbara to the east, and the Pacific Ocean to the

---

3 The source of the data provided in this section, except as otherwise noted, is Goleta Water District, *Water Supply Assessment City of Goleta Proposed Amended General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan*, May 22, 2008.
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south. The service area encompasses approximately 29,000 acres and includes the City of Goleta, University of California, and Santa Barbara Airport (City of Santa Barbara property); the remainder of the service area is located in the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara. GWD provides water service to approximately 86,946 people through a distribution system that includes over 270 miles of pipeline, as well as eight reservoirs ranging in individual capacity from 0.3 million gallons to over 6 million gallons, with a total combined capacity of approximately 20.2 million gallons.

Drainage Facilities

Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste

The County of Santa Barbara County owns and, through its Public Works Department (Department), operates the Tajiguas Landfill as well as the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station. The management of solid waste by the Department includes collection, recycling, disposal, and mitigation for illegal dumping. Within the City, collection services are provided by Marbog Industries. Waste generated in the City is handled at the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station where recyclable and organic materials are sorted. The remaining solid waste is disposed of at the Tajiguas Landfill.

The 80-acre Tajiguas Landfill, located 26 miles west of Santa Barbara, has a permitted capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards of which 71% is already utilized. The facility is permitted to operate through 2020 and based on current waste disposal rates it will reach its 23.3 million cubic yard capacity in approximately 2023. The South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station process 550 tons of waste per day (City of Goleta, GP/CLUP FEIR, 2006).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact would be expected to occur if the proposed project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

Cumulative Impacts

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Residual Impact
# MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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16. ATTACHMENTS:
    A. Project Plans (11" x 17" reductions)
    B. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Attachment D – Network Sidewalk Potential ROW Conflicts Spreadsheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>REDM Action</th>
<th>SDRM (subject to)</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Lent Cost</th>
<th>SubCost</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5832</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5835</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$283.00</td>
<td>$283.00</td>
<td>$566.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia 130</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,014.00</td>
<td>$2,014.00</td>
<td>$4,028.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5870 Utility</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5812 Temporary</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5810 Temporary</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5880 Temporary</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5810 Temporary</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Temporary &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5870 Utility</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Permanent &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5812 Temporary</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Permanent &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5880 Temporary</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Permanent &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5810 Temporary</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Permanent &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin 5870 Utility</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Permanent &amp; Permanent - Encroachment, Easement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Roadway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>Owner has control of ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All sums are in dollars.
- The table represents cost subtotals including taxes and fees.
- Rows marked with an asterisk (*) indicate additional notes are available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Address</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>RDW Action</th>
<th>RDW Solicited</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>SubTotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Photo 1</th>
<th>Photo 2</th>
<th>Photo 3</th>
<th>Photo 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Decorative Picket Fence</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 75</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Grass &amp; Ornamental hedge</td>
<td>6 feet 30 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 34</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Picket Fence</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 156</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Decorative Picket Fence</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 38</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Decorative Picket Fence</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolote 95</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Right to Open</td>
<td>200-00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Decorative Picket Fence</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/27/2017
Attachment E – Professional Design Services Sample Agreement
AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF GOLETA  
AND  
(Insert Name of CONSULTANT or CONTRACTOR)

This AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES is made and entered into this (day) day of (month), 2017, by and between the CITY OF GOLETA, a municipal corporation (herein referred to as "CITY"), and CONSULTANT, (herein referred to as "CONSULTANT").

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT represents that they are sufficiently experienced and capable of providing the services agreed to herein and are sufficiently familiar with the needs of the CITY; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT was (explain process of selection RFP) selected for award of this AGREEMENT by (Department Director or Manager); and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT was recommended for award based on ________; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT was selected for award of this AGREEMENT by City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, on this 14th day of February, 2017, approved this AGREEMENT and authorized the City Manager to execute this AGREEMENT per the Goleta Municipal Code Section 3.05.240.

CITY and CONSULTANT agree as follows:

1. RETENTION AS CONSULTANT

CITY hereby retains CONSULTANT, and CONSULTANT hereby accepts such engagement, to perform the services described in Section 2. CONSULTANT warrants it has the qualifications, experience, and facilities to properly and timely perform said services.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

The services to be performed by CONSULTANT are as follows:

Professional environmental services in conjunction with the Old Town Sidewalk Infill Project. Services shall generally include project review, CEQA document preparation, public outreach, support for preparing Council reports, public notices and resolutions, as more particularly set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto.
forth in the Scope of Work, attached as Exhibit “A,” and incorporated herein. CONSULTANT shall deliver to CITY the deliverables defined in Exhibit A.

3. COMPENSATION AND PAYMENT

   (a) **Maximum and Rate.** The total compensation payable to CONSULTANT by CITY for the services under this AGREEMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED the sum of $ (herein "not to exceed amount"), and shall be earned as the work progresses on the following basis:

   Hourly at the hourly rates and with reimbursement to CONSULTANT for those expenses set forth in CONSULTANT’s Schedule of Fees marked Exhibit "B," attached and incorporated herein. The rates and expenses set forth in that exhibit shall be binding upon CONSULTANT until , after which any change in said rates and expenses must be approved in writing by CITY’s Project Manager (CITY is to be given 60 days notice of any rate increase request), provided the not to exceed amount is the total compensation due CONSULTANT for all work described under this AGREEMENT.

   (b) **Payment.** CONSULTANT shall provide CITY with written verification of the actual compensation earned, which written verification shall be in a form satisfactory to CITY’s Project Manager. Invoices shall be made no more frequently than on a monthly basis, and describe the work performed (including a list of hours worked by personnel classification). All payments shall be made within 30 days after CITY’s approval of the invoice.

4. EXTRA SERVICES

   CITY shall pay CONSULTANT for those CITY authorized extra services, not reasonably included within the services described in Section 2, as mutually agreed to in advance. Unless CITY and CONSULTANT have agreed in writing before the performance of extra services, no liability and no right to claim compensation for such extra services or expenses shall exist. The applicable hourly rates for extra services shall be at the hourly rates set forth in the compensation exhibit. Any compensation for extra services shall be part of the total compensation and shall not increase the not to exceed amount identified in Section 3.

5. CITY PROJECT MANAGER AND SERVICES BY CITY

   The services to be performed by CONSULTANT shall be accomplished under the general direction of, and coordinate with, CITY’s "Project Manager," as that staff person is designated by CITY from time to time, and who presently is James Winslow, Senior Project Engineer. Project Manager shall have the authority to act on behalf of the
CITY in administering this AGREEMENT but shall not be authorized to extend the term of the AGREEMENT or increase the not to exceed amount.

CITY shall perform the services as follows:
- Lead Agency for the CEQA process,
- Preparing the final Council staff report, public notices, and resolutions,
- Submitting the final CEQA certification to Caltrans

6. TERM, PROGRESS AND COMPLETION

The term of this AGREEMENT is from the date first written above to December 31, 2017, unless term of this AGREEMENT is extended or the AGREEMENT is terminated as provided for herein.

CONSULTANT shall not commence work on the services to be performed until (i) CONSULTANT furnishes proof of insurance as required by paragraph 10 below, and (ii) CITY gives written authorization to proceed with the work provided by CITY’s Project Manager. All services shall be completed according to the schedule for delivery of services attached as Exhibit “C” and incorporated here in as “schedule.”

7. OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTS

All drawings, designs, data, photographs, reports and other documentation (other than CONSULTANT’s drafts, notes and internal memorandum), including duplication of same prepared by CONSULTANT in the performance of these services, are the property of CITY. CITY shall be entitled to immediate possession of the same upon completion of the work under this AGREEMENT, or at any earlier or later time when requested by CITY. CITY agrees to hold CONSULTANT harmless from all damages, claims, expenses, and losses arising out of any reuse of the plans and specifications for purposes other than those described in this AGREEMENT, unless written authorization of CONSULTANT is first obtained.

8. PERSONAL SERVICES/NO ASSIGNMENT/SUBCONTRACTOR

This AGREEMENT is for professional services which are personal to CITY. is deemed to be specially experienced and is a key member of CONSULTANT’s firm, and shall be directly involved in performing, supervising or assisting in the performance of this work. This key person shall communicate with, and periodically report to, CITY on the progress of the work. Should any such individual be removed from assisting in this contracted work for any reason, CITY may terminate this AGREEMENT. The following portions of the work will be subcontracted out to other parties by CONSULTANT:

This AGREEMENT is not assignable by CONSULTANT without CITY’s prior consent in writing.
9. **HOLD HARMLESS AND INDEMNITY**

   (a) **Hold Harmless for CONSULTANT's Damages.** CONSULTANT holds CITY, its elected officials, officers, agents, and employees, harmless from all of CONSULTANT's claims, demands, lawsuits, judgments, damages, losses, injuries or liability to CONSULTANT, to CONSULTANT's employees, to CONSULTANT's contractors or subcontractors, or to the owners of CONSULTANT's firm, which damages, losses, injuries or liability occur during the work required under this AGREEMENT, or occur while CONSULTANT is on CITY property, or which are connected, directly or indirectly, with CONSULTANT's performance of any activity or work required under this AGREEMENT.

   (b) **Defense and Indemnity of Third Party Claims/Liability.** CONSULTANT shall indemnify, defend with counsel approved by CITY, and hold harmless CITY, its officers, officials, employees and volunteers from and against all liability, loss, damage, expense, cost (including without limitation reasonable attorneys fees, expert fees and all other costs and fees of litigation) of every nature arising out of or in connection with CONSULTANT's negligence, recklessness or willful misconduct in the performance of work hereunder or its failure to comply with any of its obligations contained in this AGREEMENT, except such loss or damage which is caused by the sole active negligence or willful misconduct of the CITY. Should conflict of interest principles preclude a single lawyer from representing both CITY and CONSULTANT, or should CITY otherwise find CONSULTANT’s legal counsel unacceptable, then CONSULTANT shall reimburse the CITY its costs of defense, including without limitation reasonable attorneys fees, expert fees and all other costs and fees of litigation. The CONSULTANT shall promptly pay any final judgment rendered against the CITY (and its officers, officials, employees and volunteers) with respect to claims determined by a trier of fact to have been the result of the CONSULTANT's negligent, reckless or wrongful performance. It is expressly understood and agreed that the foregoing provisions are intended to be as broad and inclusive as is permitted by the law of the State of California and will survive termination of this AGREEMENT.

   (c) **No Waiver.** CITY does not waive, nor shall be deemed to have waived, any indemnity, defense or hold harmless rights under this section because of the acceptance by CITY, or the deposit with CITY, of any insurance certificates or policies described in Section 10.

10. **INSURANCE**

CONSULTANT shall, at CONSULTANT's sole cost and expense, provide insurance as described herein. All insurance is to be placed with insurers authorized to do business in the State of California with an A.M. Best and Company rating of A- or better, Class VII or better, or as otherwise approved by CITY.

Insurance shall include the following (or broader) coverage:
a) Insurance Services Office Commercial Liability coverage “occurrence” form CG 00 01 or its exact equivalent with an edition date prior to 2004 and with minimum limits of $1,000,000 per occurrence and $2,000,000 in the aggregate.

b) Insurance Services Office form number CA 0001 or equivalent covering Automobile Liability, including hired and non-owned automobile liability with a minimum limit of $1,000,000 per accident. If the Service Provider owns no vehicles, this requirement may be satisfied by a non-owned and hired auto endorsement to Service Provider’s commercial general liability policy.

c) Workers’ Compensation insurance complying with California worker’s compensation laws, including statutory limits for workers’ compensation and an Employer’s Liability limit of $1,000,000 per accident or disease.

d) Professional Liability insurance on a policy form appropriate to CONSULTANT’s profession. Limits shall be no less than $1,000,000 per claim.

Liability insurance policies required to be provided by CONSULTANT hereunder shall contain or be endorsed to contain the following provisions:

a) CITY, its employees, officials, agents and member agencies shall be covered as additional insureds. Coverage shall apply to any and all liability arising out of the work performed or related to the contract. Additional insured status under the general liability requirement shall be provided on Insurance Services Office Form CG 20 10 with an edition date prior to 2004, or its exact equivalent. Additional insured status for completed operations shall be provided either in the additional insured form or through another endorsement such as CG 20 37 with an edition date prior to 2004.

b) CONSULTANT’s insurance shall apply to each insured against whom a claim is made or suit is brought, except with respect to the limits of the insurer’s liability. Coverage will not be limited to CITY’s vicarious liability.

c) Liability coverage shall be primary and non-contributing with any insurance maintained by CITY.

d) Evidence of coverage (including the workers’ compensation and employer’s liability policies) shall provide that coverage shall not be suspended, voided, canceled or reduced in coverage or in limits except after 30 days’ prior written notice has been given to CITY. Such provision shall not include any limitation of liability of the insurer for failure to provide such notice.
e) No liability insurance coverage provided to comply with this AGREEMENT shall prohibit CONSULTANT, or CONSULTANT's employees, or agents, from waiving the right of recovery prior to a loss. CONSULTANT waives its right of recovery against CITY.

f) CONSULTANT agrees to deposit with CITY within fifteen days of Notice to Proceed of the Contract certificates of insurance and required endorsements.

g) There shall be no recourse against CITY for payment of premiums or other amounts with respect to the insurance required to be provided by CONSULTANT hereunder. Any failure, actual or alleged, on the part of CITY to monitor compliance with these requirements will not be deemed as a waiver of any rights on the part of CITY. CITY has no additional obligations by virtue of requiring the insurance set forth herein. In the event any policy of insurance required under this AGREEMENT does not comply with these requirements or is canceled and not replaced, CITY has the right but not the duty to obtain the insurance it deems necessary and any premium paid by CITY will be promptly reimbursed by CONSULTANT or CITY will withhold amounts sufficient to pay premium from CONSULTANT payments.

h) CONSULTANT agrees to provide immediate notice to CITY of any claim or loss against CONSULTANT arising out of the work performed under this AGREEMENT. CITY assumes no obligation or liability by such notice, but has the right (but not the duty) to monitor the handling of any such claim or claims if they are likely to involve CITY.

11. RELATION OF THE PARTIES

The relationship of the parties to this AGREEMENT shall be that of independent contractors and that in no event shall CONSULTANT be considered an officer, agent, servant or employee of CITY. CONSULTANT shall be solely responsible for any workers compensation insurance, withholding taxes, unemployment insurance, and any other employer obligations associated with the described work.

12. CORRECTIONS

In addition to the above indemnification obligations, CONSULTANT shall correct, at its expense, all errors in the work that may be disclosed during CITY's review of CONSULTANT's report or plans. Should CONSULTANT fail to make such correction in a reasonably timely manner, such correction shall be made by CITY, and the cost thereof shall be charged to CONSULTANT or withheld from any funds due to CONSULTANT hereunder.
13. **TERMINATION BY CITY**

CITY, by notifying CONSULTANT in writing, may upon calendar days notice, terminate without cause any portion or all of the services agreed to be performed under this AGREEMENT. If termination is for cause, no notice period need be given. In the event of termination, CONSULTANT shall have the right and obligation to immediately assemble work in progress for the purpose of closing out the job. All compensation for actual work performed and charges outstanding at the time of termination shall be payable by CITY to CONSULTANT within 30 days following submission of a final statement by CONSULTANT unless termination is for cause. In such event, CONSULTANT shall be compensated only to the extent required by law.

14. **ACCEPTANCE OF FINAL PAYMENT CONSTITUTES RELEASE**

The acceptance by CONSULTANT of the final payment made under this AGREEMENT shall operate as and be a release of CITY from all claims and liabilities for compensation to CONSULTANT for anything done, furnished, or relating to CONSULTANT's work or services. Acceptance of payment shall be any negotiation of CITY's check or the failure to make a written extra compensation claim within 10 calendar days of the receipt of that check. However, approval or payment by CITY shall not constitute, nor be deemed, a release of the responsibility and liability of CONSULTANT, its employees, subcontractors, agents and consultant for the accuracy and competency of the information provided and/or work performed; nor shall such approval or payment be deemed to be an assumption of such responsibility or liability by CITY for any defect or error in the work prepared by CONSULTANT, its employees, subcontractors, agents and consultants.

15. **AUDIT OF RECORDS**

At any time during normal business hours and as often as it may deem necessary, CONSULTANT shall make available to a representative of CITY for examination of all its records with respect to all matters covered by this AGREEMENT and will permit CITY to audit, examine and/or reproduce such records. CONSULTANT will retain such financial records, time sheets, work progress reports, invoices, bills and project records for at least two years after termination or final payment under this AGREEMENT.

16. **WAIVER; REMEDIES CUMULATIVE**

Failure by a party to insist upon the strict performance of any of the provisions of this AGREEMENT by the other party, irrespective of the length of time for which such failure continues, shall not constitute a waiver of such party's right to demand strict compliance by such other party in the future. No waiver by a party of a default or breach of the other party shall be effective or binding upon such party unless made in writing by such party, and no such waiver shall be implied from any omissions by a party to take any action with respect to such default or breach. No express written waiver of a
specified default or breach shall affect any other default or breach, or cover any other period of time, other than any default or breach and/or period of time specified. All of the remedies permitted or available to a party under this AGREEMENT, or at law or in equity, shall be cumulative and alternative, and invocation of any such right or remedy shall not constitute a waiver or election of remedies with respect to any other permitted or available right of remedy.

17. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

CONSULTANT is unaware of any CITY employee or official that has a financial interest in CONSULTANT’S business. During the term of this AGREEMENT and/or as a result of being awarded this AGREEMENT, CONSULTANT shall not offer, encourage or accept any financial interest in CONSULTANT’S business by any CITY employee or official.

18. CONSTRUCTION OF LANGUAGE OF AGREEMENT

The provisions of this AGREEMENT shall be construed as a whole according to its common meaning of purpose of providing a public benefit and not strictly for or against any party. It shall be construed consistent with the provisions hereof, in order to achieve the objectives and purposes of the parties. Wherever required by the context, the singular shall include the plural and vice versa, and the masculine gender shall include the feminine or neutral genders or vice versa.

19. MITIGATION OF DAMAGES

In all situations arising out of this AGREEMENT, the parties shall attempt to avoid and minimize the damages resulting from the conduct of the other party.

20. GOVERNING LAW

This AGREEMENT, and the rights and obligations of the parties, shall be governed and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. Should litigation occur, venue shall be in Superior Court of Santa Barbara County.

21. TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

CONSULTANT shall provide CITY with a complete Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification, Form W-9 (Rev. 12-87), as issued by the Internal Revenue Service.

22. NON-APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

Payments due and payable to CONSULTANT for current services are within the current budget and within an available, unexhausted and unencumbered appropriation of CITY funds. In the event CITY has not appropriated sufficient funds for payment of
CONSULTANT services beyond the current fiscal year, this AGREEMENT shall cover only those costs incurred up to the conclusion of the current fiscal year.

23. **MODIFICATION OF AGREEMENT**

The tasks described in this AGREEMENT and all other terms of this AGREEMENT may be modified only upon mutual written consent of CITY and CONSULTANT.

24. **USE OF THE TERM “CITY”**

Reference to “CITY” in this AGREEMENT includes City Manager or any authorized representative acting on behalf of CITY.

25. **PERMITS AND LICENSES**

CONSULTANT, at its sole expense, shall obtain and maintain during the term of this AGREEMENT, all appropriate permits, licenses, and certificates, including a CITY business license, that may be required in connection with the performance of services under this AGREEMENT.

26. **CAPTIONS**

The captions or headings in this AGREEMENT are for convenience only and in no other way define, limit or describe the scope or intent of any provision or section of the AGREEMENT.

27. **AUTHORIZATION**

Each party has expressly authorized the execution of this AGREEMENT on its behalf and bind said party and its respective administrators, officers, directors, shareholders, divisions, subsidiaries, agents, employees, successors, assigns, principals, partners, joint venturers, insurance carriers and any others who may claim through it to this AGREEMENT.

28. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PARTIES**

Except for CONSULTANT'S proposals and submitted representations for obtaining this AGREEMENT, this AGREEMENT supersedes any other agreements, either oral or in writing, between the parties hereto with respect to the rendering of services, and contains all of the covenants and agreements between the parties with respect to said services.
29. **PARTIAL INVALIDITY**

If any provision in this AGREEMENT is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions will nevertheless continue in full force without being impaired or invalidated in any way.

30. **NOTICES**

Any notice required to be given hereunder shall be deemed to have been given by depositing said notice in the United States mail, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows:

**TO CITY:**
Attention: City Manager
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

**TO CONSULTANT:**

**In concurrence and witness whereof,** this AGREEMENT has been executed by the parties effective on the date and year first above written.

**CITY OF GOLETA**

Michelle Greene, City Manager

**CONSULTANT**

By:
Title:

**ATTEST:**

Deborah Lopez, City Clerk

By:
Title:

**APPROVED AS TO FORM**

Tim W. Giles, City Attorney